Historic, Archive Document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

203496

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Public Law 759--81st Congress

Chapter 896--2d Session

H. R. 7786

CHAPTER VI--DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Digest of Public Law 759 1

Index and Summary of History on H. R. 7786 3

Index to debate 6

DIGEST OF PUBLIC LAW 759, CHAPTER VI.

Chapter VI is cited as the "Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1951." The Act provides direct appropriation of $775,533,924 and authorizations to borrow from the Secretary of the Treasury in the amount of $536,500,000. In addition, permanent appropriations are available in the amount of $125,509,210.

These amounts are exclusive of the effects of Sec. 411 of Chapter VI of the Act, which requires that $791,888 of the funds provided Agriculture for travel expenses be deposited to the surplus fund of the Treasury; and Sec. 1214 of Chapter XII, which requires, through the apportionment procedure, an over-all reduction of $550,000,000 in the appropriations, reappropriations, contract authorizations, and reauthorizations made in the Act for the various departments and agencies.

Items of major significance contained in Chapter VI, including amounts of increase or decrease as compared with fiscal year 1950, are as follows:

CONSERVATION AND USE OF AGRICULTURAL LAND RESOURCES - $282,500,000 appropriated (increase of $25,456,561), of which not to exceed $25,500,000 is for administrative expenses; Act provides a program authorization of $285,000,000 for the 1951 crop year; ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS AND MARKETING QUOTAS - $32,300,000 appropriated (increase of $2,149,226) of which $4,000,000 is to be placed in reserve to be released by the Budget Bureau only after determination by the Secretary that marketing quotas on the 1951 crops of wheat, corn, and rice are necessary; SUGAR ACT - $63,750,000 appropriated (increase of $3,750,000); MARKETING SERVICES - $10,989,000 appropriated (increase of $269,800).

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION - The Act authorizes use of $16,350,000 for administrative expenses from corporate funds (increase of $1,000,000), and provides for restoration of capital impairment in the amount of $66,698,457.

COMMODITY EXCHANGE AUTHORITY - $650,000 appropriated (increase of $82,200). SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE - $53,900,000 appropriated (increase of $768,700); LAND UTILIZATION PROGRAM - $1,565,175 appropriated (increase of $318,175). FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION - $7,204,000 appropriated (increase of $2,081,000).

FARMERS' HOME ADMINISTRATION: Borrowing authorizations - $154,000,000 in loans including $65,000,000 (increase of $23,650,000) for farm tenancy and farm housing, $85,000,000 for production and subsistence, and $4,000,000 (increase of $1,000,000) for water facilities loans; The Act authorizes the distribution of $3,500,000 for farm ownership loans in reclamation projects and to entrymen on unpatented public lands, without regard to farm population and prevalence of tenancy; Grants - $650,000 appropriated (no increase), Salaries and expenses - $28,500,000 appropriated (increase of $1,901,000).

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION - $8,550,000 (increase of $1,422,000) for administrative expenses; the Act provides borrowing authorizations for loans in the amount of $350,000,000 for rural electrification and $32,500,000 (increase of $7,500,000) for rural telephone, and authorizes additional borrowing authorization for rural electrification loans of not to exceed $150,000,000, including the uncommitted balance available as a carry-over from the fiscal year 1950, upon certification of need by the Secretary of Agriculture.

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION - $585,000 (increase of $54,000) for salaries and expenses, and limits the assessments to be made against FCA corporations for supervisory and other services not to exceed $2,325,000. In addition, the Act provides the following corporate administrative expense limitations; Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, $1,280,000 (decrease of $220,000); Federal Intermediate Credit Banks, $1,496,000 (increase of $98,000); Production Credit Corporations, $1,358,000 (increase of $10,000).

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION - $73,825,358 (decrease of $2,284,165). In addition, $200,000 for cortisone research is provided by transfer from Public Health Service. Significant changes over 1950 include: Agricultural Research Center - $300,000 to establish a working capital fund; Research on Agricultural Problems of Alaska - decrease of $395,000 consisting of an increase of $20,000 for agricultural research and a reduction of $415,000 due to elimination of nonrecurring construction costs for buildings and facilities provided in the 1950 Appropriation Act; Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine - decrease of $1,153,000 for Control of Emergency Outbreaks of Insect and Plant Diseases, and decrease of $125,100 in other work of the Bureau. The Act provides that of the $2,100,000 appropriated for Control of Emergency Outbreaks of Insects and Plant Diseases, $1,250,000 shall constitute a contingency fund for use only to the extent determined necessary by the Secretary and the Budget Bureau, and subject to the approval of the Appropriations Committee of both Houses. The Act also provides for a $50,-000 transfer to Public Health Service for investigation of the effects of insecticidal and fungicidal residue on human health.

RESEARCH AND MARKETING ACT OF 1946 (Title II) - $6,000,000 appropriated. Funds for research under sections 10(a), utilization and development of uses of agricultural products, and 10(b), other than research on utilization, were consolidated with regular appropriations of the various agencies handling this work; and Sec. 9 funds, for payments to States, were transferred to Office of Experiment Stations.

CONTROL OF FOREST PESTS - $5,700,000 appropriated (decrease of $2,281,000), including a contingency fund of $750,000 under the Forest Pest Control Act for use only to the extent determined necessary by the Secretary and Budget Bureau.

FOREST SERVICE, EXCLUDING PERMANENT APPROPRIATIONS - $61,415,000 (increase of $911,500). Significant items include: National Forest Protection and Management - $27,100,000 appropriated (increase of $310,000); Cooperative Range Improvements - $700,000, a new item formerly financed from grazing fees collected and deposited into a trust fund account; Fighting Forest Fires - $6,000,000 appropriated (decrease of $777,000), of which $2,500,000 shall constitute a contingency fund, for use only to the extent determined necessary by the Secretary and the Budget Bureau; Forest Development Roads and Trails - $10,348,000 (same as 1950); Acquisition of Lands for National Forests - $450,000 (decrease of $101,000 under the Weeks Act and an increase of $75,000 for Superior National Forest); Forest Fire Cooperation - $9,500,000 (increase of $500,000); Farm and Other Private Forestry Cooperation - $1,300,000 (increase of $224,600).

FLOOD CONTROL - $10,315,000 (increase of $815,000).
EXTENSION SERVICE (principally payments to States) - $28,003,498 exclusive of permanent appropriations (a decrease of $15,152), including provision for further development of cooperative extension work in Alaska and Puerto Rico.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY - $2,161,300 (decrease of $35,755).
OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR - $2,562,500 (increase of $183,000).

CHAPTER VI

January 12, 1950	Hearings: House, H. R. 7786, Pt. 1, Agriculture Dept.
January 16, 1950	Hearings: House, H. R. 7786, Pt. 2, Agriculture Dept.
January 23, 1950	Hearings: House, H. R. 7786, Pt. 3, Agriculture Dept. Senate, H. R. 7786. Agriculture Dept.
January 30, 1950	Hearings: House, H. R. 7786, Pt. 4, Agriculture Dept.
February 6, 1950	Hearings: House, H. R. 7786, Pt. 5, Agriculture Dept.
February 10, 1950	Hearings: House, H. R. 7786, Pt. 6, Agriculture Dept.
March 21, 1950	House Committee on Appropriations reported H. R. 7786. House Report 1797. Print of the bill as reported.
April 3, 1950	House began debate on H. R. 7786.
April 4, 1950	House debate continued.
April 5, 1950	House debate continued. Discussed Missouri Valley program and soil conservation (pp. 4822-6), also use of surplus food (pp. 4829-32).
April 6, 1950	House debate continued. Discussed BAE funds in connection with the Brannan price-support plan and Government officials making speeches over the country (5003-6).
April 18, 1950	House debate continued.
April 19, 1950	House debate continued. Discussed a more extensive conservation program (pp. 5471-3).
April 26, 1950	House debate continued. Agreed to Keefe amendment for transfer from Federal Security Agency to this Dept. of $200,000 for research into utilization of plant material amd vegetable sources of cortisone (pp. 5835-6).
April 27, 1950	House debate continued: Rejected the following amendments: By Rep. Andersen, to reduce 40 separate items to total $2,562,300 (pp. 5986-96). By Rep. Rees to reduce to $750 on individual payments under ACP (pp. 6010-6). By Rep. Taber, to prohibit use of funds for USDA officers for attendance at meetings in connection with proposed legislation (pp. 6017-20). By Rep. Barrett, to increase funds by $160,000 for emergency control of insect outbreaks (pp. 6009-10). By Rep. IeCompte, to provide $100,000 for European corn borer research (p. 6020). By Rep. Carnaham, to increase funds $1,500,000 for school-lunch program (p. 6021) Agreed to Horan amendment to reduce travel expenses in the Dept. (pp. 5998-6001).

CHAPTER VI

January 12, 1950 — Hearings: House, H. R. 7786, Pt. 1, Agriculture Dept.

January 16, 1950 — Hearings: House, H. R. 7786, Pt. 2, Agriculture Dept.

January 23, 1950 — Hearings: House, H. R. 7786, Pt. 3, Agriculture Dept.

Senate, H. R. 7786. Agriculture Dept.

January 30, 1950 — Hearings: House, H. R. 7786, Pt. 4, Agriculture Dept.

February 6, 1950 — Hearings: House, H. R. 7786, Pt. 5, Agriculture Dept.

February 10, 1950 — Hearings: House, H. R. 7786, Pt. 6, Agriculture Dept.

March 21, 1950 — House Committee on Appropriations reported H. R. 7786. House Report 1797. Print of the bill as reported.

April 3, 1950 — House began debate on H. R. 7786.

April 4, 1950 — House debate continued.

April 5, 1950 — House debate continued. Discussed Missouri Valley program and soil conservation (pp. 4822-6), also use of surplus food (pp. 4829-32).

April 6, 1950 — House debate continued. Discussed PAC funds in connection with the Truman price-support plan and Government officials making speeches over the country (5009-6).

April 18, 1950 — House debate continued.

April 19, 1950 — House debate continued. Discussed a more extensive conservation program (pp. 5471-3).

April 26, 1950 — House debate continued. Agreed to Keefe amendment for transfer from Federal Security Agency to this Dept. of $200,000 for research into utilization of plant material and vegetable sources of nutrients (pp. 5835-6).

April 27, 1950 — House debate continued: Rejected the following amendments:
By Rep. Andersen, to reduce 40 separate items to total $2,562,300 (pp. 5906-06).
By Rep. Rees to reduce to $950 on individual payments under ACP (pp. 6020-6).
By Rep. Taber, to prohibit use of funds for USDA officers for attendance at meetings in connection with proposed legislation (pp. 6017-20).
By Rep. Burrett, to increase funds by $150,000 for emergency control of insect outbreaks (pp. 6009-10).
By Rep. Jacobs, to provide $100,000 for European corn borer research (p. 6020).
By Rep. Carlson, to increase funds $1,500,000 for school-lunch program (p. 6021)
Agreed to Doran amendment to reduce travel expenses in the Dept. (pp. 5906-6002).

April 28, 1950	House debate continued. Discussed soil conservation work and Dept's. report on Missouri Valley (pp. 6093-4).
May 3, 1950	House debate continued. Discussed REA cooperatives (pp. 6361-8).
May 8, 1950	House Rules Committee reported H. Res. 593 waiving points of order against Chapter XI, general provisions. House Report 2021.
May 9, 1950	House agreed to H. Res. 593.
May 10, 1950	House debated and passed H. R. 7786 with amendments by a vote of 362-21. Agreed, 274-112 to the Thomas amendment, as amended by Rep. Taber for reductions as follows: Civilian personnel, 10%, Dept. of Defense, 2%; Civilian travel, 20%, military, 5%; Transportation of things, 10%, Defense Depts., 5%; Communications services, rents and utilities, printing and reproduction, contractual services, and equipment all reduced 10%, except Defense Dept; Lands and structures 5%.
May 11, 1950	Print of H. R. 7786 as referred to the Senate Committee on Appropriations.
July 6, 1950	Senate Committee reported H. R. 7786 with amendments. Senate Report 1941. Print of the bill as reported.
July 11, 1950	Senate began debate on H. R. 7786.
July 12, 1950	Senate debate continued. Discussed research program.
July 14, 1950	Senate debate continued. The Bridges amendment was proposed and discussed.
July 17, 1950	Senate debate continued. Rejected amendments to increase funds for forest development roads and trails and to reduce funds for flood control (pp. 10541-2). Also discussed Research and Marketing Act, veterinarians for Union Stockyards at Seattle, CCC price-support funds and exhibits and movies.
July 18, 1950	Senate debate continued. Agreed to several committee amendments.
July 19, 1950	Senate debate continued. Received the Report of the President on the situation in Korea, requesting the Depts. to review their programs with this in mind. H. Doc. 646.
July 28, 1950	Senate debate continued. Discussed reductions in funds, restrictions on the filling of vacancies, and annual and sick leave.
July 31, 1950	Senate debate continued. Discussed annual leave.
August 1, 1950	Senate debate continued. Rejected amendment to reduce leave.

August 3, 1950	Senate debate continued. Agreed to Bridges-Byrd amendment for 10% reduction of nondefense funds, with certain exceptions, by a 55-31 vote.
August 4, 1950	Senate debated and passed H. R. 7786 with amendments.
	Print of the bill with the amendments of the Senate numbered.
August 7, 1950	House conferees appointed.
August 8, 1950	Senate conferees appointed.
August 23, 1950	House discussed consideration of the bill.
August 24, 1950	House received the conference report. House Report 2991.
	Tabulation showing funds and principal language changes.
August 25, 1950	House agreed to the conference report.
August 28, 1950	Senate agreed to the conference and House acted on amendments in disagreement.
September 6, 1950	Approved. Public Law 759.
	Statement of the President on signing H. R. 7786.

INDEX TO DEBATE ON

H. R. 7786

Administrative expenses
Reduction 11476

Administration and management 5858

Appropriations
Agriculture . . 5857-8, 5865-6, 5987, 5988, 5993-8, 6000-1, 11889
Reductions (All departments and agencies)4684-5, 4688-90-4691, 4759-60
4765-6, 4769, 4795-6, 4805-7, 4809-10, 4814-19, 4822-26, 4829, 4978
4981, 5002-7, 5374-6, 6803-10, 6891-6909, 6914-20, 6923-5, 6996-7
7023-4, A-3745, 10311-14, 11473-80, 11632-44, 11888-90, 11893-11900
. . . . . 12012-18, 13425, 13771-79, 13783-88
Investigating Committee 4764-7, 5858

Brannan plan 4825, 5003, 5006, 5869-70, 6004-5, 6018-20

Budget estimates 4688, 4818-19

Bureau of Agricultural Economics 5003, 10534-35

Bureau of Animal Industry 10536-38, 10644-46, 13659, 13786

Bureau of the Budget 4764-5

Bureau of Dairy Industry 10538-39

Bureau of Entomoloty & Plant Quarantine
Emergency outbreaks 13659, 13786
European Corn borer 5990, 5996, 6020
Forest pests 10540, 13659
Grasshopper control 5867, 6009-10
Insect investigation 10540
Management 5858

Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics . . . . . .
. . . . . .5003, 5987, 5997-8, 6000, 10536

Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils & Agricultural Engineering. . 10539-40

Commodity Credit Corporation 6804-10
Funds (apportionment, p. 10536) 10558-59, 10640-42
Price support programs . . . 5859,5866, 6004-5, 6904, 6905, 6913-14
Sec. 32 funds 4829-31, 6007-08

Construction
Reduction 11476

Cotton 5861-62

Equipment & supplies 6895, 6909, 6923

Expenditures
Reduction in 10093-96, 10312-14

Extension Service 10549

Farm income 5858-9, 5866, 6003-4

Farm labor 5859, 5861

Farmers Home Administration 5861, 5985, 5990-91, 5992, 5994, 10544-46, 10547-49

Federal Crop Insurance Corporation 5994, 10557-59

Flood Control 5863, 6093-4, 10541-42, 10644, 13660, 13786
Army Engineers & Bureau of Reclamation 4794-5, 4797-4804, 4807-8, 4823

Food production 5859-60

Foreign affairs
Relief 4691

Forest Service
Funds 5989-90, 5992-3, 10540-41, 10644, 13660, 13786
National forests, management 5864, 6000-1, 13660
Recreational areas 5864
Reforestation 5860, 5864, 6000-1
Roads and trails 5989-90, 5992-3, 10540-41

General Services Administration 4690-1

Government Corporations 6804-08

Health 4770-3, 4779-80, 5997-8

Housing, farm 5858

Investigating Committees 4764-7, 5859

Library 5003, 5982, 5998, 6007, 10557

Marketing
Eggs 5375

Meat inspection . 10536, 10537-38 , 10559, 10643, 10644-46, 11899, 12016

Office of Experiment Stations 10152, 10531-34, 10535

Office of Foreign Agriculture Relations 5989, 5994

Office of Information . . 5984-5, 5989, 10550-54, 10557, 10640-43, 13661

Office of the Secretary 5982, 5989, 10549

Office of the Solicitor 5984, 5989, 5994, 10549-50, 13660-1

Personnel
Civilian employees 4796
Employment 5375, 5857
.6894, 6909, 6917-18,6919-20, 6924-5, 6996-7, 7023-4, 11476-80, 11533
Leave 6916,, 11477, 11532, 11636
Racial discrimination 6910-13
Salaries, increases 4763-4, 5988, 10548
Travel 5006, 5982
.5998, 6000-01, 6017-20, 6894-5, 6909, 6923-5, 11476-80, 13661, 13786

Power Plants
Reclamation Service 4820-1, 6097-6100, 6016-7, 6361-68

Printing & binding 6894, 6909, 6923

Production and Marketing Administration
Conservation and use of agricultural land . 5471-3, 5860-1, 5986, 5993
6001, 6003, 6006-7, 6010-13, 6016, 6017, 6020-21, 10542, 13660, 13786
Funds 5989, 10543
Marketing and distribution 5375
Price supports. 5859, 5861, 5866, 5869-70, 6004-5, 11900
School lunch program 6021
Surplus commodities 4829-31, 5868, 5982-4, 6004-5

Rents and utilities 6894, 6909

Research
Alaska 10535
Animal diseases 5861
Forestry products 10155
Fuels 5859
Funds 5987, 10152-55, 10535, 10641-4
Insects 5861
Poultry breeding 5981-2
Straw, wheat and flax 10155

Research and Marketing Act . . 5858, 5981-2, 6001, 10152-55, 10531-34

Rural Electrification Administration
Electrification . . . . . .
. 5861, 5988-9, 5994, 5995, 6002, 6363-68, 10546-47, 13653, 13779-82
Telephones 5864-5, 6002, 6005, 10543-4, 13653

Section 32
Surplus commodities 4829-31, 5868, 5982-4, 6007-08

Soil Conservation Service
General .. .4823, 4824, 5471-3, 5860-1, 6020-21, 6093-4, 10542, 10643
Soil conservation districts 5858, 5863-4, 5986, 5988

. . 5991, 5993, 5996, 6001, 6002, 6003, 6006-7, 6014-17, 6093, 13660

Sugar Act 10542-3

Tables
Appropriation bills 4817
Appropriation reductions 4819-20, 13652
Commodities, storage charges 4830-1
Expenditures, fiscal year 1951 4760-1
Federal receipts and expenditures 4762, 5532
Health research 4776-8
Livestock delivery to market 4758

Transportation
Commodities 4829-31, 5375, 5868
Of things 6894, 6909, 6923
Roads 4758-9

Travel
See Personnel, travel

Vehicles 6910

Veto
Single-item veto 5001-2

14. FISHERIES. The "Daily Digest" states that a subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee approved for reporting to the full committee H. R. 6533, providing for a Nation-wide sport-fish restoration program (p. D276).

BILLS INTRODUCED

15. OLEOMARGARINE. S. Con. Res. 83, by Sen. Lehman, to provide for an investigation by the Justice Department of firms manufacturing oleomargarine, with a view to determining whether they are violating the antitrust laws; to Judiciary Committee (p. 3800).

S. J. Res. 162, by Sen. Lehman, providing for an investigation by the Secretary of Agriculture into the effect on American agriculture of the repeal of certain taxes relating to oleomargarine; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee (pp. 3757, 3800). Sen. Lehman explained the purpose of his joint resolution (p. 3800).

16. AAAct. S. 3274, by Sen. Murray (for Sen. Pepper) to amend section 8c (6) of the the Agricultural Adjustment Act; to the Agriculture and Forestry Committee (p. 3757).

17. CENSUS. H. R. 7787, by Rep. Dondero, Mich., and H. R. 7790, by Rep. Rees, Kans., to amend the Census Act of 1929 so as to prohibit inquiries as to income of individuals; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee (p. 3809).

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

18. RURAL ELECTRIFICATION. Sen. Hill inserted Clyde T. Ellis' (Executive Manager, National Rural Electric Cooperative Assn.) statement discussing the need for expansion of REA facilities, and criticizing efforts to curb the generating program (pp. A2201-4).

19. VETERANS' EDUCATION. Extension of remarks of Rep. Blackney, Mich., favoring H. R. 7057, to provide that funds granted annually to land-grant colleges for teaching personnel shall not be deducted from estimates of cost presented to the Veterans' Administration for training veterans (p. A2201).

COMMITTEE HEARINGS Released by G.P.O.

20. APPROPRIATIONS. Defense Department appropriations, 1951, parts 4 and 5. H. Appropriations Committee.

Interior Department appropriations for 1951 (Mission Indians, Calif.). H. Appropriations Committee.

Commerce Department appropriations for 1951. H. Appropriations Committee.

oOo

COMMITTEE HEARINGS ANNOUNCEMENTS for Mar. 22: H. Agriculture, surplus commodities disposal; H. Education and Labor, education of children residing on Federal property (ex.); H. Foreign Affairs, ECA continuation (ex.); H. Public Works, Federal aid highways; S. Appropriations, independent offices appropriations (ex.); S. Interstate and Foreign Commerce, nomination of James K. Knudson to be ICC commissioner; S. Finance, social security amendments; H. Un-American Activities, bill making it unlawful for Federal employees to be affiliated with Communist organizations; H. Ways and Means, tax revision; and Conference on cotton acreage-allotments measure (ex.).

oOo

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

House Committee Bill, 1951, Compared with Appropriations and Borrowing Authorizations, 1950, and Budget Estimates, 1951

(Note.--1950 figures include all supplemental appropriations to date and are adjusted for comparability with the appropriation structure proposed in the 1951 House Committee Bill.) a/

Bureau or Item	Fiscal Year 1950			Budget Estimates, 1951	House Committee Bill, 1951	Increase (+) or Decrease (-), House Committee Bill Compared With	
	Actual Appropriations and Borrowing Authorizations	Pending Supplementals (P.L. 429 Pay Adjustments)	Total Estimated Available			Total Estimated Available, 1950	Budget Estimates, 1951
APPROPRIATED FUNDS:							
Production and Marketing Administration:							
Conservation and use of agricultural land resources	$257,043,439	--	$257,043,439	$285,000,000	b/282,500,000	+25,456,561	-2,500,000
Acreage allotments and marketing quotas	30,150,774	--	30,150,774	34,000,000	32,300,000	+2,149,226	-1,700,000
Sugar Act	60,000,000	--	60,000,000	67,500,000	60,000,000	--	-7,500,000
Removal of Surplus Agricultural Commodities (30% of customs receipts) .	125,606,982	--	125,606,982	110,000,000	110,000,000	-15,606,982	--
National School Lunch Act	83,500,000	--	83,500,000	83,500,000	83,500,000	--	--
Marketing services .	10,525,500	193,700	10,719,200	11,487,000	10,975,500	+256,300	-511,500
Total, Production and Marketing Administration (excluding Commodity Credit Corporation)	566,826,695	193,700	567,020,395	591,487,000	579,275,500	+12,255,105	-12,211,500

a/ Research and Marketing Act funds for research under sections 10(a) and 10(b) of the Research and Marketing Act of 1946 and the special research fund have been included with the regular funds of the various agencies handling this work.

b/ House Committee Bill authorizes the formulation of a 1951 crop year program amounting to $285,000,000 (same as Budget estimate).

Bureau or Item	Fiscal Year 1950			Budget Estimates, 1951	House Committee Bill, 1951	Increase (+) or Decrease (-), House Committee Bill Compared with	
	Actual Appropriations and Borrowing Authorizations	Pending Supplementals (P.L. 429 Pay Adjustments)	Total Estimated Available			Total Estimated Available, 1950	Budget Estimates, 1951
APPROPRIATED FUNDS:							
Commodity Exchange Authority	$558,200	$9,600	$567,800	$675,000	$650,000	+$82,200	-$25,000
Soil Conservation Service:							
Soil conservation research	1,496,000	26,000	1,522,000	1,542,100	1,500,000	-22,000	-42,100
Soil conservation operations	50,572,300	1,037,000	51,609,300	52,047,000	52,900,000	+1,290,700	+853,000
Total	52,068,300	1,063,000	53,131,300	53,589,100	54,400,000	+1,268,700	+810,900
Land Utilization Program (Title III, Farm Tenant Act)	1,225,000	22,000	1,247,000	1,893,100	1,490,000	+243,000	-403,100
Payments due counties: submarginal land program	247,500	- -	247,500	243,500	243,500	-4,000	- -
Water conservation and utilization projects	- -	- -	- -	969,900	400,000	+400,000	-569,900
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation	5,054,000	69,000	5,123,000	7,450,000	6,854,000	+1,731,000	-596,000
Farmers' Home Admin.:							
Grants and loans (Farm housing program)	2,000,000	- -	2,000,000	5,000,000	650,000	-1,350,000	-4,350,000
Salaries and expenses	26,149,000	450,000	26,599,000	30,000,000	27,700,000	+1,101,000	-2,300,000
Total, Farmers' Home Administration	28,149,000	450,000	28,599,000	35,000,000	28,350,000	-249,000	-6,650,000
Rural Electrification Administration (administrative expenses)	6,963,000	120,000	7,083,000	9,525,000	8,150,000	+1,067,000	-1,375,000

Bureau or Item	Fiscal Year 1950			Budget Estimates, 1951	House Committee Bill, 1951	Increase (+) or Decrease (-), House Committee Bill Compared with	
	Actual Appropriations and Borrowing Authorizations	Pending Supplementals (P.L. 429 Pay Adjustments)	Total Estimated Available			Total Estimated Available, 1950	Budget Estimates, 1951
APPROPRIATED FUNDS:							
Farm Credit Adminis.:							
Direct appropriation	$531,000	- -	$531,000	$592,000	$585,000	+$54,000	-$7,000
Assessments against member institutions of the Farm Credit system	2,281,800	- -	2,281,800	2,327,000	2,325,000	+43,200	-2,000
Agricultural Research Administration:							
Office of the Administrator (including Agricultural Research Center)	773,400	7,600	781,000	692,200	600,000	-181,000	-92,200
Working Capital Fund	- -	- -	- -	400,000	300,000	+300,000	-100,000
Research on strategic and critical agricultural materials	349,000	5,000	354,000	515,500	399,000	+45,000	-116,500
Research on agricultural problems of Alaska	675,000	- -	675,000	316,200	260,000	-415,000	-56,200
Office of Experiment Stations (principally payments to States)	7,833,058	6,200	7,839,258	7,865,208	7,818,708	-20,550	-46,500
Bureau of Animal Industry	23,957,800	431,900	24,389,700	25,080,800	24,300,000	-89,700	-780,800
Bureau of Dairy Industry	1,613,300	17,300	1,630,600	1,899,300	1,600,000	-30,600	-299,300

Bureau or Item	Fiscal Year 1950			Budget Estimates, 1951	House Committee Bill, 1951	Increase (+) or Decrease (-), House Committee Bill Compared with	
	Actual Appropriations and Borrowing Authorizations	Pending Supplementals (P.L. 429 Pay Adjustments)	Total Estimated Available			Total Estimated Available, 1950	Budget Estimates, 1951
APPROPRIATED FUNDS:							
Agricultural Research Administration: Cont.							
Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering	$10,746,640	$157,700	$10,904,340	$11,985,100	$10,752,700	-$151,640	-$1,232,400
Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine							
Control of emergency outbreaks of insects and plant diseases	2,253,000	- -	2,253,000	4,855,000	850,000	-1,403,000	-4,005,000
Other work of the Bureau	11,087,300	131,300	11,218,600	11,921,700	10,610,900	-607,700	-1,310,800
Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry ..	8,395,625	38,851	8,434,476	8,818,800	7,750,000	-684,476	-1,068,800
Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics	1,749,200	16,100	1,765,300	2,217,200	1,500,000	-265,300	-717,200
Total, Agricultural Research Admin. .	69,433,323	811,951	70,245,274	76,567,008	66,741,308	-3,503,966	-9,825,700
Research and Marketing Act of 1946 a/	11,000,000	- -	11,000,000	11,102,000	11,000,000	- -	-102,000
Control of forest pests (including white pine blister rust control)	5,220,000	45,700	5,265,700	8,213,500	4,719,500	-546,200	-3,494,000

a/ Research and Marketing Act funds for research under sections 10(a) and 10(b) of the Research and Marketing Act of 1946 and the special research fund have been included with the regular funds of the various agencies handling this work.

Bureau or Item	Fiscal Year 1950			Budget Estimates, 1951	House Committee Bill, 1951	Increase (+) or Decrease (-), House Committee Bill Compared with	
	Actual Appropriations and Borrowing Authorizations	Pending Supplementals (P.L. 429 Pay Adjustments)	Total Estimated Available			Total Estimated Available, 1950	Budget Estimates, 1951
APPROPRIATED FUNDS:							
Forest Service (excluding fighting forest fires and forest development roads and trails)	$53,647,990	$679,390	$54,327,380	$60,345,300	$54,483,000	+$155,620	-$5,862,300
Fighting forest fires	a/ 6,777,000	- -	a/ 6,777,000	6,500,000	6,000,000	-777,000	-500,000
Forest development roads and trails	10,348,000	- -	10,348,000	12,465,000	10,348,000	- -	-2,117,000
Flood Control	9,500,000	- -	9,500,000	11,700,000	10,750,000	+1,250,000	-950,000
Extension Service (principally payments to States)	32,707,160	16,200	32,723,360	33,519,448	32,604,710	-118,650	-914,738
Office of the Secretary (including immediate Office of the Secretary, Offices of Budget and Finance, Plant and Operations, Personnel and Hearing Examiners)	2,151,300	32,083	2,183,383	2,275,300	2,143,300	-40,083	-132,000
Office of Solicitor	2,364,000	15,500	2,379,500	3,070,000	2,450,000	+70,500	-620,000
Office of Information	1,256,228	12,600	1,268,828	1,297,200	1,265,800	-3,028	-31,400
Library	713,293	21,700	734,993	740,000	713,293	-21,700	-26,707
Bureau of Agricultural Economics	5,438,900	99,700	5,538,600	6,293,400	5,325,000	-213,600	-968,400

a/ Includes $6,677,000 estimated supplemental pending consideration by the Congress.

Bureau or Item	Fiscal Year 1950			Budget Estimates, 1951	House Committee Bill, 1951	Increase (+) or Decrease (-), House Committee Bill Compared with	
	Actual Appropriations and Borrowing Authorizations	Pending Supplementals (P.L. 429 Pay Adjustments)	Total Estimated Available			Total Estimated Available, 1950	Budget Estimates, 1951
APPROPRIATED FUNDS:							
Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations ..	$576,400	$11,500	$587,900	$623,400	$600,000	+$12,100	-$23,400
Deduct amounts included above proposed for transfer from "Salaries and expenses, farm housing" and "Supply and distribution of farm labor" for Public Law 429 adjustments .	- -	-664,200	-664,200	- -	- -	+664,200	- -
Total, appropriations:	875,038,089	3,009,424	878,047,513	938,463,156	891,866,911	+13,819,398	-46,596,245
BORROWING AUTHORIZATIONS:							
Farmers' Home Administration Loans:							
Farm tenancy and farm housing	40,000,000	- -	40,000,000	70,000,000	56,350,000	+16,350,000	-13,650,000
Production and subsistence	85,000,000	- -	85,000,000	85,000,000	85,000,000	- -	- -
Water facilities ...	3,000,000	- -	3,000,000	5,000,000	4,000,000	+1,000,000	-1,000,000
Total, Farmers' Home Administration ...	128,000,000	- -	128,000,000	160,000,000	145,350,000	+17,350,000	-14,650,000
Rural Electrification Administration Loans:							
Rural electrification:	a/ 350,000,000	- -	a/350,000,000	400,000,000	b/350,000,000	- -	-50,000,000

a/ In addition, the Act provides additional borrowing authorization of not to exceed $150,000,000 for rural electrification loans upon certification of need by the Secretary of Agriculture.

b/ House Committee Bill authorizes additional borrowing authorization of not to exceed $150,000,000, including the uncommitted balance available as a carry-over from the fiscal year 1950, for rural electrification loans upon certification of need by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Bureau or Item	Fiscal Year 1950			Budget Estimates, 1951	House Committee Bill, 1951	Increase (+) or Decrease (-), House Committee Bill Compared with	
	Actual Appropriations and Borrowing Authorizations	Pending Supplementals (P.L. 429 Pay Adjustments)	Total Estimated Available			Total Estimated Available, 1950	Budget Estimates, 1951
BORROWING AUTHORIZATIONS:							
Rural Electrification Administration Loans: Cont'd							
Rural telephone	$25,000,000	- -	$25,000,000	$50,000,000	$25,000,000	- -	-$25,000,000
Total, Rural Electrification Admin.	375,000,000	- -	375,000,000	450,000,000	375,000,000	- -	-75,000,000
Total, Borrowing authorizations .	503,000,000	- -	503,000,000	610,000,000	520,350,000	+17,350,000	-89,650,000
Total, Appropriations and Borrowing Authorizations	1,378,038,089	3,009,424	1,381,047,513	1,548,463,156	1,412,216,911	+31,169,398	-136,246,245
DEDUCT:							
Borrowing authorizations	503,000,000	- -	503,000,000	610,000,000	520,350,000	+17,350,000	-89,650,000
Permanent appropriations	141,427,682	- -	141,427,682	125,509,210	125,509,210	-15,918,472	- -
Total, Direct annual appropriations (excluding permanents) in Appropriations Bill..	733,610,407	3,009,424	736,619,831	812,953,946	766,357,701	+29,737,870	-46,596,245

	Fiscal Year 1950			Budget Estimates, 1951	House Committee Bill 1951	Increase (+) or Decrease (-), House Committee Bill Compared with	
	Actual Appropriations and Borrowing Authorizations	Pending Supplementals (P.L. 429 Pay Adjustments)	Total Estimated			Total Estimated Available, 1950	Budget Estimates, 1951
CORPORATE ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSE LIMITATIONS							
Commodity Credit Corporation	$15,000,000	$319,600	$15,319,600	$16,750,000	$16,000,000	+$680,400	-$750,000
Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation	1,500,000	--	1,500,000	1,280,000	1,280,000	-220,000	--
Federal Intermediate Credit Banks	1,398,000	--	1,398,000	1,496,000	1,496,000	+98,000	--
Production Credit Corporations	1,328,000	20,000	1,348,000	1,358,000	1,358,000	+10,000	--
Total, Corporate Administrative Expense Limitation	19,226,000	339,600	19,565,600	20,884,000	20,134,000	+568,400	-750,000

EXCERPTS FROM COMMITTEE REPORT APPLICABLE TO CONSOLIDATED BILL:

Responsibility of the Executive Branch:

"Economy neither begins nor ends in the Halls of Congress. Under the Budget and Accounting Act it is the responsibility of the executive branch of the Government to submit annually to the Congress the estimates of the amounts which officials in the executive branch feel are required to support the necessary activities of the Government. The Congress reviews these estimates and decides the maximum amounts which must be appropriated for these various activities, and the annual appropriation bill provides the sums so determined by the Congress.

"Appropriation of a given amount for a particular activity constitutes only a ceiling upon the amount which should be expended for that activity. The administrative officials responsible for administration of an activity for which appropriation is made bear the final burden for rendering all necessary service with the smallest amount possible within the ceiling figure fixed by the Congress. Every official of the Government who has responsibility for administration of a program must assume a portion of the burden for the deficit in the Federal Treasury. In the first place, he must take into account the condition of the Federal finances when he recommends to the Bureau of the Budget the amount which, in his judgment, is necessary for supporting his activity. In the second place, it is his responsibility to so control and administer the activities under his jurisdiction as to expend as little as possible out of the funds appropriated.

"The so-called Antideficiency Act has been a part of the law for many years but the present statute is antiquated and was written at a time when the fiscal operations of the Government were far more simple. Current laws are so complex and the structure of the Government has become so involved as to render the current law inoperative in many cases. On that account the committee has included as section 1111 in chapter XI a redraft of the Antideficiency Act. The purpose is to require careful apportionment of all types of funds expended by Federal agencies and efficient administration of the Government's business."

Annual Leave of Employees:

"The committee has included in the bill a provision, in section 1112 intended to prevent the accumulation of annual leave during the present calendar year. To be ultimately effective in attaining its real purpose, the prevention of carrying annual leave forward from year to year, it should be reenacted in succeeding years. It is recommended that the appropriate legislative committees review the entire leave situation with view to establishing a sound and equitable leave policy which will prevent the abuses possible under current legislation." (Section 1112 provides that no part of the funds included in the 1951 Act shall be available for payment of annual leave accumulated during calendar year 1950 and unused as of December 31, 1950.)

COMMENTS APPLICABLE TO DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE CHAPTER

Merging of Research Funds

Special attention is directed to the fact that the Research and Marketing Act funds for research under sections 10a and 10b of the Research and Marketing Act and the special research fund appropriations have been merged with the regular funds of the various bureaus and agencies handling this work. The purpose of this action is to eliminate the separate appropriations for the special research fund and Research and Marketing Act, except for activities under section 9 and title II of the Research and Marketing Act. This will tend to eliminate duplication and give more control to the Congress of work done under this program."

Closing Field Stations

In its report last year the committee directed the Department to absorb pay increases and other reductions in such a manner as to prevent the closing of field installations and stations.

In view of the fact that the committee has found it necessary to require many of the bureaus and agencies to absorb all or a portion of the pay increases under Public Law 429 and Public Law 359, it wishes to reemphasize this matter in connection with the 1951 programs. While the committee recognizes the difficulty of maintaining the same facilities in view of increased costs due to pay increases and similar items, it must insist that these costs be absorbed by increased operating efficiencies and by applying reductions to activities and field stations which can absorb them without complete closing or liquidation."

Efficiency of Operations

The committee is disturbed about the question of efficient administration and operation within the Department. In the case of the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, which was investigated by the staff of the committee during the past year, the need for better planning, organization, and administration is apparent. This same condition may apply to other segments of the Department. Overlapping and duplication of activities, particularly in connection with activities in the field, is constantly being brought to the committee's attention. The committee is concerned about the future of the Department of Agriculture and the agricultural programs of the country, in view of the fact that a large number of separate organizational units are conducting separate and in many cases completely independent programs in the field, each with a separate representative contacting the farmer. It appears to the committee that more positive coordination between the soil conservation programs of the Soil Conservation Service and Production and Marketing Administration is essential if maximum results are to be obtained. It also appears that more frequent and more critical reevaluation of the programs of the Department must be made, especially in connection with research activities. The committee expects to give special study to these problems during the coming year so that they may be considered in connection with the 1952 budget estimates. The Secretary of Agriculture should have members of his immediate staff, as well as officials of the individual bureaus and agencies, make a special study of these matters during the coming year."

RMA Commodity Committees

It is expected that the Department will continue to utilize the commodity committees provided for under title III of the act to an even larger extent than has been done in the past. The committee feels that the use of these committees is of extreme

importance to the future effectiveness of the research work of the Department. Since there is evidence that there is some reluctance throughout the Department to adopt new lines of research holding more promise and discontinue older projects which have ceased to be productive, the commodity committees can assist materially in the frequent reevaluation of all research activities to assure essentiality of programs undertaken."

Use of Contract Authority

"The committee feels that the Department has not fully utilized the contract authority contained in the act. Therefore, it expects that increased emphasis will be given to the conduct of research activities through contracts in the future. To assure that attention will be given to this matter, the committee has provided in the bill that not less than $650,000 of the amount approved for title II activities must be done by contract and not less than $575,000 of the amounts provided in the appropriations of the various bureaus and agencies for work under 10a of the act must be done by contract."

Section 32

"The committee has included a provision in the bill under this heading which will authorize the Department to pay from this fund transportation and handling charges on surplus commodities owned by the Department for the purpose of distribution to public welfare agencies. The committee believes that this authority should be provided to enable the Department to make surplus commodities available to public welfare organizations, where no other possible means exists to pay the cost of transportation from storage locations to points of use."

Limitation on Purchase of Passenger Motor Vehicles

The committee bill provides that not to exceed 497 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only may be purchased outside the District of Columbia by the Department during fiscal year 1951, a reduction of 344 from the Budget estimate.

- oOo -

81st Congress, 2d Session } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES { Report No. 1797

GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1951

March 21, 1950.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. Cannon, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 7786]

APPROPRIATIONS

The Committee on Appropriations submits the following report in explanation of the accompanying bill making appropriations for the several branches, departments, and agencies of the Government and for the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, an omnibus appropriation bill, embodying appropriations heretofore annually submitted in separate measures. The separations heretofore observed are preserved, however, and are submitted as separate chapters of the accompanying consolidated bill.

Such chapters and the chairmen of the subcommittees having jurisdiction are as follows:

	Report page No.	Bill page No.
Chapter I. District of Columbia, Hon. Joe B. Bates	13	2
II. Legislative branch, Hon. Christopher C. McGrath	15	3
III. State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, Hon. John J. Rooney	31	30
IV. Treasury-Post Office, Hon J. Vaughan Gary	69	96
V. Labor-Federal Security, Hon. John E. Fogarty	87	117
VI. Agriculture Department, Hon. Jamie L. Whitten	125	156
VII. Interior Department, Hon. Michael J. Kirwan	159	216
VIII. Independent offices, Hon. Albert Thomas	199	256
IX. Civil functions, Hon. John H. Kerr	245	332
X. Defense Establishment, Hon. George H. Mahon	265	345
XI. General provisions, Hon Louis C. Rabaut	333	412

63968—50——1

The measure herewith presented is the composite product of the several subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations, reviewed by a central subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations and approved by the Committee as a Whole. It submits an over-all appropriation program for the fiscal year 1951 and is complete to date. It does not, of course, make provision for estimates which may later be submitted in response to authorizations subsequently enacted. It does not include appropriations for foreign aid or other purposes now pending in legislative committees of the House and which may be added as amendments in the other Chamber. Nor does it include appropriations for estimates which may later be transmitted from the Bureau of the Budget for deficiencies incurred in the fiscal year 1950 but which it is hoped will be largely obviated by the consolidated appropriation procedure in future years.

Estimates for 1951 of direct annual appropriations chargeable against general revenues are $28,651,781,168 as compared with appropriations for the fiscal year 1950 of $28,098,417,844, against which the committee recommends appropriations of $27,266,403,664. The following table compares the foregoing amounts as distributed by chapters in the accompanying bill:

Summary by Chapters

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1950, and estimates and amounts recommended in bill for 1951

Chapter	Subcommittee	Appropriations, 1950	Estimates, 1951	Recommended in bill for 1951	Bill compared with—	
					1950 appropriations	1951 estimates
I	District of Columbia	$12,000,000	$12,000,000	$12,000,000		
II	Legislative branch	53,443,144	65,296,396	56,822,450	+$3,379,306	−$8,473,946
III	State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary	1,130,867,639	1,184,035,897	1,110,870,462	−19,997,177	−73,165,435
IV	Treasury-Post Office (payable from general fund of Treasury)	969,969,299	1,131,155,600	947,105,000	−22,864,299	−184,050,600
V	Labor—Federal Security Agency	2,335,290,285	2,462,072,500	2,271,099,614	−64,190,671	−190,972,886
VI	Agriculture	731,328,607	806,278,446	764,032,701	+32,704,094	−42,245,745
VII	Interior	590,203,947	669,251,505	621,634,130	+31,430,183	−47,617,375
VIII	Independent offices	8,555,498,235	8,458,148,324	8,024,877,007	−530,621,228	−433,271,317
IX	Civil Functions	664,254,190	834,867,500	632,620,000	−31,634,190	−202,247,500
X	Defense Establishment	13,055,562,498	13,028,675,000	12,825,342,300	−230,220,198	−203,332,700
	Total, direct annual appropriations	28,098,417,844	28,651,781,168	27,266,403,664	−832,014,180	−1,385,377,504

The 1950 appropriation figures reflected in the detailed tabulations represent actual appropriations to date. Certain pay acts enacted by the last session of the Congress, principally the Classification Act of 1949 (Public Law 429, approved October 28, 1949) provided salary increases for Government employees generally; Public Law 429 was effective November 1, 1949, or for two-thirds of the present fiscal year 1950. Salary amounts in the regular 1950 appropriations were not based on the new rates now in force, but the 1951 estimates include provision for meeting the added pay costs in that year. Therefore, any deficiency appropriations or other provision which might ultimately be made in 1950 to meet pay act costs under the individual appropriation items have not been taken into account in making comparisons between amounts recommended in the accompanying bill and those presently available in 1950.

CONTRACT AUTHORIZATIONS

During the past few years it has become the rather general practice to submit to Congress, in the annual budget, requests for contract authorizations rather than for cash appropriations for large items which might extend beyond the first year of operations. This has resulted in committing the Federal budget to substantial expenditures several years ahead. It is therefore the desire of the committee that the budget hereafter avoid the use of contract authorizations and submit requests for direct appropriations in lieu thereof.

The estimates for contract authorizations for the fiscal year 1951 total $1,961,149,500 as compared with a total of $3,656,034,628 for the fiscal year 1950, against which the committee recommends, for 1951, $1,778,626,500, as set forth in the following table:

Summary by Chapters

Comparative statement of contract authorizations for 1950, and estimates and amounts recommended in the bill for 1951

Chapter	Subcommittee	Authorizations, 1950	Estimates, 1951	Recommended in bill for 1951	Bill compared with—	
					1950 authorizations	1951 estimates
III	State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary	$68,200,000	$91,036,500	$65,786,500	−$2,413,500	−$25,250,000
V	Labor-Federal Security Agency	184,207,300	161,211,000	79,288,000	−104,919,300	−81,923,000
VII	Interior	65,251,700	44,750,000	37,250,000	−28,001,700	−7,500,000
VIII	Independent Offices	702,074,628	578,367,000	510,517,000	−191,557,628	−67,850,000
X	Defense Establishment	2,636,301,000	1,085,785,000	1,085,785,000	−1,550,516,000	
	Total, contract authorizations	3,656,034,628	1,961,149,500	1,778,626,500	−1,877,408,128	−182,523,000

EXPENDITURES

The reduction under the estimates of appropriations as set forth above in the amount of $1,385,377,504 will result in reductions in actual expenditures in the fiscal year 1951 of $979,489,060. Disbursements of many types of appropriations, such as payment of contractors, and so forth, frequently are delayed beyond the close of the fiscal year for which the appropriation was made. Obligations against annual appropriations can only be incurred during the year for which made available, but the balances remain on the books of the Treasury for an additional 2 years for the liquidation of such obligations. Some types of appropriations, such as construction of public works, remain available without limitation. It is, therefore, necessary to make an analysis of appropriation reductions in order to determine the net effect upon the Treasury during the fiscal year for which the appropriation bill makes provision. The difference between the amount of the saving in expenditures during the first year and the total reductions in appropriations will be reflected in savings in future years.

The following table is a comparison of expenditures—as distinguished from appropriations—for the fiscal year 1951 as estimated in the President's budget with the amount of such expenditures out of appropriations and funds already available plus amounts appropriated in the accompanying bill. In view of the very confused and involved manner in which the budget document presents expenditure data, it is not practicable to present in this report a detailed comparison of expenditures in the same form as appropriated amounts are presented. The intricate processes used by the Bureau of the Budget resulting in this confusion are unnecessary, and the Bureau is therefore requested to simplify the process and so present its data in the 1952 budget as to make comparisons of individual appropriation accounts feasible.

Analysis of estimated expenditures for the fiscal year 1951

Organization unit	Budget estimates		Recommended in bill		Bill compared with budget estimate	
	Appropriations in this bill	Expenditures in 1951 from appropriations in this bill	Appropriations	Revised estimate of expenditures in 1951 from appropriations in this bill	Appropriations	Expenditures
Legislative branch (excluding the Senate)	$65,296,396	$53,549,003	$56,822,450	$46,015,553	−$8,473,946	−$7,533.450
The judiciary	24,113,700	24,956,526	23,560,165	24,376,526	−553,535	−580,000
Executive Office of the President	10,492,553	9,712,053	9,947,553	9,252,053	−545,000	−460,000
Independent offices	8,149,421,777	7,801,784,288	7,629,304,944	7,532,261,888	−520,116,833	−269,522,400
Federal Security Agency	1,635,083,600	1,459,548,159	1,591,784,590	1,418,438,159	−43,299,010	−41,110,000
General Services Administration	861,883,194	749,471,696	836,126,434	724,009,696	−25,756,760	−25,462,000
Housing and Home Finance Agency	47,000,000	46,009,632	23,400,000	22,629,632	−23,600,000	−23,380,000
Department of Agriculture	806,278,446	701,354,465	764,032,701	664,470,655	−42,245,745	−36,883,810
Loan authorizations	(610,000,000)	185,130,000	(520,350,000)	168,130,000	−(89,650,000)	−17,000,000
Department of Commerce	782,419,000	759,059,847	725,429,000	703,803,847	−56,990,000	−55,256,000
Department of Defense:						
Military functions	13,025,000,000	9,957,043,330	12,822,182,300	9,815,503,330	−202,817,700	−141,540,000
Civil functions	834,867,500	564,382,500	632,620,000	429,644,500	−202,247,500	−134,738,000
Department of Interior	669,251,505	524,532,029	621,634,130	488,605,629	−47,617,375	−35,926,400
Department of Justice	147,425,800	137,603,660	144,230,000	134,645,160	−3,195,800	−2,958,500
Department of Labor	220,014,700	175,938,771	208,573,100	173,270,771	−11,441,600	−2,668,000
Post Office Department (payable from general fund of Treasury)	554,607,000	554,607,000	401,500,000	401,500,000	−153,107,000	−153,107,000
Department of State	230,077,397	167,321,355	217,651,297	161,166,455	−12,426,100	−6,154,900
Treasury Department	576,548,600	519,317,664	545,605,000	494,109,064	−30,943,600	−25,208,600
District of Columbia	12,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000		
Bill total	28,651,781,168	24,403,321,978	27,266,403,664	23,423,832,918	−1,385,377,504	−979,489,060
Estimates of 1951 expenditures out of prior year appropriations, working, transferred and revolving funds		7,079,776,516		7,079,776,516		
Items not considered in this bill [1]	11,592,751,053	10,955,658,912	11,592,751,053	10,955,658,912		
Budget total	40,244,532,221	42,438,757,406	38,859,154,717	41,459,268,346	−1,385,377,504	−979,489,060

[1] Represents budget estimates of anticipated appropriations and expenditures for the Senate, foreign aid, permanents and indefinites, proposed legislation, nonappropriated funds, etc.

The amounts shown at the foot of the foregoing table as "not considered in this bill" are enumerated as follows:

	1951 appropriations	1951 expenditures
Proposed legislation (1950)		$78,500,000
Proposed legislation (1951)	$4,452,316,000	2,356,696,400
Nonappropriated funds		2,086,949,973
U. S. Senate	12,486,891	12,334,155
Expenses, occupied countries	350,000,000	196,000,000
Mutual defense assistance (liquidation of present contract authority)	500,000,000	100,000,000
Reserve for contingencies	211,969,631	170,800,000
Permanent and indefinite appropriations	5,949,018,531	5,842,953,384
1951 supplementals under existing legislation	116,960,000	111,425,000
Total	11,592,751,053	10,955,658,912

COMPARISON WITH REVENUES

The revenues for the fiscal year 1951 are estimated in the budget at $37,305,586,034. This estimate was made in late autumn and the committee is advised that the agencies which make these estimates will not be able to make a closer estimate until after the 1st of April.

The budget, as presented, contemplated a net deficit of $5,133,171,372. As recommended to the House the bill contemplates a reduction in this deficit of $979,489,060 leaving a net deficit of $4,153,682,312.

THE PUBLIC DEBT

The total public debt at the end of fiscal year 1951 is estimated in the budget at $263,800,000,000, an increase, during the year, of $5,400,000,000. As reported by the committee, the recommended expenditures will require an increase in the debt of approximately $4,420,000,000 to a total of $263,800,000,000 on June 30, 1951.

The difference between "net deficit" and "increase in the public debt" as stated above is accounted for by an increase in the working balance in the Treasury ($48,000,000) and by necessity of making payments out of certain special and trust accounts in the Treasury in excess of probable receipts to such accounts during the year. In earlier years receipts exceeded expenditures in these accounts and served to reduce the public debt.

EFFORTS TO REDUCE

The Committee on Appropriations has made every possible effort to effect reductions in the budget. The various subcommittees have held extensive hearings, have examined a mass of data, and have consulted every available source in an effort to find amounts which might be eliminated from the budget. The question constantly asked has not been, "Is the proposed expenditure for a worth-while purpose?" The question has been, "Is the proposed expenditure for a purpose which, regardless of its worth, can be dispensed with?" The 42.4 billion dollars set out in the President's budget included substantial amounts which were beyond reach of the Committee on Appropriations. For example, the interest on the public debt, totaling $5,625,000,000, is paid out of a permanent appropriation; veterans' direct benefits, pursuant to law, total $4,700,000,000; grants to States for

social security, public health, etc., pursuant to statutes under which payment is automatic, total $3,000,000,000. Expenditures classified as public debt transactions, etc., total $2,000,000,000. The amount recommended for liquidation of contract authorizations is $4,500,000,000.

More than one-third of the budget is for national defense including aid to foreign countries. While these items are subject to review by the committee with possibilities of some reductions, it is not possible to make major reductions.

The press and radio have constantly reported claims by various agencies and individuals that the budget can be reduced by figures ranging to several billion dollars. Certain of these agencies have gone to the trouble and expense to publish brochures outlining their programs. These recommendations have been studied with a view to using such information as might be contained therein to effect reductions in the budget. However, without exception, they are written in such general terms as to be practically useless in effecting budget reductions. They discuss large reductions in broad areas of the budget without at any point naming appropriation accounts which should be reduced or giving specific data as to programs which could be curtailed.

It is a very simple matter to say in a speech that Government expenditures should be reduced by three or five billion dollars and in support of such statement to point generally at the large expenditures for national defense, foreign aid, grants to States, and so forth, but it is an entirely different matter to study the detail of the budget including cost of unavoidable services such as the postal service, and a review of outstanding commitments either by previously granted contracts authorization or by operation of laws which result each year in fixed charges. It has been suggested that veterans' benefits be greatly reduced, but the merits of this proposal must be weighed by the legislative committees of the Congress if any attention is given it. So long as the veterans' laws remain as presently written, the Committee on Appropriations has no choice but to recommend such amounts as are necessary to pay the benefits due. The amount appropriated is in no sense a control of expenditure and is only a judgment of the amount which will be required. None of those who advocated extensive reductions in the budget through press releases, brochures, etc., submitted any data to the Committee on Appropriations which would have been of assistance in effecting reductions. The committee was importuned from all sides for increases in appropriations and spent many days listening to the testimony of persons who desired appropriations for purposes not in the budget, but not one single witness appeared before the committee to suggest a program for reduction except in a few isolated cases where local interests opposed specific appropriations for local purposes.

The subcommittees have worked diligently for many weeks and explored every possible source. When their reports were filed, a central subcommittee was appointed to review them in order to determine the effect on the Treasury of the action proposed by the subcommittees. This central subcommittee sought additional savings, and finally the bill was considered by the Full Committee on Appropriations. The bill represents the best efforts of the committee utilizing every possible facility for determining the Government's fiscal requirements.

RESPONSIBILITY OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Economy neither begins nor ends in the Halls of Congress. Under the Budget and Accounting Act, it is the responsibility of the executive branch of the Government to submit annually to the Congress the estimates of the amounts which officials in the executive branch feel are required to support the necessary activities of the Government. The Congress reviews these estimates and decides the maximum amounts which must be appropriated for these various activities, and the annual appropriation bill provides the sums so determined by the Congress.

Appropriation of a given amount for a particular activity constitutes only a ceiling upon the amount which should be expended for that activity. The administrative officials responsible for administration of an activity for which appropriation is made bear the final burden for rendering all necessary service with the smallest amount possible within the ceiling figure fixed by the Congress. Every official of the Government who has responsibility for administration of a program must assume a portion of the burden for the deficit in the Federal Treasury. In the first place, he must take into account the condition of the Federal finances when he recommends to the Bureau of the Budget the amount which, in his judgment, is necessary for supporting his activity. In the second place, it is his responsibility to so control and administer the activities under his jurisdiction as to expend as little as possible out of the funds appropriated.

The so-called Antideficiency Act has been a part of the law for many years but the present statute is antiquated and was written at a time when the fiscal operations of the Government were far more simple. Current laws are so complex and the structure of the Government has become so involved as to render the current law inoperative in many cases. On that account the committee has included as section 1111 in chapter XI a redraft of the Antideficiency Act. The purpose is to require careful apportionment of all types of funds expended by Federal agencies and efficient administration of the Government's business.

TRANSFER BETWEEN APPROPRIATIONS

Various laws authorize transfers, on the books of the Treasury, between appropriation accounts and several different methods have been evolved for effecting these transfers of funds. There seems to be no substantial reason for more than one such method. Furthermore, under section 601 of the Economy Act of 1932, which authorizes establishment of working funds by transfer of appropriated funds from one agency to another, it has been found possible to carry balances of appropriations forward from one year to another. This results in legalizing the expenditure of funds for obligations incurred after the close of the period for which the appropriation was made. The original purpose of the act has been subjected to numerous abuses which have come to the attention of the committee and it seems desirable to so restrict the use of the authority contained in section 601 as to prevent continuation of availability beyond the original period provided by the appropriating act.

Therefore, section 1110 has been included in chapter XI of the bill for the purpose of (1) simplifying the methods of transfer between appropriation accounts and (2) prohibiting the use of the authority of section 601 in such manner as to maintain available for obligations balances which otherwise would revert to the Treasury.

ANNUAL LEAVE OF EMPLOYEES

The committee has included in the bill a provision, in section 1112 intended to prevent the accumulation of annual leave during the present calendar year. To be ultimately effective in attaining its real purpose, the prevention of carrying annual leave forward from year to year, it should be reenacted in succeeding years. It is recommended that the appropriate legislative committees review the entire leave situation with view to establishing a sound and equitable leave policy which will prevent the abuses possible under current legislation.

THE PERFORMANCE BUDGET

The Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government recommended a very extensive revision of the form in which the Federal budget is presented to the Congress, and the 1951 budget, as presented, is an effort to comply with the recommendations of the Commission. Much improvement over the old form has been made, but only the first steps have been taken. It will require 2 or 3 years to realize the full benefit that should flow from the structural revisions undertaken pursuant to the Commission's recommendations. In its full fruition it is hoped and expected that the better presentation of data will enable the Congress to appropriate more intelligently and provide funds more nearly in line with actual requirements. This can be accomplished only if the budget data are so directly related to the accounting data available in the agencies as to make possible a close check on cost of operations. Some of the schedules in the budget for 1951 meet this test. Others are so written as actually to result in lessened facility for consideration by the Congress as compared with the old system. Some of the schedules are so drawn as in reality to make the budget justification notes submitted in support thereof purely a series of essays with price tags attached. Frequently it is not possible to compare work-load data and past year costs with estimated future requirements. Unless these schedules are revised in such form as to adapt themselves to appropriate accounting systems, the Committee on Appropriations will be confronted each year with the task of comparing an estimate of requirements for the future with an estimate of expenditures in the past rather than being able to compare estimates of future requirements with actual costs of past operations.

The Secretary of the Treasury, the Comptroller General of the United States, and the Director of the Budget have undertaken a joint program to improve accounting processes in the Government. In this effort lies the success or failure of the performance-type budget. It was not expected that the 1951 budget would furnish cost data for the current and past years inasmuch as most agencies of the Government are operating antiquated accounting systems which do not produce the kind of cost information which is required. But if

the new method is to succeed, immediate attention must be given to modernization and improvement of accounting systems, and the schedules presented in the budget must be so written as to provide a basis for proper accounting. The only alternative will be to return to the old method of examining long lists of individual jobs and statements which were adequate 30 years ago when the Budget and Accounting Act was passed but which do not readily lend themselves to presentation of the requirements of the complex government structure now existing. The staff of the Committee on Appropriations will discuss the subject in detail with budget officers of agencies and the Bureau of the Budget before the budget for 1952 is formulated.

SIMPLIFICATION OF THE BUDGET

Prior to the enactment of the Budget and Accounting Act, the Congress each year was supplied with the book of Estimates of Appropriations, transmitted by the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to law. This document was merely a statement of the amounts requested by the heads of various agencies and furnished no summary data as to the total requested appropriations, related to income, with estimates of expenditure. The Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 established the Bureau of the Budget and directed the President of the United States to transmit to Congress each year the Budget which, under the law, includes not only the data formerly set forth in the annual Estimates of Appropriations, but summary statements of total appropriations and expenditures, as well as comparisons with probable income and recommendations as to the manner in which probable deficiencies should be met.

In the ensuing 29 years, the budget document has become increasingly complex. The fact is that it has become so involved as to make ready analysis of the mass of detail presented difficult almost to the point of futility. Application of the performance budget theory discussed under the preceding heading has served to clarify only the individual items of appropriation and has not touched upon the confusion and complexity in other phases of the budget which must be analyzed in order to appraise the fiscal difficulties of the Nation.

The simplification of the present budget document, developed through a patchwork process followed for the past three decades, should be undertaken by the Bureau of the Budget as a project of first priority in connection with the presentation of estimates for fiscal year 1952. A few of the difficulties are discussed in the following paragraphs for the purpose of pointing up the intricacies which the Committee on Appropriations has found burdensome in analyzing the budget and are cited here as examples of matters to which the Bureau of the Budget should give urgent attention.

Cost of proposed legislation.—The budget document, in addition to submitting the annual estimates, carries information as to the probable cost of legislation which the administration proposes for enactment. The manner in which these items have been intermingled with estimates for immediate appropriation results in confusion requiring exhaustive analysis in order to arrive at the exact totals of the budget actually presented to Congress for action. In presenting future

budgets these items should be separately carried in all tabulations so as to maintain a clear line of demarcation between estimates formally submitted to Congress and the cost of items subsequently to be presented.

Trust accounts.—Various agencies of the Government carry a great number of trust-fund accounts, some of which are substantial, but most of which are in very small amounts. These trust accounts are not charges against the Federal revenues and are not presented for action by the Congress. The manner in which they have heretofore been presented has scattered them through the budget in such a way as to make the statements unwieldy and to add confusion to a document which of necessity is complex when presented in its most simple form. It is entirely appropriate that the budget document should report to the Congress annually the status of these trust funds, but all information in regard to them should be placed in one separate section of the budget where it will be more useful to anyone who desires to review the trust accounts and eliminate the confusion resulting from intermingling with appropriated funds.

Working funds, etc.—A great deal of space is given over in the budget to elaborate schedules and statements in regard to working funds and subsidiary accounts which are minor in character and are not before the Congress for any direct action. As a matter of fact, much of the data included in these schedules would be useful to the Congress if presented in connection with statements relating to the main accounts from which the funds are derived. The budget should review this situation and make every effort to eliminate surplusage and otherwise simplify this presentation.

CHAPTER VI

Department of Agriculture

SUBCOMMITTEE

JAMIE L. WHITTEN, Mississippi, *Chairman*

WILLIAM G. STIGLER, Oklahoma
EDWARD H. KRUSE, Jr., Indiana
H. CARL ANDERSEN, Minnesota
WALT HORAN, Washington

In preparing this chapter of the bill, the committee was faced with the necessity of providing for a number of new programs adopted during the last session of Congress and covering the expansion of certain existing programs based on prior commitments of Congress. These mandatory allowances involve new programs, such as rural telephone, rural housing, reforestation, and fire protection, which were started during fiscal year 1950 and now must be provided for on a full-year basis in 1951. They also provide for the establishment of an estimated 150 new soil conservation districts in 1951, cover increased costs for marketing quotas and acreage allotments necessary to prevent surpluses, provide for the extension of the Federal crop insurance program to 240 additional counties in 1951, and cover the conservation and use of agricultural land resources program announced last year and to which the Government is committed. In addition the pay increases pursuant to Public Laws 359 and 429 will cost the Department approximately $6,568,000.

For these programs the Bureau of the Budget recommended some 2,600 additional employees for 1951. The committee has eliminated such additional employees and has allowed increases only in sufficient amounts to permit the Department to continue positions authorized for 1950 on a full-year basis in 1951.

On a comparative basis with the present fiscal year, the amount recommended in this bill represents a decrease of $9,250,917. If pending 1950 supplementals totaling $7,085,000 are taken into consideration, the total reduction in the 1950 programs on a comparative basis is in excess of $16,300,000. To cover the new and expanded programs mentioned above in 1951, there is provided $41,955,011, which makes a total in this bill for direct appropriations of $764,032,701. This is $42,245,745 below the amount proposed in the 1951 budget estimates. In addition, the committee has reduced by $199,990,000 the revolving fund for resubscriptions to the capital stock of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, and has approved a reduction of $125,000,000 in the revolving fund for subscriptions to the capital stock of the Federal land banks.

Attention is directed to the fact that direct annual appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for each of the 3 years preceding the last war were in excess of $1,000,000,000. The amount appropriated in 1940 was $1,543,000,000, more than double the amount for 1951 carried in this bill.

MERGING OF RESEARCH FUNDS

Special attention is directed to the fact that the Research and Marketing Act funds for research under sections 10a and 10b of the

Research and Marketing Act and the special research fund appropriations have been merged with the regular funds of the various bureaus and agencies handling this work. The purpose of this action is to eliminate the separate appropriations for the special research fund and Research and Marketing Act, except for activities under section 9 and title II of the Research and Marketing Act. This will tend to eliminate duplication and give more control to the Congress of work done under this program.

GENERAL FINANCIAL SITUATION

The committee is concerned about the general financial condition of the Federal Government and the serious international problems facing the United States. In accordance with the movement underway to curtail Federal expenditures, it has made every effort to hold amounts approved for 1951 to the 1950 appropriation level or below. At the same time, the committee recognizes the importance of a sound agricultural economy to the future strength and solvency of this country, and an effort has been made to provide sufficient funds in this bill to assure such a condition. Only the most essential programs have been included in the bill and many important, but not absolutely essential, projects and activities have been eliminated or curtailed. Many of the reductions in estimates discussed later in this report have been made on this basis, and, therefore, are not outlined in detail under the separate paragraphs.

CLOSING FIELD STATIONS

In its report last year the committee directed the Department to absorb pay increases and other reductions in such a manner as to prevent the closing of field installations and stations.

In view of the fact that the committee has found it necessary to require many of the bureaus and agencies to absorb all or a portion of the pay increases under Public Law 429 and Public Law 359, it wishes to reemphasize this matter in connection with the 1951 programs. While the committee recognizes the difficulty of maintaining the same facilities in view of increased costs due to pay increases and similar items, it must insist that these costs be absorbed by increased operating efficiencies and by applying reductions to activities and field stations which can absorb them without complete closing or liquidation.

EFFICIENCY OF OPERATIONS

The committee is disturbed about the question of efficient administration and operation within the Department. In the case of the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, which was investigated by the staff of the committee during the past year, the need for better planning, organization, and administration is apparent. This same condition may apply to other segments of the Department. Overlapping and duplication of activities, particularly in connection with activities in the field, is constantly being brought to the committee's attention. The committee is concerned about the future of the Department of Agriculture and the agricultural programs of the country, in view of the fact that a large number of separate organizational units are conducting separate and in many cases completely independent

programs in the field, each with a separate representative contacting the farmer. It appears to the committee that more positive coordination between the soil conservation programs of the Soil Conservation Service and Production and Marketing Administration is essential if maximum results are to be obtained. It also appears that more frequent and more critical reevaluation of the programs of the Department must be made, especially in connection with research activities. The committee expects to give special study to these problems during the coming year so that they may be considered in connection with the 1952 budget estimates. The Secretary of Agriculture should have members of his immediate staff, as well as officials of the individual bureaus and agencies, make a special study of these matters during the coming year.

AVOIDING FUTURE SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES

For a number of years it has been customary to finance certain emergency programs of the Department by providing deficiency appropriations to supplement funds included in the regular annual bill. The items which have been handled in this manner are: "Control of emergency outbreaks of insects and plant diseases"; "Forest Pest Control Act"; and "Fighting forest fires." To avoid the necessity for such deficiency estimates, the President has recommended additional funds to put these three programs on a full annual basis in 1951.

The committee feels that, of the three items proposed, the estimate for fighting forest fires is the only one which can be approved on the new basis for 1951. The committee is not adverse to making such a change for the other two appropriations in the future, and requests the Department and the Bureau of the Budget to present the 1952 estimates on this basis. It must insist, however, that such estimates be based on complete advance surveys and sound program planning.

RESEARCH AND MARKETING ACT

The committee has approved a total of $11,000,000, which provides $5,000,000 for payments to States, Territories, and Puerto Rico under section 9 of the act, and $6,000;000 for title II of the act. This amount is a continuation of the amounts available for these two sections of the act for the fiscal year 1950; it is expected that pay increases will be absorbed. Funds for sections 10a and 10b of the act have been consolidated with the regular appropriations for the various research bureaus and agencies of the Department which have been doing the work by allotment from this appropriation in the past.

The committee has had difficulty during the past several years in distinguishing between activities carried out by the various bureaus and agencies under regular appropriations and those conducted from sections 10a and 10b funds. To improve administration of these funds and to enable the various bureaus and agencies to utilize them more effectively, the committee has made the change outlined above. This action does not reduce amounts available in 1951 for these purposes, since adequate funds have been included in appropriations approved for each bureau and agency to carry out this work. The committee will expect the Department to present its budget estimates in the future in such a manner as to permit evaluation of the amounts used for Research and Marketing Act projects under the new arrange-

ment. This matter will be given further study by the committee during the next year to evaluate the effect of the consolidation, and to determine the advisability of taking similar action in connection with the funds retained under this appropriation for 1951.

It is expected that the Department will continue to utilize the commodity committees provided for under title III of the act to an even larger extent than has been done in the past. The committee feels that the use of these committees is of extreme importance to the future effectiveness of the research work of the Department. Since there is evidence that there is some reluctance throughout the Department to adopt new lines of research holding more promise and discontinue older projects which have ceased to be productive, the commodity committees can assist materially in the frequent reevaluation of all research activities to assure essentiality of programs undertaken.

The committee feels that the Department has not fully utilized the contract authority contained in the act. Therefore, it expects that increased emphasis will be given to the conduct of research activities through contracts in the future. To assure that attention will be given to this matter, the committee has provided in the bill that not less than $650,000 of the amount approved for title II activities must be done by contract and not less than $575,000 of the amounts provided in the appropriations of the various bureaus and agencies for work under 10a of the act must be done by contract.

The committee has included authority in the bill for the construction of a poultry-breeding house at Purdue University at a cost of not to exceed $29,000, in order that adequate facilities for this work may be provided.

The special provision inserted in the 1950 act relative to work on oilseeds, fats and oils, and their products has been eliminated from the 1951 bill with the understanding that this work will be continued in 1951 on a basis comparable to that done in 1950.

BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

Economic investigations.—The committee has approved $2,600,000 for 1951. This amount includes funds for research projects previously handled by allotment from the Research and Marketing Act (sec. 10) and special research fund appropriations. A total of $15,000 is also included for economic research on farm housing and farm construction.

Crop and livestock estimates.—A total of $2,725,000 has been approved for 1951 for this activity, which is a decrease of $92,900 in the amount appropriated for 1950 and $652,800 in the estimate for 1951. The amount approved includes funds for work relative to current farm construction and for the work formerly financed from the special research fund appropriation.

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION, OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

The committee has approved $600,000 for 1951. This amount includes funds to cover the section 10 projects previously appropriated for under the Research and Marketing Act appropriation.

WORKING CAPITAL FUND, AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH CENTER

The budget request of $400,000 for the establishment of a working capital fund to provide a more satisfactory method of financing reimbursable operations at the Center has been reduced by the committee to $300,000. In the past, funds appropriated to the Office of the Administrator of the Agricultural Research Administration have been used as a revolving fund for this purpose. Since this practice does not provide sufficient cash for financing the obligations of the Center on a current basis, and since the use of an administrative-type appropriation for this purpose is highly unsatisfactory, it is believed that the establishment of the new working capital fund will facilitate operations considerably and will result in more efficient and economical operations. It should be noted that this item is not an annual recurring appropriation and will not result in additional cost to the Government, since the initial amount of the fund will be returned to the Treasury in the event the fund is discontinued.

RESEARCH ON STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL AGRICULTURAL MATERIALS

The budget estimate for 1951 for this item is $515,500. The amount approved by the committee is $399,000, an increase of $50,000 over the amount appropriated for 1950. The budget estimate for 1951 contains an increase of $150,000 to conduct studies on large-scale extraction of vegetable tannins, $25,000 for studies on hemp production and hemp seed storage, and $8,300 for pay increases. The decrease of $116,500 made by the committee has not been applied to any specific item. Therefore, it will be necessary for the Department to reevaluate all activities to be financed from this appropriation so as to do as much as possible on the projects proposed within the amount approved.

RESEARCH ON AGRICULTURAL PROBLEMS OF ALASKA

The committee has approved $260,000 for this work in 1951, which is a decrease of $415,000 below the 1950 appropriation and $56,200 in the 1951 budget estimate. The budget estimate proposes a reduction of $415,000 for nonrecurring construction costs of buildings and facilities provided in the 1950 Appropriation Act.

OFFICE OF EXPERIMENT STATIONS

Payments to States and Territories.—The amount approved for 1951, $7,406,208, is a continuation of the amount appropriated for 1950. The 1951 budget estimate requested an increase of $10,000 for additional research in Alaska, which the committee does not feel can be approved at the present time.

Salaries and expenses.—The committee has approved $237,500, which is a decrease of $18,950 from the 1950 appropriation and $26,150 from the 1951 budget estimate. The amount approved includes funds for activities previously appropriated for under the special research fund appropriation.

Federal Experiment Station, Puerto Rico.—The committee has approved $175,000, which is an increase of $4,600 above the 1950 appropriation and a decrease of $10,350 below the 1951 estimate. The

amount approved includes funds for activities previously covered by section 10 funds under the Research and Marketing Act appropriation, together with additional funds to replace the water supply line and increase reservoir capacity in connection with the water system for this station in Puerto Rico.

BUREAU OF HUMAN NUTRITION AND HOME ECONOMICS

A total of $1,500,000 has been approved for this Bureau for 1951. This amount includes funds for section 10, Research and Marketing Act projects and special research fund projects previously financed by allotments from the appropriations for this work. The 1951 budget estimate included $365,000 to conduct a national survey of rural family living expenditures as well as $49,200 to assist in the development of farm-house plans as a part of the farm housing program. No funds have been approved for 1951 for either of these activities. The funds for this Bureau have increased from $360,000 in 1941 to approximately $1,800,000 in 1950, including Research and Marketing Act and special research fund allotments. The committee believes that continued increases in appropriations for the work of this Bureau cannot be justified at this time, that the survey of rural family living expenses cannot be provided for, and that development of farm-house plans is adequately covered by the regular work of this and other Bureaus.

The committee expects this Bureau to make a thorough reevaluation of all of its activities during the next year to make certain that attention is devoted only to the most essential research work in the field of human nutrition and home economics. A full report on this matter will be expected in connection with the 1952 budget estimates.

BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY

Animal husbandry.—The committee has approved $2,250,000 for this activity for 1951. This amount includes the funds for projects formerly financed from the Research and Marketing Act (sec. 10) and special research fund appropriations as well as a small increase to cover additional pay costs. Two decreases have been proposed in the 1951 budget estimates, one in the amount of $50,280 due to the liquidation of the agricultural remount service, and the other in the amount of $19,000 resulting from the closing of the horse-breeding work at Middlebury, Vt. It is understood that a further decrease of $11,000 will be reflected in the 1952 budget estimate in connection with the closing of the Middlebury station.

Diseases of animals.—The sum of $1,300,000 has been approved by the committee for this purpose for 1951. This amount includes a small increase for additional pay costs together with funds to cover projects formerly financed from the Research and Marketing Act (sec. 10) and special research fund appropriations. Authority has been included in the bill to purchase a farm at Ames, Iowa, which is used in connection with research on hog cholera. The committee understands that this property is being disposed of by the present owner and feels that it is advisable to arrange for its purchase to assure continued facilities for this important work.

Animal disease control and eradication.—The committee has approved a total of $7,950,000, which is an increase of $113,000 above

the 1950 appropriation and a decrease of $154,000 in the 1951 budget estimate. The increase covers approximately half of the pay increases, together with an additional $100,000 to strengthen inspection services as proposed in the 1951 estimate. A decrease of $50,000 has been made in the amount of funds requested to replace passenger-carrying vehicles. The committee believes that the combination of three appropriations under the single head in 1951 should result in some economies of operation. This has been taken into consideration in arriving at the figure for 1951.

The attention of the committee has been directed to the problem existing in connection with the animal-quarantine station at Clifton, N. J. The present location for the station was entirely satisfactory at the time it was established in 1900. Now, however, it is located in the geographical heart of the city, is very valuable property, and could well be sold and the station relocated. The Secretary is requested to look into this matter at the earliest possible time with a view to selecting a satisfactory location elsewhere. He is requested to furnish the committee with information as soon as practicable concerning (1) possible alternative locations, (2) cost of establishing the station at a new location, and (3) the maximum price for which the present facilities can be sold to the highest bidder.

Meat inspection.—The committee has approved $12,800,000, which is an increase of $223,000 over the 1950 appropriation and a decrease of $159,000 in the 1951 budget estimate. The increase will cover approximately 60 percent of the pay increases.

BUREAU OF DAIRY INDUSTRY

A total appropriation of $1,600,000 has been approved for 1951. This amount includes $20,000 for increased work load in connection with the dairy herd improvement association program. It also includes funds for projects formerly financed by allotment from the Research and Marketing Act (sec. 10) and special research fund appropriations.

The 1951 budget includes funds and authority for the construction of 10 housing units for employees at the Agricultural Research Center at Beltsville, Md. The Bureau has experienced serious difficulty at the center in employing competent dairy labor because of the lack of housing facilities in that area. While the committee recognizes the problem, the funds and appropriation language have not been approved for 1951. It is believed that consideration must be given to the overall housing problem at the center, and study must be made as to the possibility of obtaining housing for these employees at some nearby housing facility such as Greenbelt.

BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL AND INDUSTRIAL CHEMISTRY

The committee has approved a total of $7,750,000 for this activity for 1951. The amount approved covers approximately half of the pay increases, and includes funds for research work formerly included under the Research and Marketing Act (sec. 10) and special research fund appropriations. The additional amount requested in House Document 457 for research into the utilization of plant materials potentially valuable as sources of the drug cortisone has not been included in the bill with the distinct understanding that an appropriation has been made to the Public Health Service for this purpose, $140,000 of which will be transferred to this Bureau for this work.

BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY, SOILS, AND AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING

Field crops.—The committee has approved $3,400,000 for this purpose. This amount provides funds for approximately half of the pay increases, together with funds for projects formerly financed from the Research and Marketing Act (sec. 10) and special research fund appropriations.

Fruit, vegetable, and specialty crops.—A total of $2,950,000 for this activity in 1951 is authorized. The amount approved covers approximately half of the additional pay costs, together with the funds for projects formerly financed from the Research and Marketing Act (sec. 10) and special research fund appropriations. The amount approved also includes funds for vegetable investigations at the Brawley, Calif., field station.

The supplemental request of $60,000 submitted in House Document 457 for research work on vegetable sources for the new drug cortisone is not included in the amount approved for this item. The committee understands that this amount will be made available from appropriations made to the Public Health Service for research work on this drug.

Forest diseases.—The committee has approved $450,000 for 1951. The amount approved includes funds for pay increases, together with funds for research work formerly appropriated for section 10 projects under the Research and Marketing Act appropriation.

Soils, fertilizers, and irrigation.—The committee authorizes $2,680,000 for this program for 1951. The amount approved includes $100,000 for continuation of construction at Brawley, Calif. It also covers half of the pay increases requested, and funds for projects formerly financed from the Research and Marketing Act (sec. 10) and special research fund appropriations. Funds for soil management investigations at Brawley, Calif., should be provided by the Department within this total.

Agricultural engineering.—A total of $1,120,000 has been approved for this activity for 1951, which includes funds for approximately half of the pay increases. The amount approved also includes $50,000 for the preparation and distribution of housing plans and studies, together with funds for activities formerly financed from the Research and Marketing Act (sec. 10) and special research fund appropriations. The committee feels that the additional funds for farm housing should be devoted entirely to the compilation and distribution of bulletins and pamphlets based on information now available on this subject. It is felt that this bureau is already doing an adequate job of basic research in this field and that further increases for this work cannot be justified at this time, particularly since it would have the effect of slowing down the current farm housing program.

National Arboretum.—The committee has approved $152,700 for this purpose, which is the amount proposed in the 1951 budget estimate. The amount approved is a reduction from the 1950 appropriation of $17,300, due to a decrease in the program for development of physical facilities.

BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY AND PLANT QUARANTINE

Because the committee was not fully satisfied with the information furnished by officials of this Bureau during the hearings on the 1950

appropriation requests, it had a thorough investigation made of the work of this Bureau with the view to securing information as to the efficiency of management and effectiveness of its programs. Studies were made of the central-office activities and visits were made to field facilities in many cases. The results of this investigation are very disturbing, since they disclose a complete lack of advance planning of programs, a serious deficiency in control over and utilization of vehicles and other property, extremely inefficient utilization of manpower, and other serious deficiencies in administration. These matters were discussed with officials of the Bureau during the hearings on the 1951 estimates, and assurances were given to the committee that action would be taken to correct these conditions as soon as possible. The committee expects to look into the activities of this Bureau further during the coming year to assure itself that effective corrective action is taken, and a complete review of the matter will be made in the consideration of the 1952 budget estimates.

The amounts approved for 1951 reflect rather severe reductions in several of the programs of the Bureau. The committee is convinced that improved administration of the affairs of the Bureau will enable it to operate within amounts approved and feels that funds beyond those approved for 1951 will not be required when inefficiencies are corrected and programs and estimates are based on better advance planning.

Insect investigations.—The committee has approved a total of $4,100,000 for this activity for 1951, which includes funds to cover research activities previously financed from the Research and Marketing Act (sec. 10) and special research fund appropriations. The committee feels that the pay increases amounting to $83,000 and the $78,000 requested for reallocation of professional positions should be absorbed.

Insect and plant disease control.—The sum of $4,185,900 has been allowed for 1951, which is $465,100 below the amount appropriated for 1950 and $566,100 below the 1951 budget request. This reduction from the 1950 appropriation level is based on expected improvements in methods of operation in the control programs of this Bureau.

Foreign plant quarantine.—The committee has approved $2,325,000, which is a continuation of the 1950 appropriation. The increase of $293,000 requested in the 1951 budget estimates has not been approved because of the general lack of planning and management in this Bureau.

Control of emergency outbreaks of insects and plant diseases.—The committee has approved a total of $850,000 for this activity for 1951. This represents a decrease of $1,403,000 in the 1950 appropriation and $1,650,000 in the 1951 budget estimate. The amount approved includes $650,000 for the furnishing of control materials, bulletins, and other assistance to farmers, in addition to $170,000 for general surveys and $30,000 for control and survey work on chinch bugs, citrus canker, and fire ants. The committee seriously questions the need and authority for maintaining a large staff of permanent employees for this program on a year-round basis and the need for keeping field offices, such as the one at Denver, Colo., open during the winter months.

Attention is directed to the fact that a supplemental estimate of $2,200,000 for 1950 for this work is now pending before Congress.

CONTROL OF FOREST PESTS

The 1951 budget included authority for the Department to construct an aircraft hangar at Turner Falls, Mass., at a cost of $10,000. The committee has not approved this proposal, because it feels that arrangements should be made to use military or other Government facilities in the area. In addition, the committee questions the advisability of the Department handling its own repair and maintenance work on its aircraft since a small operation with only a few planes can generally be handled more economically on a contract basis. Certainly this should be investigated.

Gypsy and brown-tail moths.—The committee has approved $539,500 for this item. This represents a reduction of $57,500 below the 1950 appropriation, plus an increase of $22,000 for the purchase of a building in Greenfield, Mass., now being used as the headquarters for the gypsy-moth control program.

Forest Pest Control Act.—The amount approved for this item, $900,000, represents a $100,000 reduction below the amount appropriated for this program in 1950. It should be noted that a supplemental estimate for 1950 of $4,500,000 is now pending.

White pine blister rust.—The committee has approved $3,280,000 for this program, which is a reduction of $365,000 below the 1950 appropriation.

FOREST SERVICE

General administrative expenses.—The committee has approved $665,000, an increase of $10,000 over the 1950 appropriation and a decrease of $11,500 below the 1951 budget estimate. The increase over 1950 will cover approximately half of the pay increases requested.

National forest protection and management.—A total of $26,890,000 has been authorized for this program in 1951. This is an increase of $590,000 over the 1950 appropriation, which is the major portion of the amount required for salary increases, and a decrease of $3,380,500 below the 1951 budget estimate. Of the amount appropriated, however, the Department shall provide $350,000 additional for reforestation and $200,000 additional for reseeding, under the provisions of Public Law 348 approved October 1949. In addition, the Department should provide $150,000 for the correction of inductive interference on national forest telephone lines from REA power lines and $75,000 additional to improve sanitation and safety on recreational areas in the national forests. A prime example of the need for improvements in recreational areas is that at Salt Lake City, Utah. The approval of the $200,000 for reseeding is contingent upon the increasing of grazing fees on the areas reseeded in sufficient amount to offset this increase.

The committee's attention has been called to the fact that timber sales are being handled on a basis that makes additional funds available for operating purposes. The committee questions this policy, and feels that some reduction in appropriations is warranted in view of this practice.

Fighting forest fires.—Due to the difficulty of predicting in advance amounts necessary for this work, the practice in the past has been to carry only a nominal sum in the annual appropriation bill and to provide supplemental funds to cover expenditures actually incurred in excess of the nominal appropriation. In order to place this appropriation on a full annual basis, and avoid future submissions of supple-

mental and deficiency estimates, the committee is recommending a total of $6,000,000 for 1951. Of this amount, $2,500,000 will be placed in reserve, to be made available only to the extent determined necessary by the Secretary of Agriculture and the Bureau of the Budget.

Forest and range management investigations.—The committee has approved a total of $2,995,000 for this item for 1951. The amount approved includes funds for research projects formerly financed by allotment from section 10 funds under the Research and Marketing Act appropriation. It also provides an increase of $35,000 for replacement of buildings and facilities at the Agricultural Research Center destroyed by fire in July 1949, and covers the increased pay costs.

Many Members of Congress have brought to the attention of the committee the urgent need for increased forest experiment work in their respective areas, as well as urgent needs for increases in a number of other appropriations in the bill. This committee agrees that these facilities are essential to the development of a sound forestry and agricultural economy in this country. While the committee does not feel that it is in a position to recommend increased appropriations for these purposes at this time, it wishes to direct the attention of officials of the Department to these matters, and suggests that all requests appearing in the 1951 hearing record be given further consideration by the Department. One of the more important of these facilities needing more funds is the Institute of Forest Genetics at Placerville, Calif. The committee feels that additional stations can be established with no increase in Federal appropriations if legislation is enacted to place this program on a cooperative basis with the States. This committee is firmly convinced that such an arrangement will provide the only satisfactory permanent solution to this problem.

Forest products.—A total of $1,300,000 has been approved by the committee for 1951. The amount approved includes the funds for research work formerly financed by transfer from section 10 funds under Research and Marketing Act appropriation.

Forest resources investigations.—The committee has approved $880,000, an increase of $14,000 over the 1950 appropriation and a decrease of $413,500 below the 1951 budget estimate. The increase will cover approximately half of the pay increases requested.

Forest development roads and trails.—The sum of $10,348,000 is approved for 1951, which is a continuation of the 1950 appropriation and a decrease of $2,117,000 below the 1951 budget estimate. The Department's attention is directed to the fact that a number of roads in the national forests badly need attention. While the committee is unable to provide additional funds for this purpose in 1951, it is felt that a reevaluation of the use of the funds approved should be made by the officials of the Department prior to their use. Attention of the committee has been called to several situations which need correction. The Department should take these into consideration in formulating their 1951 program.

Acquisition of lands for national forests, Weeks Act.—The committee has approved $100,000 for 1951, which is a reduction of $301,000 below the 1950 appropriation and $600,000 below the 1951 budget estimate. While the committee recognizes the value of this program, it is believed that more than the amount approved for 1951 cannot be justified at this time.

Acquisition of lands for national forests, Superior National Forest.—The committee has approved $150,000, an increase of $75,000 above the 1950 appropriation and a decrease of $50,000 from the 1951 budget estimate. Public Law 733, approved June 22, 1948, authorized the establishment of this national forest and authorized appropriations of $500,000 for the purpose. An initial appropriation of $75,000 was made for 1950, and this authorization will enable the Department to continue the acquisition of privately owned lands within the area, which can be acquired at less cost now than in the future.

Acquisition of lands for national forests, special acts.—The budget estimate of $142,000 has been allowed for this purpose, which is a continuation of the 1950 program.

Forest fire cooperation.—The committee has approved a total of $9,500,000 which is an increase of $500,000 above the 1950 appropriation and a decrease of $500,000 from the 1951 estimate. This increase is required to intensify cooperative fire protection on State and privately owned lands as contemplated by Public Law 392, approved October 26, 1949.

Farm and other private forestry cooperation.—The committee has approved $1,300,000 for this program for 1951, an increase of $224,600 above the 1950 appropriation and a decrease of $775,400 below the 1951 estimate. The increase approved by the committee is to be used to strengthen cooperation with States in procurement, production, and distribution of forest-tree and shrub seeds and plants. This increase is recommended in view of the recent enactment of reforestation legislation, Public Law 392, and because of the generally recognized need for increased emphasis on this important work.

FLOOD CONTROL

An authorization of $10,750,000 has been allowed for this purpose in 1951, which is a decrease of $950,000 in the 1951 estimate. The amount approved includes $1,250,000 to cover project costs which were met in 1950 from prior-year balances. The reduction in this item is not intended to eliminate the work proposed in connection with development of an agricultural program for the Columbia Basin. The committee feels, however, that the appropriations are sufficiently large under this heading, as well as for the various cooperating bureaus and agencies of the Department, to permit this work to be done with existing personnel and facilities.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

Soil conservation research.—The committee has approved a total of $1,500,000 for this work in 1951. This is an increase of $4,000 over the 1950 appropriation and a decrease of $42,100 in the 1951 budget estimate. The amount approved includes funds to cover approximately half of the pay increases requested, together with funds for research formerly covered by allotment from section 10 funds under the Research and Marketing Act appropriation.

Soil conservation operations.—A total of $52,900,000 has been approved for 1951. This is an increase of $2,327,700 over the 1950 appropriation and an increase of $853,000 over the 1951 budget estimate. The estimate includes an increase of $1,475,000 for pay increases requested. Offsetting this increase is a reduction of $147,000

for passenger-carrying vehicles. In addition, it includes an item of $1,000,000 for establishment of an estimated 150 new soil-conservation districts in 1951. The committee has included language in the bill authorizing the employment of soil experts to assist in meeting the expansion involved in establishing the new districts.

Land utilization and retirement of submarginal land.—The committee has approved $1,490,000, an increase of $265,000 over the 1950 appropriation and a decrease of $403,100 under the 1951 budget estimate. The amount approved includes $265,000 for the replacement of the Greenleaf Lake spillway on the Cookson Hills land utilization project. In the past few years, the spillway apron has been damaged to the point where the entire dam is in danger of destruction in the event of a major storm.

The committee feels that every effort must be made to reduce the size of this program in the future through the disposition of land. The committee strongly urges that legislation be enacted during the present session to enable the Department to sell or otherwise dispose of much of this land.

Water conservation and utilization projects.—A fund of $400,000 has been approved by the committee for this purpose for 1951, a decrease of $569,900 below the 1951 budget estimate, and a decrease of $287,011 below the amount available for this purpose in 1950 as a carry-over from prior years.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The committee has approved an administrative expense limitation of $16,000,000 for 1951, which is $1,000,000 above the amount authorized for 1950 and $750,000 below the 1951 budget estimate. This increase will permit the Corporation to place the 1950 program on a full-year basis in 1951. In addition it covers nearly the full cost of the pay increases. It should be noted that a supplemental estimate for 1950 in the amount of $420,000 for this organization is now pending before Congress. Attention is directed to the fact that the amount approved herein is a limitation on the amount of corporate funds which may be used for administrative purposes and is not a direct appropriation from the Federal Treasury.

CONSERVATION AND USE OF AGRICULTURAL LAND RESOURCES

An appropriation of $282,500,000 is approved for this program for 1951, which is based on a program authorization of $285,000,000 contained in the 1950 Appropriation Act. The amount approved is an increase of $25,456,561 over the 1950 appropriation and a decrease of $2,500,000 in the budget estimate, including a reduction of $2,000,000 in administrative costs. The limitation in the appropriation act for administrative expenses has been reduced to $25,500,000. The limitation on funds for National and State expenses has been reduced to $5,000,000, due largely to a reduction of $264,700 in transfers to cooperating agencies for issuing checks and preauditing applications as proposed in the 1951 estimate.

A program authorization of $285,000,000 for the 1951 crop year has been approved, which is a continuation of the amount approved for the 1950 crop year.

The provision permitting county committees to transfer 5 percent of their allocations to the Soil Conservation Service for employment of

technicians is being continued for 1951. The committee feels that this provision must be continued to more effectively integrate the work under this appropriation with that of the Soil Conservation Service. The committee is disturbed to find that this authorization, which was inserted in the act last year, has not been utilized as fully as was intended. The Secretary of Agriculture and the heads of the major units of the Department are urged to give this matter special attention in the coming year, since it is apparent that the utilization of this provision or some similar plan is absolutely essential if the Department is to meet the objectives set forth by Congress in connection with soil conservation. It is the opinion of the committee that the Production and Marketing Administration should use this service and should accept the certificate of Soil Conservation Service technicians. The Production and Marketing Administration is not to employ separate technicians of its own.

ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS AND MARKETING QUOTAS

A total of $32,300,000 has been approved for 1951, which is an increase of $2,149,226 above the 1950 appropriation and a decrease of $1,700,000 below the 1951 estimate. In addition the committee has placed $4,000,000 of the recommended appropriation in a reserve to be released by the Bureau of the Budget only after determination by the Secretary that marketing quotas on the 1951 crops of wheat, corn, and rice are necessary.

SUGAR ACT

The committee has approved a total of $60,000,000 for this program for 1951. This is the amount of the 1950 appropriation and is a reduction of $7,500,000 below the 1951 budget estimate. Since the increase proposed for 1951 is based on the estimated volume of sugar production in 1950, the committee does not feel justified in approving additional funds until firmer information is available on actual production, particularly since there is nothing definite at this time to indicate that 1950 crops will exceed those of 1949.

REMOVAL OF SURPLUS AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Section 32 of the act of August 24, 1935, as amended, makes an annual appropriation of an amount equal to 30 percent of the gross receipts from duties collected under the customs laws during the current year next preceding the beginning of each fiscal year. The amount estimated for this fund for 1951 is $110,000,000, a reduction of $15,606,982 below the amount available for 1950.

The committee has included a provision in the bill under this heading which will authorize the Department to pay from this fund transportation and handling charges on surplus commodities owned by the Department for the purpose of distribution to public welfare agencies. The committee believes that this authority should be provided to enable the Department to make surplus commodities available to public welfare organizations, where no other possible means exists to pay the cost of transportation from storage locations to points of use. This will not increase total expenditures from this fund but will enable the Department to distribute surplus commodities for use by the needy.

NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT

The committee has approved the 1951 budget estimate of $83,500,000, which is a continuation of the amount included in the 1950 Appropriation Act. While the committee recognizes the importance of this activity and realizes that additional funds could be utilized to good advantage, no increase has been approved in view of the general financial condition of the Federal Government.

MARKETING SERVICES

Market news service.—The committee has approved $2,050,000, an increase of $150,000 above the 1950 appropriation and a decrease of $224,300 below the 1951 budget estimate. The amount approved includes approximately 75 percent of the pay increases requested and an increase of $100,000 for additional marketing news and reporting services in critical marketing areas. The increase approved, which represents approximately one-half of the increase proposed in the 1951 budget estimate, should be used by the Department to put into effect the most important of the additional reporting services proposed. In reevaluation of the use of these funds, the committee feels that consideration should be given to the need for additional funds for the New England Radio News Service with headquarters at Boston.

Market inspection of farm products.—The amount approved, $780,000, is an increase of $22,000 over the 1950 appropriation and a decrease of $2,800 below the 1951 budget estimate. All of the increase is required to meet increased pay costs.

Marketing farm products.—The committee has approved $1,260,000 for this activity for 1951. The amount approved includes $20,000 for increasing the cotton-fiber-testing service furnished by this organization. In addition, it includes funds for pay increases as well as funds for research projects formerly financed by allotment from section 10 funds under the Research and Marketing Act appropriation.

Tobacco acts.—A total of $1,660,500 has been approved for 1951, an increase of $58,500 above the 1950 appropriation and a decrease of $21,600 below the 1951 budget estimate. The entire increase approved is required to meet increased pay costs.

Cotton statistics, classing, standards, and futures acts.—The committee has approved $1,675,000 for 1951, an increase of $19,000 over the 1950 appropriation, and a decrease of $51,200 in the 1951 budget estimate. The increase will cover a small portion of the pay increases requested.

Marketing regulatory acts.—A total of $3,550,000 has been approved for 1951, an increase of $150,000 over the 1950 appropriation and a decrease of $197,600 below the 1951 budget estimate. The amount approved will cover better than half of the increased pay costs, and will provide approximately $100,000 to cover increased work load in connection with the various marketing acts under the supervision of this organization.

COMMODITY EXCHANGE AUTHORITY

An appropriation of $650,000 for 1951 has been allowed by the committee, an increase of $91,800 over the amount appropriated for 1950 and a decrease of $25,000 below the 1951 budget estimate. The increase includes $11,800 for increased pay costs. It also includes

$80,000 to establish and enforce speculative trading limits on a number of commodities not now covered, to prevent price manipulation and corners and to insure fair and honest dealing on commodity exchanges.

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION

The committee has approved $6,854,000, an increase of $1,800,000 over the appropriation for 1950 and a decrease of $596,000 in the 1951 budget estimate. This increase will extend the Federal crop insurance program to an estimated 240 new counties during 1951, as contemplated by Public Law 268, Eighty-first Congress.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Salaries and expenses.—The committee has approved a total of $8,150,000 for the administrative expenses of this organization during 1951. This is an increase of $1,187,000 over the 1950 appropriation and a decrease of $1,375,000 in the 1951 budget estimate. This increase will put on a full-year basis in 1951, administrative expenses of the rural telephone program authorized and appropriated for on a part-year basis in 1950, pursuant to Public Law 423, approved October 28, 1949, and will cover full-year costs of the part-year funds approved in the Second Supplemental Act, 1950. It should be noted that a supplemental estimate of $385,000 for 1950 for this program is currently pending.

Loans.—A total of $350,000,000 for rural electrification loans has been provided for 1951, with a continuation of authority for the Secretary of Agriculture to obtain an additional $150,000,000 from the Secretary of the Treasury if needed. Officials of the Department estimate that a balance of approximately $100,000,000 of the additional borrowing authority approved for 1950 will be available for carry-over into the fiscal year 1951. The bill stipulates that this uncommitted balance shall be included within the additional $150,000,000 which may be borrowed if necessary in 1951.

The committee has also approved a total of $25,000,000, to be borrowed from the Treasury on the same basis as for rural electrification loans, for the new rural telephone program. This amount is the same as that authorized for 1950 and is a decrease of $25,000,000 in the budget estimate for 1951. The committee feels that this loan authorization should be limited to the 1950 level until further evidence is available to indicate the demand for loans under this program.

The committee has been concerned for some time with the problem of area coverage under the rural electrification program and is of the opinion that special and primary attention should be given to expanding rural lines so as to provide current to those not yet receiving such service.

In the opinion of the committee, fees paid for engineering and legal work in connection with the larger loans are too high. It is believed that such fees should not be established strictly on a percentage basis but maximum limits should be fixed which would in the cases pointed out to the committee reduce the fees paid substantially. These costs are passed on to the consumer.

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

Loans.—The committee has approved a total borrowing authority for 1951 of $145,350,000. This is an increase of $17,350,000 over the amount approved for 1950 and a decrease of $14,650,000 below the

budget estimates for 1951. An increase of $15,000,000 has been authorized for farm tenancy and housing loans, $1,350,000 has been approved as a transfer from direct appropriation to borrowing authorization for enlargement and development loans under section 504b of the Housing Act of 1949, and an additional $1,000,000 in borrowing authority has been provided for water facilities loans. The increase for farm tenancy and housing loans will give effect to the Homestead Entrymen Act enacted in the last session of Congress, and will provide an increase of $10,000,000 in borrowing authority for the farm housing program. The increase of $1,000,000 for water facilities loans is necessary to meet the needs of settlers on reclamation projects as contemplated by Public Law 361. The committee has provided that the uncommitted balance of the $25,000,000 made available for farm housing loans in 1950 will be carried forward into 1951 for consolidation with the new amounts approved.

Grants.—A total of $650,000 has been approved for 1951 for repair and improvement grants for farm dwellings and other farm buildings under section 504a of the Housing Act of 1949. This is a continuation of the amount approved for this purpose for 1950 and is a decrease of $1,350,000 below the 1951 estimate.

Salaries and expenses.—The committee has approved $27,700,000 for administrative expenses of the Farmers Home Administration, which is an increase of $1,551,000 over 1950 appropriations and a decrease of $2,300,000 below the estimate for 1951. This increase will permit the Department to put the farm housing program authorized on a part-year basis in 1950 on a full-year basis in 1951, and will cover increased pay costs. In addition, it will provide approximately $300,000 for servicing insured mortgages made in prior years and for handling the additional farm-tenant and water-facilities loans authorized for 1951.

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

A total of $2,910,000 is authorized for salaries and expenses of the Farm Credit Administration for 1951. Of this amount, $2,325,000 will be obtained by assessments against member banks and $585,000 is provided by direct appropriation. The direct appropriation approved for 1951 includes funds for within-grade salary advancements and pay increases as well as funds for research projects previously financed by allotment from section 10 work under the Research and Marketing Act appropriation.

Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation.—The committee has approved the budget estimate of $1,280,000 for administrative expenses for 1951, which is a reduction of $220,000 below the authorization for 1950. It should be noted that this fund is an administrative expense limitation on the funds of the Corporation and not a direct appropriation from the Federal Treasury.

Federal intermediate credit banks.—The budget estimate of $1,496,000 has been allowed, which is an increase of $98,000 above the 1950 authorization. This increase will meet an estimated 6 percent increase in volume of loans and discounts in 1951 and will cover pay increases requested. The amount approved is an administrative expense limitation on the funds of the banks and not a direct appropriation.

Production Credit Corporation.—The committee has approved the budget estimate of $1,358,000, an increase of $30,000 over the 1950

authorization, to cover pay increases. The amount approved is a limitation on funds of the Corporation, not an appropriation.

EXTENSION SERVICE

Payments to States.—The total of $27,000,000 has been authorized for 1951, which is a reduction of $88,950 below the appropriation for 1950 and a reduction of $856,538 below the 1951 budget estimate. The decrease represents a reduction in the amount of funds available for work under the Farm Housing Act of 1949.

Salaries and expenses.—The committee has approved $900,000 for this purpose, which is a reduction of $13,500 below the 1950 appropriation and $58,200 below the 1951 budget estimate. The reason for this reduction is the same as that outlined above for payments to States.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

A total of $2,143,300 has been approved for 1951, together with authorization to transfer from other appropriations not to exceed $109,280. The amounts approved, which represent a slight reduction below the 1950 appropriation, and a reduction of $132,000 below the budget estimate for 1951, include funds for the work formerly financed by allotment from section 10 funds under the Research and Marketing Act appropriation. The committee is not disapproving the work proposed in this Office in connection with the development of a program in the Columbia Basin. It is believed, however, that this work should be performed with existing staff and facilities.

OFFICE OF SOLICITOR

The committee has approved $2,450,000 for this activity in 1951, which is an increase of $86,000 over the 1950 appropriation and a decrease of $620,000 in the 1951 estimates. The amount approved provides an increase for the handling of rural telephone contracts by the Solicitor's Office, together with funds for a small portion of increased pay costs. It also includes funds for work formerly handled by allotment from section 10 funds under the Research and Marketing Act appropriation.

OFFICE OF FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL RELATIONS

A total of $600,000 has been approved for 1951, an increase of $23,600 above the 1950 appropriation and a decrease of $23,400 in the 1951 budget estimate. The increase will strengthen United States representation in international organizations, which the committee is convinced is necessary if this country is to compete satisfactorily in foreign markets. This Office will be required to absorb the increase requested for pay increases and within-grade salary advancements within the amount approved for 1951.

OFFICE OF INFORMATION

The committee has approved a total of $1,265,800 for 1951, which is an increase of $9,572 above the 1950 appropriation. This allowance covers increased printing and inquiry service in connection with

the new farm housing program and the acreage allotments and marketing quotas program. The amount approved includes funds for the work formerly financed by allotment from section 10 money under the Research and Marketing Act appropriation.

LIBRARY

An appropriation of $713,293, which is a continuation of the amount approved for 1950 and a decrease of $26,707 in the 1951 budget estimate, is approved for the Library. It is believed that a review of the scope of the activities of the Office is advisable.

LIMITATIONS AND LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

The following limitations and legislative provisions not heretofore carried in any appropriation act are included in the bill:

On page 156, line 19, in connection with the Research and Marketing Act:

Provided, that not less than $650,000 of this amount shall be available for contracts in accordance with the provisions of section 205 of said Act:

On page 157, line 15, in connection with the Research and Marketing Act:

except that a poultry breeding house may be constructed at Purdue University at a cost to this appropriation of not to exceed $29,000.

On page 160, line 17, in connection with the working capital fund, Agricultural Research Center:

For the establishment of a working capital fund, to be available without fiscal year limitation, for expenses necessary for furnishing facilities and services by the Agricultural Research Center to Government agencies, $300,000. Said fund shall be reimbursed from applicable appropriations or other funds to cover the charges for such facilities and services, including handling and related charges, for equipment rentals (including depreciation, maintenance, and repairs), for supplies, equipment and materials, stores of which may be maintained at the Center, and for building construction, alterations, and repair, and applicable appropriations or other funds may also be charged their porportionate share of the necessary general expenses of the Center not covered by the annual appropriation.

On page 161, line 12, in connection with research on strategic and critical agricultural materials:

including not to exceed $30,000 for alterations at the Eastern Regional Research Laboratory, Wyndmoor, Pennsylvania, to provide pilot plant facilities for tannin extraction, and such amount shall be in addition to amounts otherwise available for alterations.

On page 164, line 1, in connection with the Federal experiment station, Puerto Rico:

and not to exceed $24,950 to replace water supply line and increase capacity of reservoir,

On page 165, line 6, in connection with diseases of animals:

including not to exceed $8,000 for the purchase of land and appurtenances near Ames, Iowa, for continuation of a hog cholera experiment station.

On page 165, line 20, in connection with animal disease control and eradication:

including not to exceed $30,000 for the acquisition of land and construction of four buildings for inspection of livestock at Canadian border ports of entry:

On page 170, line 22, in connection with soils, fertilizers, and irrigation:

including not to exceed $100,000 for construction or acquisition of buildings, facilities, and equipment for the station at Brawley, California.

On page 176, line 7, in connection with control of forest pests:

construction and alteration of necessary buildings, not to exceed $23,500 for the purchase of one building at Greenfield, Massachusetts: Provided, That the cost of constructing or altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed $2,500,

On page 180, line 16, in connection with the Forest Service, national forest protection and management:

and not to exceed $5,000 shall be available for the purchase of administrative sites.

On page 180, line 24, in connection with fighting forest fires:

of which $2,500,000 shall be apportioned for use, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, only to the extent that the Secretary, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, finds necessary to meet emergency conditions.

On page 185, line 8, in connection with flood control:

and to plan the agricultural phases of the development of the Columbia Basin area in accordance with the provisions of laws relating to the activities of the Department,

On page 193, line 5, in connection with acreage allotments and marketing quotas:

Provided, That $4,000,000 of this appropriation shall be placed in reserve pending determination by the Secretary as to necessity of marketing quotas on the 1951 crops of wheat, corn, and rice, to be released in such amounts and at such times as determined by the Bureau of the Budget to be necessary in connection with such marketing quotas.

On page 193, line 19, in connection with removal of surplus agricultural commodities:

The Department of Agriculture is authorized to pay out of funds made available by section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 612 (c)) transportation and handling charges on surplus commodities owned by the Department or any of its instrumentalities or agencies for the purpose of distribution to public welfare agencies.

On page 199, line 19, in connection with Farmers Home Administration:

and advances incident to the acquisition and preservation of security of obligations under the foregoing several authorities:

On page 209, line 21, in connection with the Commodity Credit Corporation:

Provided further, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to discharge $170,515,131 of the indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation to the Secretary of the Treasury by canceling notes in such amount issued by the Corporation to the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to section 4 of the Act of March 8, 1938, as amended (15 U. S. C. 713a–4).

On page 214, line 17, in connection with Sec. 410 of general provisions:

Not less than $575,000 shall be available for contracts in accordance with section 10 (a) of the Act of August 14, 1946 (7 U. S. C. 427i) from appropriations herein made for the Bureau of Agricultural Economics; Bureau of Animal Industry; Bureau of Dairy Industry; Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering; Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine; Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry; Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics; and the Forest Service.

ANALYSIS OF ACTION BY COMMITTEE

1950 appropriation		$731,328,607
Comparative total for 1951		722,077,690
Salary increases (Public Laws 359 and 429)	$6,568,000	
Capital improvements (nonrecurring):		
Improvement and acquisition of property for operating purposes	690,450	
Flood-control and water conservation projects	1,915,000	
	2,605,450	
New programs approved last session of Congress:		
Reforestation and fire protection	1,275,000	
Rural telephone	600,000	
Farm housing	550,000	
	2,425,000	
Expanded activities based on prior commitments:		
Conservation and use of agricultural land resources	25,456,561	
Federal Crop Insurance	1,800,000	
	27,256,561	
Other new programs:		
Acreage allotments and marketing quotas	2,100,000	
Soil conservation operations	1,000,000	
	3,100,000	
Total increases		41,955,011
Total appropriation, 1951		764,032,701

63968—50——10

PERMANENT APPROPRIATIONS

Agency and item	Appropriation, 1950	Estimates, 1951	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Cooperative agriculture extension work	$4, 704, 710	$4, 704, 710	
Payments to school funds, Arizona and New Mexico national forest fund	61, 000	61, 000	
Payments to States and Territories from national forest fund	7, 719, 490	7, 500, 000	−$219, 490
Roads and trails for States, national forest fund	3, 088, 000	3, 000, 000	−88, 000
Payments due counties, submarginal-land program	247, 500	243, 500	−4, 000
Removal of surplus agricultural commodities (30 percent of customs receipts)	125, 606, 982	110, 000, 000	−15, 606, 982
Payment from proceeds of sales, motor-propelled vehicles, etc	796, 000	550, 000	−246, 000
Net total, permanent appropriation	142, 223, 682	126, 059, 210	−16, 164, 472

TRUST FUNDS

[Not a charge against revenues]

Agency and item	Appropriation, 1950	Estimates, 1951	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Animal Industry: Expenses and refunds, inspection and grading of canned wet animal foods	$95,000	$95,000	
Forest Service: Cooperation work	6,000,000	6,000,000	
Soil Conservation Service:			
Payments in lieu of taxes and operation and maintenance costs, water conservation and utilization projects	75,640	19,350	−$56,290
Operation and maintenance, water distribution systems, water conservation and utilization projects	9,800	9,800	
Production and Marketing Administration:			
Expenses and refunds, inspection and grading of farm products	5,280,000	5,375,000	+95,000
Grading of agriculture commodities	691,000	683,800	−7,200
Indemnity fund, county associations	500	500	
Undistributed cotton price adjustment payments	200	200	
Farmers Home Administration:			
Liquidation of deposits, lease and purchase contracts	20,000	24,000	+4,000
State rural rehabilitation corporation funds	11,000,000	9,000,000	−2,000,000
Miscellaneous contributed funds	378,100	411,600	+33,500
Return of excess deposits for reproduction of photographs, mosaics, and maps	800	800	
Total, trust accounts	23,551,040	21,620,050	−1,930,990

LOAN AUTHORIZATIONS

Agency and item	Authorization, 1950	Estimates, 1951	Recommended in bill for 1951	Bill compared with—	
				1950 authorization	1951 estimate
Farmers Home Administration:					
Farm tenancy and housing loans	$40, 000, 000	$70, 000, 000	$56, 350, 000	+$16, 350, 000	−$13, 650, 000
Production and subsistence loans	85, 000, 000	85, 000, 000	85, 000, 000	----------	----------
Water facilities loans	3, 000, 000	5, 000, 000	4, 000, 000	+1, 000, 000	−1, 000, 000
Total, Farmers Home Administration	128, 000, 000	160, 000, 000	145, 350, 000	+17, 350, 000	−14, 650, 000
Rural Electrification Administration:					
Rural electrification loans	350, 000, 000	400, 000, 000	350, 000, 000	----------	−50, 000, 000
Rural telephone loans	25, 000, 000	50, 000, 000	25, 000, 000	----------	−25, 000, 000
Total, Rural Electrification Administration	375, 000, 000	450, 000, 000	375, 000, 000	----------	−75, 000, 000
Total, loan authorization	503, 000, 000	610, 000, 000	520, 350, 000	+17, 350, 000	−89, 650, 000

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES OF GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS

Agency and item	Authorization, 1950	Estimates, 1951	Recommended in bill for 1951	Bill compared with—	
				1950 authorization	1951 estimate
Commodity Credit Corporation	$15,000,000	$16,750,000	$16,000,000	+$1,000,000	−$750,000
Farm Credit Administration:					
Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation	1,500,000	1,280,000	1,280,000	−220,000	----------
Federal Intermediate Credit Banks	1,398,000	1,496,000	1,496,000	+98,000	----------
Production Credit Corporation	1,328,000	1,358,000	1,358,000	+30,000	----------
Total, administrative expense limitations	19,226,000	20,884,000	20,134,000	+908,000	−750,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1950, AND ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1951

Agency and item	Appropriation, 1950	Estimates, 1951	Recommended in bill for 1951	Bill compared with—	
				1950 appropriations	1951 estimates
Research and Marketing Act of 1946:					
Title I:					
Sec. 9 (payments to land-grant colleges)	$5,000,000	$5,000,000	$5,000,000	----------	----------
Sec. 10a (utilization research)	(1)	----------	----------	----------	----------
Sec. 10b (cooperative research other than utilization)	(2)	----------	----------	----------	----------
Title II (improvement and development of marketing and distribution)	6,000,000	6,102,000	6,000,000	----------	−$102,000
Total, Research and Marketing Act of 1946	11,000,000	11,102,000	11,000,000	----------	−102,000
Bureau of Agricultural Economics:					
Economic investigations	2,621,000	2,915,600	2,600,000	−$21,000	−315,600
Crop and livestock estimates	2,817,900	3,377,800	2,725,000	−92,900	−652,800
Total Bureau of Agricultural Economics	5,438,900	6,293,400	5,325,000	−113,900	−968,400
Agricultural Research Administration:					
Office of Administrator	773,400	692,200	600,000	−173,400	−92,200
Working capital fund, Agricultural Research Center	----------	400,000	300,000	+300,000	−100,000

Special research fund	(3)				
Research on strategic and critical agricultural materials	349,000	515,500	399,000	+50,000	−116,500
Research on agricultural problems of Alaska	675,000	316,200	260,000	−415,000	−56,200
Office of Experiment Stations:					
Payments to States	7,406,208	7,416,208	7,406,208		−10,000
Salaries and expenses	256,450	263,650	237,500	−18,950	−26,150
Federal Experiment Station, Puerto Rico	170,400	185,350	175,000	+4,600	−10,350
Total, Office of Experiment Stations	7,833,058	7,865,208	7,818,708	−14,350	−46,500
Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics	1,749,200	2,217,200	1,500,000	−249,200	−717,200

[1] Activities previously carried under this title have been transferred to and consolidated with: "Insect investigation, Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine," "Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry," "Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics," "Forest products, Forest Service," "Office of the Secretary," "Office of the Solicitor," "Office of Information," "Economic investigation, Bureau of Agricultural Economics," "Office of administrator, Agricultural Research Administration," "Animal husbandry, Bureau of Animal Industry," "Bureau of Dairy Industry" and "Field crops," "Fruit, vegetable, and specialty crops," "Forest diseases," "Agricultural engineering, Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering."

[2] Activities previously carried under this title have been transferred to and consolidated with: "Insect investigation, Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine," "Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry," "Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics," "Forest and range management investigation, Forest Service," "Soil conservation research, Soil Conservation Service," "Marketing farm products, Production and Marketing Administration," "Salaries and expenses, Farm Credit Administration," "Office of the Secretary," "Office of Information," "Economic investigations, Bureau of Agricultural Economics," "Office of administrator, Agricultural Research Administration," "Administration of grants, etc., Office of Experiment Stations," "Animal husbandry and diseases of animals, Bureau of Animal Industry," "Bureau of Dairy Industry" and "Field crops," "Fruit, vegetable and specialty crops," "Soils, fertilizers, and irrigation," "Agricultural engineering, Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering."

[3] Activities previously carried under this title have been transferred to and consolidated with: "Insect control, Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine," "Bureau of Agriculture and Industrial Chemistry," "Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics," "Economic investigations and crop and livestock, Bureau of Agricultural Economics," "Administration of grants, Office of Experiment Stations," "Animal husbandry and disease of animals, Bureau of Animal Industry," "Bureau of Dairy Industry," and "Field crops," "Fruit, vegetable, and specialty crops," "Agricultural engineering," "Bureau of Plant Industry, Soil and Agricultural Engineering."

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1950, and estimates and amounts recommended in the bill for 1951—Continued

Agency and item	Appropriations, 1950	Estimates, 1951	Recommended in bill for 1951	Bill compared with—	
				1950 appropriations	1951 estimate
Agricultural Research Administration—Continued					
Bureau of Animal Industry:					
Salaries and expenses:					
Animal husbandry	$2, 248, 200	$2, 519, 700	$2, 250, 000	+$1, 800	−$269, 700
Diseases of animals	1, 295, 600	1, 498, 100	1, 300, 000	+4, 400	−198, 100
Animal disease control and eradication	7, 837, 000	8, 104, 000	7, 950, 000	+113, 000	−154, 000
Meat inspection	12, 577, 000	12, 959, 000	12, 800, 000	+223, 000	−159, 000
Total, salaries and expenses	23, 957, 800	25, 080, 800	24, 300, 000	+342, 200	−780, 800
Market agreements, hog cholera virus and serum	[48, 800]	[49, 300]	[49, 300]	[+500]	
Eradication of foot-and-mouth and other contagious diseases of animals	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)
Total, Bureau of Animal Industry	23, 957, 800	25, 080, 800	24, 300, 000	+342, 200	−780, 800
Bureau of Dairy Industry	1, 613, 300	1, 899, 300	1, 600, 000	−13, 300	−299, 300
Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry	8, 395, 625	8, 818, 800	7, 750, 000	−645, 625	−1, 068, 800
Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils and Agricultural Engineering:					
Field crops	3, 446, 800	3, 638, 300	3, 400, 000	−46, 800	−238, 300
Fruit, vegetable, and specialty crops	2, 956, 700	3, 328, 900	2, 950, 000	−6, 700	−378, 900

Forest diseases	443, 740	501, 500	450, 000	+6, 260	−51, 500
Soils, fertilizers, and irrigation	2, 576, 400	3, 014, 200	2, 680, 000	+103, 600	−334, 200
Agricultural engineering	1, 153, 000	1, 349, 500	1, 120, 000	−33, 000	−229, 500
National Arboretum	170, 000	152, 700	152, 700	−17, 300	
Total, Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils and Agricultural Engineering	10, 746, 640	11, 985, 100	10, 752, 700	+6, 060	−1, 232, 400
Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine:					
Salaries and expenses:					
Insect investigations	4, 111, 300	4, 551, 700	4, 100, 000	−11, 300	−451, 700
Insect and plant-disease control	4, 651, 000	4, 752, 000	4, 185, 900	−465, 100	−566, 100
Foreign plant quarantines	2, 325, 000	2, 618, 000	2, 325, 000		−293, 000
Total salaries and expenses	11, 087, 300	11, 921, 700	10, 610, 900	−476, 400	−1, 310, 800
Control of emergency outbreaks of insect and plant diseases	2, 253, 000	2, 500, 000	850, 000	−1, 403, 000	−1, 650, 000
Total, Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine	13, 340, 300	14, 421, 700	11, 460, 900	−1, 879, 400	−2, 960, 800
Control of Forest Pests:					
Gypsy and brown-tail moths	575, 000	613, 500	539, 500	−35, 500	−74, 000
Forest Pest Control Act	1, 000, 000	1, 006, 500	900, 000	−100, 000	−106, 500
White-pine blister rust	3, 645, 000	4, 600, 000	3, 280, 000	−365, 000	−1, 320, 000
Total, control of forest pests	5, 220, 000	6, 220, 000	4, 719, 500	−500, 500	−1, 500, 500

[4] Estimates for 1950 and 1951 deferred pending availability of information.

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1950, and estimates and amounts recommended in the bill for 1951—Continued

Agency and item	Appropriations, 1950	Estimates, 1951	Recommended in bill for 1951	Bill compared with—	
				1950 appropriations	1951 estimate
Forest Service:					
Salaries and expenses:					
General administrative expenses	$655,000	$676,500	$665,000	+$10,000	−$11,500
National forest protection and management	26,300,000	30,270,500	26,890,000	+590,000	−3,380,500
Fighting forest fires	[5] 6,777,000	6,500,000	6,000,000	−777,000	−500,000
Forest and range management investigations	2,893,100	3,067,000	2,995,000	+101,900	−72,000
Forest products	1,372,000	1,359,400	1,300,000	−72,000	−59,400
Forest resources investigations	866,000	1,293,500	880,000	+14,000	−413,500
Total, salaries and expenses	38,863,100	43,166,900	38,730,000	−133,100	−4,436,900
Forest development roads and trails	10,348,000	12,465,000	10,348,000	----------	−2,117,000
Acquisition of lands for national forests:					
Weeks Act	401,000	700,000	100,000	−301,000	−600,000
Superior National Forest	75,000	200,000	150,000	+75,000	−50,000
Special acts	142,000	142,000	142,000	----------	----------
Forest-fire cooperation	9,000,000	10,000,000	9,500,000	+500,000	−500,000

Farm and other private forestry cooperation	1, 075, 400	2, 075, 400	1, 300, 000	+224, 600	−775, 400
Total, Forest Service	59, 904, 500	68, 749, 300	60, 270, 000	+365, 500	−8, 479, 300
Flood control	[6] 9, 500, 000	11, 700, 000	10, 750, 000	+1, 250, 000	−950, 000
Soil Conservation Service:					
Salaries and expenses:					
Soil conservation research	1, 496, 000	1, 542, 100	1, 500, 000	+4, 000	−42, 100
Soil conservation operations	50, 572, 300	52, 047, 000	52, 900, 000	+2, 327, 700	+853, 000
Total, salaries and expenses	52, 068, 300	53, 589, 100	54, 400, 000	+2, 331, 700	+810, 900
Land utilization and retirement of submarginal land	1, 225, 000	1, 893, 100	1, 490, 000	+265, 000	−403, 100
Water conservation and utilization projects	[7]	969, 900	400, 000	+400, 000	−569, 900
Total, Soil Conservation Service	53, 293, 300	56, 452, 100	56, 290, 000	+2, 996, 700	−162, 100
Production and Marketing Administration:					
Conservation and use of agricultural land resources	257, 043, 439	285, 000, 000	282, 500, 000	+25, 456, 561	−2, 500, 000
Acreage allotments and marketing quotas	30, 150, 774	34, 000, 000	32, 300, 000	+2, 149, 226	−1, 700, 000
Sugar Act	60, 000, 000	67, 500, 000	60, 000, 000	----------	−7, 500, 000
National School Lunch Act	83, 500, 000	83, 500, 000	83, 500, 000	----------	----------

[5] Includes $100,000 regular appropriation plus $6,677,000 estimated supplemental, approximately $6,000,000 of which has been spent through December 1949.
[6] In addition prior year balance of $1,250,400 available.
[7] Prior year balance of $678,011 available.

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1950, and estimates and amounts recommended in the bill for 1951—Continued

Agency and item	Appropriations, 1950	Estimates, 1951	Recommended in bill for 1951	Bill compared with—	
				1950 appropriations	1951 estimate
Production and Marketing Administration—Continued					
Marketing services:					
Market news service	$1, 900, 000	$2, 274, 300	$2, 050, 000	+$150, 000	−$224, 300
Market inspection of farm products	758, 000	782, 800	780, 000	+22, 000	−2, 800
Marketing farm products	1, 209, 500	1, 274, 000	1, 260, 000	+50, 500	−14, 000
Tobacco acts	1, 602, 000	1, 682, 100	1, 660, 500	+58, 500	−21, 600
Cotton statistics, classing, standards, and futures acts	1, 656, 000	1, 726, 200	1, 675, 000	+19, 000	−51, 200
Marketing regulatory acts	3, 400, 000	3, 747, 600	3, 550, 000	+150, 000	−197, 600
Total, marketing services	10, 525, 500	11, 487, 000	10, 975, 500	+450, 000	−511, 500
Total, Production and Marketing Administration	441, 219, 713	481, 487, 000	469, 275, 500	+28, 055, 787	−12, 211, 500
Commodity Exchange Authority	558, 200	675, 000	650, 000	+91, 800	−25, 000
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation	5, 054, 000	7, 450, 000	6, 854, 000	+1, 800, 000	−596, 000
Rural Electrification Administration (salaries and expenses)	6, 963, 000	9, 525, 000	8, 150, 000	+1, 187, 000	−1, 375, 000

Farmers Home Administration:					
Grants	2, 000, 000	5, 000, 000	650, 000	−1, 350, 000	−4, 350, 000
Salaries and expenses	26, 149, 000	30, 000, 000	27, 700, 000	+1, 551, 000	−2, 300, 000
Total	28, 149, 000	35, 000, 000	28, 350, 000	+201, 000	−6, 650, 000
Farm Credit Administration:					
Salaries and expenses:					
Assessments against member banks	[2, 281, 800]	[2, 327, 000]	[2, 325, 000]	[+43, 200]	[−2, 000]
Direct appropriation	531, 000	592, 000	585, 000	+54, 000	−7, 000
Extension Service:					
Payments to States:					
Capper-Ketcham Act	1, 480, 000	1, 480, 000	1, 480, 000		
Bankhead-Jones Act, title II:					
Sec. 21	12, 000, 000	12, 000, 000	12, 000, 000		
Sec. 23	12, 500, 000	12, 500, 000	12, 500, 000		
Additional extension work	555, 000	555, 000	555, 000		
Alaska	23, 950	56, 100	23, 950		−32, 150

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1950, and estimates and amounts recommended in the bill for 1951—Continued

Agency and item	Appropriation, 1950	Estimates, 1951	Recommended in bill for 1951	Bill compared with—	
				1950 approriation	1951 estimate
Extension Service—Continued					
Payments to States—Continued					
Puerto Rico	$408,000	$540,438	$408,000	----------	−$132,438
Housing Act of 1949	122,000	725,000	33,050	−$88,950	−691,950
Total, payments to States	27,088,950	27,856,538	27,000,000	−88,950	−856,538
Salaries and expenses	913,500	958,200	900,000	−13,500	−58,200
Total, Extension Service	28,002,450	28,814,738	27,900,000	−102,450	−914,738
Office of the Secretary	2,151,300	2,275,300	2,143,300	−8,000	−132,000
Office of Solicitor	2,364,000	3,070,000	2,450,000	+86,000	−620,000
Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations	576,400	623,400	600,000	+23,600	−23,400
Office of Information	1,256,228	1,297,200	1,265,800	+9,572	−31,400
Library	713,293	740,000	713,293	----------	−26,707
Total direct annual appropriations	731,328,607	806,278,446	764,032,701	+32,704,094	−42,245,745

CHAPTER XI

CENTRAL SUBCOMMITTEE

LOUIS C. RABAUT, Michigan, *Chairman*

W. F. NORRELL, Arkansas
ALBERT GORE, Tennessee
E. H. HEDRICK, West Virginia
OTTO E. PASSMAN, Louisiana
JOHN TABER, New York
RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH, Massachusetts
KARL STEFAN, Nebraska

Alternates

HENRY M. JACKSON, Washington
WILLIAM G. STIGLER, Oklahoma
SIDNEY R. YATES, Illinois
ALBERT J. ENGEL, Michigan
FRANK B. KEEFE, Wisconsin

General Provisions

The last chapter of the appropriation bill is entitled "General Provisions" and carries those provisions which have been made applicable to all appropriations carried in the bill. Other general provisions are carried in each chapter of the bill and are applicable only to the chapter in which they appear. The structure of the appropriation bill can be greatly simplified by consolidation of many of these general provisions in a single chapter relating to the entire bill inasmuch as many of the provisions in the separate chapters are similar in character. This consolidation will require a great deal of study so no attempt has been made to effect it in presenting the accompanying bill. However, the Bureau of the Budget is requested to review the whole matter and propose a draft of general provisions in the 1952 budget which will avoid the necessity of repetition in the several chapters of the bill.

In addition to the usual formal sections which are included each year, the committee recommends enactment of an amendment to the Antideficiency Act and a provision relating to transfer of appropriations which are explained in further detail on pages 8 and 9 of this report.

LIMITATIONS AND LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

The following limitation not heretofore included in any appropriation bill is recommended:

On page 425, in connection with general provisions:

SEC. 1112. No part of the funds of, or available for expenditure by, any corporation or agency included in this Act shall be available to pay for annual leave accumulated by any officer or employee during the calendar year 1950 and unused at the close of business on December 31, 1950.

COMPLIANCE WITH RULE XIII—CLAUSE 2A

The following is submitted in compliance with rule XIII, clause 2A:

IN PENDING BILL	EXISTING LAW
On page 417, beginning on line 15:	(c) Orders placed as provided in subsection (a) shall be considered as obligations upon appropriations in the same manner as orders or contracts placed with private contractors. Advance payments credited to special working funds shall remain available to the procuring agency for entering into contracts and other uses during the fiscal year or years for which the appropriation involved was made and thereafter until said appropriation lapses under the law to the surplus fund of the Treasury (31 U. S. C. 686).
No funds made available by this or any other Act shall be withdrawn from one appropriation account for credit to another, or to a working fund, except as authorized by law: Provided, That, except as otherwise specifically provided by law, any funds so withdrawn and credited shall be available for the same purposes, and subject to the same limitations, conditions, and restrictions, as provided by the Act appropriating such funds: Provided further, That any such withdrawal	

IN PENDING BILL

and credit shall be made, without warrant action, by check: Provided further, That no funds withdrawn and credited pursuant to section 601 of the Act of June 30, 1932, as amended (47 Stat. 417, 31 U. S. C. 686), shall be available for any period beyond that provided by the Act appropriating such funds.

SEC. *1111. Section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U. S. C. 665), is hereby further amended to read as follows:*

"SEC. 3679. (a) No officer or employee of the United States shall make or authorize an expenditure from or create or authorize an obligation under any appropriation or fund in excess of the amount available therein; nor shall any such officer or employee involve the Government in any contract or other obligation, for the payment of money for any purpose, in advance of appropriations made for such purpose, unless such contract or obligation is authorized by law.

"(b) No officer or employee of the United States shall accept voluntary service for the United States or employ personal service in excess of that authorized by law, except in cases of emergency involving the safety of human life or the protection of property.

"(c) (1) Except as otherwise provided in this section, all appropriations or funds available for obligation for a definite period of time shall be so apportioned as to prevent obligation thereof in a manner which would indicate a necessity for deficiency or supplemental appropriations for such period; and all appropriations or funds not limited to a definite period of time, and all authorizations to create obligations by contract in advance of appropriations, shall be so apportioned as to achieve the most effective and economical use thereof. As used hereafter in this section, the term 'appropriation' means appropriations, funds, and authorizations to create obligations by contract in advance of appropriations.

"(2) In apportioning any appropriation, reserves may be established to provide for contingencies, or to effect savings whenever savings are made possible by or through changes in requirements, greater efficiency of operations, or other developments subsequent to the date on which such appropriation was made available. Whenever it is determined by an officer designated in subsection (d) of this section to make apportionments and reapportionments that any amount so reserved will not be required to carry out the purposes of the appropriation concerned, he shall recommend the rescission of such

EXISTING LAW

§ 665. Expenditures in excess of appropriations; voluntary service forbidden; apportionment of appropriations for contingent expenses or other general purposes.

No executive department or other Government establishment of the United States shall expend, in any one fiscal year, any sum in excess of appropriations made by Congress for that fiscal year, or involve the Government in any contract or other obligation for the future payment of money in excess of such appropriations unless such contract or obligation is authored by law. Nor shall any department or any officer of the Government accept voluntary service for the Government or employ personal service in excess of that authorized by law, except in cases of sudden emergency involving the loss of human life or the destruction of property. All appropriations made for contingent expenses or other general purposes, except appropriations made in fulfillment of contract obligations expressly authorized by law, or for objects required or authorized by law without reference to the amounts annually appropriated therefor, shall, on or before the beginning of each fiscal year, be so apportioned by monthly or other allotments as to prevent expenditures in one portion of the year which may necessitate deficiency or additional appropriations to complete the service of the fiscal year for which said appropriations are made; and all such apportionments shall be adhered to and shall not be waived or modified except upon the happening of some extraordinary emergency or unusual circumstance which could not be anticipated at the time of making such apportionment, but this provision shall not apply to the contingent appropriations of the Senate or House of Representatives; and in case said apportionments are waived or modified as herein provided, the same shall be waived or modified in writing by the head of such executive department or other Government establishment having control of the expenditure, and the reasons therefor shall be fully set forth in each particular case and communicated

IN PENDING BILL

amount in the manner provided in the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, for estimates of appropriations.

"(3) Any appropriation subject to apportionment shall be distributed by months, calendar quarters, operating seasons, or other time periods, or by activities, functions, projects, or objects, or by a combination thereof, as may be deemed appropriate by the officers designated in subsection (d) of this section to make apportionments and reapportionments. Except as otherwise specified by the officer making the apportionment, amounts so apportioned shall remain available for obligation, in accordance with the terms of the appropriation, on a cumulative basis unless reapportioned.

"(4) Apportionments shall be reviewed at least four times each year by the officers designated in subsection (d) of this section to make apportionments and reapportionments, and such reapportionments made or such reserves established, modified, or released as may be necessary to further the effective use of the appropriation concerned, in accordance with the purposes stated in paragraph (1) of this subsection.

"(d) (1) Any appropriation available to the legislative branch, the Judiciary, or the District of Columbia, which is required to be apportioned under subsection (c) of this section, shall be apportioned or reapportioned in writing by the officer having administrative control of such appropriation. Each such appropriation shall be apportioned not later than thirty days before the beginning of the fiscal year for which the appropriation is available, or not more than thirty days after approval the act by which the appropriation is made available, whichever is later.

"(2) Any appropriation available to an agency, which is required to be apportioned under subsection (c) of this section, shall be apportioned or reapportioned in writing by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. The head of each agency to which any such appropriation is available shall submit to the Bureau of the Budget information, in such form and manner and at such time or times as the Director may prescribe, as may be required for the apportionment of such appropriation. Such information shall be submitted not later than forty days before the beginning of any fiscal year for which the appropriation is available, or not more than fifteen days after approval of the Act by which such appropriation is made available, whichever is later. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall apportion each such appropriation and shall notify the agency concerned of his action not later than twenty days before the beginning of

EXISTING LAW

to Congress in connection with estimates for any additional appropriations required on account thereof. Any person violating any provision of this section shall be summarily removed from office and may also be punished by a fine of not less than $100 or by imprisonment for not less than one month (R. S. § 3679; Mar. 3, 1905, ch. 1484, §4, 33 Stat. 1257; Feb. 27, 1906, ch. 510, § 3, 34 Stat. 48).

IN PENDING BILL

the fiscal year for which the appropriation is available, or not more than thirty days after the approval of the Act by which such appropriation is made available, whichever is later. When used in this section, the term 'agency' means any executive department, agency, commission, authority, administration, board, or other independent establishment in the executive branch of the Government, including any corporation wholly or partly owned by the United States which is an instrumentality of the United States.

"(e) (1) No apportionment or reapportionment which, in the judgment of the officer making such apportionment or reapportionment would indicate a necessity for a deficiency or supplemental estimate shall be made except upon a determination by such officer that such action is required because of (A) any laws enacted subsequent to the transmission to the Congress of the estimates for an appropriation which require expenditures beyond administrative control; or (B) emergencies involving the safety of human life, the protection of property, or the immediate welfare of individuals in cases where an appropriation has been made to enable the United States to make payment of, or contributions towards, sums which are required to be paid to individuals either in specific amounts fixed by law or in accordance with formulae prescribed by law.

"(2) In each case of an apportionment or a reapportionment which, in the judgment of the officer making such apportionment or reapportionment, would indicate a necessity for a deficiency or supplemental estimate, such officer shall immediately submit a detailed report of the facts of the case to the Congress. In transmitting any deficiency or supplemental estimates required on account of any such apportionment or reapportionment, reference shall be made to such report.

"(f) The officers designated in subsection (d) of this section to make apportionments and reapportionments receipts from industrial and power operations available under law and may exempt from apportionments any appropriation made specifically for—

"(1) Interest on, or retirement of, the public debt;

"(2) Payment of claims, judgments, refunds, and draw-backs;

"(3) Any item determined by the President to be of a confidential nature;

"(4) Payment under private relief Acts or other laws requiring payments to designated payees in the total amount of such appropriation;

EXISTING LAW

IN PENDING BILL

"(5) Contingent expenses of the Senate or of the House of Representatives.

"(g) Any appropriation which is apportioned or reapportioned pursuant to this section may be divided and subdivided administratively within the limits of such apportionments or reapportionments. The officer having administrative control of any such appropriation available to the legislative branch, the Judiciary, or the District of Columbia, and the head of each agency, subject to the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, shall prescribe, by regulation, a system of administrative control (not inconsistent with any other accounting procedures prescribed by or pursuant to law) which shall be designed to (A) restrict obligations against each appropriation to the amount of apportionments of reapportionments made for each such appropriation, and (B) enable such officer or agency head to fix responsibility for the creation of any obligation in excess of an apportionment or reapportionment.

"(h) No officer or employee of the United States shall authorize or create any obligation (A) in excess of an apportionment or reapportionment, or (B) in excess of the amount permitted by regulations prescribed pursuant to subsection (g) of this section.

"(i) (1) In addition to any penalty or liability under other law, any officer or employee of the United States who shall violate subsection (a), (b), or (h) of this section shall be subjected to appropriate administrative discipline, including, when circumstances warrant, suspension from duty without pay or removal from office; and any officer or employee of the United States who shall knowingly and wilfully violate subsection (a), (b), or (h) of this section shall, upon conviction, be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned for not more than two years or both.

"(2) In the case of a violation of subsection (a), (b), or (h) of this section by an officer or employee of an agency, or of the District of Columbia, the head of the agency concerned or the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, shall immediately report to the President, through the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and to the Congress all pertinent facts together with a statement of the action taken thereon."

EXISTING LAW

○

Union Calendar No. 696

81ST CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 7786

[Report No. 1797]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MARCH 21, 1950

Mr. CANNON, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the following bill; which was committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

---

A BILL

Making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the support of the Government, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, namely:

CHAPTER I—DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

For the general fund of the District of Columbia, $11,000,000, and for the water fund, established by law (D. C. Code, title 43, ch. 15), $1,000,000, both amounts to be advanced July 1, 1950.

trial relations; printing and binding; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); and payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672); $2,949,700.

Boards of inquiry: To enable the Service to pay necessary expenses of boards of inquiry appointed by the President pursuant to section 206 of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947 (29 U. S. C. 176–180, 182), including printing and binding; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); and rent in the District of Columbia, $50,000.

This title may be cited as the "Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service Appropriation Act, 1951".

This chapter may be cited as the "Labor-Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1951".

CHAPTER VI—DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

TITLE I

Research and Marketing Act of 1946

To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of section 9 of title I and title II of the Act of August 14, 1946, as amended (7 U. S. C. 427, 427h, 427j, 1621–1629), as follows:

For payments to States, Territories, and Puerto Rico for agricultural experiment stations pursuant to section 9 of the Bankhead-Jones Act approved June 29, 1935, as amended by the Act of August 14, 1946, $5,000,000;

For the improvement and development, independently or through cooperation among Federal and State agencies, and others, of a sound and efficient system for the distribution and marketing of agricultural products pursuant to the "Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946" (title II of the Act of August 14, 1946, as amended), including the objects for which funds are available for titles II and III of such Act of August 14, 1946, $6,000,000: *Provided,* That not less than $650,000 of this amount shall be available for contracts in accordance with the provisions of section 205 of said Act: *Provided further,* That the Secretary may make available to any bureau, office, or agency of the Department such amounts from this appropriation as may be necessary to carry out the functions for which it is made (but amounts

made available to the Office of the Secretary, Office of the Solicitor, and Office of Information, shall not exceed those which the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives of the Department, shall determine), and any such amounts shall be in addition to amounts transferred or otherwise made available to other appropriation items of the Department: *Provided further,* That no part of this appropriation shall be available for work relating to fish or shellfish or any product thereof, except for the support of equitable transportation rates before Federal agencies concerned with such rates and for development of foreign markets.

In all, $11,000,000: *Provided,* That no part of this appropriation shall be used for beginning construction of any building costing in excess of $15,000, except that a poultry breeding house may be constructed at Purdue University at a cost to this appropriation of not to exceed $29,000.

BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

For necessary expenses in carrying out the provisions of the Act establishing the Bureau of Agricultural Economics (5 U. S. C. 673) and related Acts, as follows:

Economic investigations: For conducting investigations and for acquiring and diffusing useful information among the people of the United States, relative to agricultural production, distribution, land utilization, and conservation in their

broadest aspects, including farm management and practice, utilization of farm and food products, purchasing of farm supplies, farm population and rural life, farm labor, farm finance, insurance and taxation, adjustments in production to probable demand for the different farm and food products; land ownership and values, farm structures, costs, prices and income in their relation to agriculture, including causes for their variations and trends, $2,600,000: *Provided*, That no part of the funds herein appropriated or made available to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics under the heading "Economic investigations" shall be used for State and county land-use planning, for conducting cultural surveys, or for the maintenance of regional offices.

Crop and livestock estimates: For collecting, compiling, abstracting, analyzing, summarizing, interpreting, and publishing data relating to agriculture, including crop and livestock estimates, acreage, yield, grades, staples of cotton, stocks, and value of farm crops and numbers, grades, and value of livestock and livestock products on farms, production, distribution, and consumption of turpentine and rosin pursuant to the Act of August 15, 1935 (5 U. S. C. 556b), and for the collection and publication of statistics of peanuts as provided by the Act approved June 24, 1936, as amended May 12, 1938 (7 U. S. C. 951–957), and data on farm construction as provided by title V of the Housing Act

of 1949 (Public Law 171), $2,725,000: *Provided,* That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be available for any expense incident to ascertaining, collating, or publishing a report stating the intention of farmers as to the acreage to be planted in cotton, or for estimates of apple production for other than the commercial crop.

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR

For necessary expenses of the Office of Administrator, including the purchase of one passenger motor vehicle, travel and subsistence expenses of Advisory Committee authorized by title III of the Act of August 14, 1946 (7 U. S. C. 1628–1629), and the maintenance, operation, and furnishing of facilities and services at the Agricultural Research Center, $600,000: *Provided,* That the appropriation current at the time services are rendered may be reimbursed (by advance credits or reimbursements based on estimated or actual charges) from applicable appropriations, to cover the charges, including handling and other related services, for equipment rentals (including depreciation, maintenance, and repairs); for services, supplies, equipment, and material furnished: *Provided further,* That of the several appropriations of the Agricultural Research Administration, not to exceed $15,000 shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706 (a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5

U. S. C. 574), as amended by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a): *Provided further*, That the several appropriations of the Agricultural Research Administration shall be available for the construction, alteration, and repair of buildings and improvements: *Provided, however*, That unless otherwise provided, the cost of constructing any one building (excepting headhouses connecting greenhouses) shall not exceed $5,000, the total amount for construction of buildings costing more than $2,500 each shall be within the limits of the estimates submitted and approved therefor, and the cost of altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed $2,500 or 2 per centum of the cost of the building as certified by the Research Administrator, whichever is greater.

WORKING CAPITAL FUND, AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH CENTER

For the establishment of a working capital fund, to be available without fiscal year limitation, for expenses necessary for furnishing facilities and services by the Agricultural Research Center to Government agencies, $300,000. Said fund shall be reimbursed from applicable appropriations or other funds to cover the charges for such facilities and services, including handling and related charges, for equipment rentals (including depreciation, maintenance, and

repairs), for supplies, equipment and materials, stores of which may be maintained at the Center, and for building construction, alterations, and repair, and applicable appropriations or other funds may also be charged their proportionate share of the necessary general expenses of the Center not covered by the annual appropriation.

RESEARCH ON STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL AGRICULTURAL MATERIALS

For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to carry out his responsibilities under section 7 (b) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act of July 23, 1946 (50 U. S. C. 98f), $399,000, including not to exceed $30,000 for alterations at the Eastern Regional Research Laboratory, Wyndmoor, Pennsylvania, to provide pilot plant facilities for tannin extraction, and such amount shall be in addition to amounts otherwise available for alterations.

RESEARCH ON AGRICULTURAL PROBLEMS OF ALASKA

For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to conduct research into the basic agricultural needs and problems of the Territory of Alaska, through such agencies of the Department as he may designate, independently or in cooperation with appropriate agencies of the Territory of Alaska, $260,000.

OFFICE OF EXPERIMENT STATIONS

Payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico

For payments to the States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico to be paid quarterly in advance, to carry into effect the provisions of the following Acts relating to agricultural experiment stations:

Hatch, Adams, Purnell, Bankhead-Jones, and related Acts: Hatch Act, the Act approved March 2, 1887 (7 U. S. C. 362, 363, 365, 368, 377–379), $720,000; Adams Act, the Act approved March 16, 1906 (7 U. S. C. 369), $720,000; Purnell Act, the Act approved February 24, 1925 (7 U. S. C. 361, 366, 370, 371, 373–376, 380, 382), $2,880,000; Bankhead-Jones Act, title I of the Act approved June 29, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 427–427g), $2,863,-708; Hawaii, the Act approved May 16, 1928 (7 U. S. C. 386–386b), extending the benefits of certain Acts of Congress to the Territory of Hawaii, $90,000; Alaska, the Act approved February 23, 1929 (7 U. S. C. 386c), extending the benefits of the Hatch Act to the Territory of Alaska, $15,000, and the provisions of section 2 of the Act approved June 20, 1936 (7 U. S. C. 369a), extending the benefits of the Adams and Purnell Acts to the Territory of Alaska, $27,500; Puerto Rico, the Act approved March 4, 1931, as amended (7 U. S. C. 386d–386f), extending the benefits of certain Acts of Congress

to Puerto Rico, $90,000; in all, payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico, $7,406,208.

Salaries and Expenses

For necessary expenses in connection with administration of grants and coordination of research with States, to carry out the provisions of the Acts approved March 2, 1887, March 16, 1906, February 24, 1925, May 16, 1928, February 23, 1929, March 4, 1931, and June 20, 1936, and Acts amendatory thereto (7 U. S. C. 361–363, 365–383, 386–386f), and title I of the Act approved June 29, 1935, as amended by the Act of December 21, 1944 (7 U. S. C. 427–427g), relative to their administration and for the administration of an agricultural experiment station in Puerto Rico, $237,500; and the Secretary shall prescribe the form of the annual financial statement required under the above Acts, ascertain whether the expenditures are in accordance with their provisions, coordinate the research work of the State agricultural colleges and experiment stations in the lines authorized in said Acts with research of the Department in similar lines, and make report thereon to Congress.

Federal Experiment Station, Puerto Rico

For expenses necessary to establish and maintain an agricultural experiment station in Puerto Rico, including the preparation, illustration, and distribution of reports and

bulletins, and not to exceed $24,950 to replace water supply line and increase capacity of reservoir, $175,000.

BUREAU OF HUMAN NUTRITION AND HOME ECONOMICS

For necessary expenses in connection with conducting investigations of the relative utility and economy of agricultural products for food, clothing, and other uses in the home, with special suggestions of plans and methods for the more effective utilization of such products for these purposes, and such economic investigations, including housing and household buying, as have for their purpose the improvement of the rural home, for coordinating nutrition services made available by Federal, State, and other agencies, and for disseminating useful information on these subjects, $1,500,000.

BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY

Salaries and Expenses

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Act, as amended, establishing a Bureau of Animal Industry, and related Acts, and for investigations concerned with the livestock and meat industries and the domestic raising of fur-bearing animals, as follows:

Animal husbandry: For investigations and experiments in animal husbandry and animal and poultry feeding and breeding, and for carrying out the purposes of section 101 (b) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U. S. C. 429) authoriz-

ing cooperation with State authorities in the administration of regulations for the improvement of poultry, poultry products, and hatcheries, $2,250,000.

Diseases of animals: For scientific investigations of diseases of animals, and for investigations of tuberculin, serums, antitoxins, and analogous products, $1,300,000, including not to exceed $8,000 for the purchase of land and appurtenances near Ames, Iowa, for continuation of a hog cholera experiment station.

Animal disease control and eradication: For the control and eradication, including inspections and quarantines, of tuberculosis and paratuberculosis of animals, avian tuberculosis, Bang's disease of cattle, scabies in sheep and cattle, southern cattle ticks, hog cholera and related swine diseases, and dourine in horses, and inspection and quarantine work; for supervision of the transportation of livestock, including administration of the twenty-eight-hour law; for inspection of vessels; and for carrying out the provisions of the Act of March 4, 1913 (21 U. S. C. 151–158), relating to veterinary biological products, $7,950,000, including not to exceed $30,000 for the acquisition of land and construction of four buildings for inspection of livestock at Canadian border ports of entry: *Provided,* That no payment hereunder as compensation for any cattle condemned for slaughter for tuberculosis, paratuberculosis, or Bang's disease shall exceed

(1) $25 for any grade animal or $50 for any purebred animal, (2) one-third of the difference between the appraised value and the value of salvage thereof, or (3) the amount paid or to be paid by the State or other cooperating agency, and no payment hereunder shall be made for any animal if at the time of test or condemnation it shall belong to or be upon the premises of any person, firm, or corporation to which it has been sold, shipped, or delivered for slaughter: *Provided further,* That inspection service shall be maintained at all stockyards having such service during the current fiscal year.

Meat inspection: For carrying out the provisions of laws relating to Federal inspection of meat and meat-food products, $12,800,000.

Marketing Agreements, Hog Cholera Virus and Serum

The sum of $49,300 of the appropriation made by section 12 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, approved May 12, 1933 (7 U. S. C. 612), is hereby made available during the fiscal year for which appropriations are herein made to carry into effect sections 56 to 60, inclusive, of the Act approved August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 851–855).

Eradication of Foot-and-Mouth and Other Contagious Diseases of Animals

For expenses necessary in the arrest and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, rinderpest, contagious pleuropneu-

monia, or other contagious or infectious diseases of animals, or European fowl pest and similar diseases in poultry, including the payment of claims growing out of past and future purchases and destruction of animals (including poultry) affected by or exposed to, or of materials contaminated by or exposed to, any such disease, wherever found and irrespective of ownership, under like or substantially similar circumstances, when such owner has complied with all lawful quarantine regulations; and for foot-and-mouth disease and rinderpest programs undertaken pursuant to the provisions of the Act of February 28, 1947 (21 U. S. C. Supp. II, 114b–114d), and the Act of May 29, 1884, as amended (7 U. S. C., 391; 21 U. S. C., 111–122), including expenses in accordance with section 2 of said Act of February 28, 1947, the Secretary may transfer from other appropriations or funds available to the bureaus, corporations, or agencies of the Department such sums as he may deem necessary, to be available only in an emergency which threatens the livestock or poultry industry of the country, and any unexpended balances of funds transferred under this head in the next preceding fiscal year shall be merged with such transferred amounts: *Provided*, That, except for payments made pursuant to said Act of February 28, 1947, the payment for such animals hereafter purchased may be made on appraisement based on the meat, egg-production,

dairy, or breeding value, but in case of appraisement based on breeding value no appraisement of any such animal shall exceed three times its meat, egg-production, or dairy value, and, except in case of an extraordinary emergency, to be determined by the Secretary, the payment by the United States Government for any such animals shall not exceed one-half of any such appraisements: *Provided further*, That poultry may be appraised in groups when the basis for appraisal is the same for each bird.

BUREAU OF DAIRY INDUSTRY

For necessary expenses in carrying out the provisions of the Act of May 29, 1924 (7 U. S. C. 401–404), including investigations, experiments, and demonstrations in dairy industry, for carrying out the applicable provisions of the Act of May 9, 1902 (26 U. S. C. 2325, 2326 (c)), relating to process or renovated butter, as amended, and the Act of May 23, 1908 (21 U. S. C. 94 (a)), insofar as it relates to the exportation of process or renovated butter, $1,600,000.

BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL AND INDUSTRIAL CHEMISTRY

For expenses necessary for investigations, experiments, and demonstrations established under the provisions of section 202 (a) to 202 (e), inclusive, of title II of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U. S. C. 1292); for the development of new and extended food, feed, and in-

dustrial uses for agricultural commodities, both plant and animal, and potential replacement crops, and processing, biological, chemical, physical, pharmacological, toxicological, and technological investigation thereof, $7,750,000: *Provided,* That not to exceed $20,000 shall be available for the alteration to buildings of the Naval Stores Station at Olustee, Florida.

BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY, SOILS, AND AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING

For expenses necessary for investigations, experiments, and demonstrations in connection with the production and improvement of farm crops and other plants and plant industries; soils and soil-plant relationships, and the application of engineering principles to agriculture; plant diseases, including nematodes, and methods for their prevention and control; plant and plant-disease collections, and surveys; the distribution of weeds and means for their control; methods of handling, processing, transportation, and storage of agricultural products; and plants in foreign countries and our possessions for introduction into the United States, including explorations and surveys, and propagation and testing in this country; and for the operation and maintenance of airplanes, as follows:

Field crops: For investigations on the production, improvement, and diseases of alfalfa, barley, clover, corn, cotton,

flax, grasses, oats, rice, rubber crops, sorghums, soybeans, sugar beets, sugarcane, tobacco, wheat, and other field crops, $3,400,000.

Fruit, vegetable, and specialty crops: For investigations on the production, improvement, and diseases of fruit, vegetable, nut, ornamental, and related crops and plants, $2,950,000.

Forest diseases: For investigations of diseases of forest and shade trees and forest products, and methods for their control, $450,000.

Soils, fertilizers, and irrigation: For investigations of soil management methods to increase and maintain productivity, including fertilization, liming, crop rotations, tillage practices, and other means of improving soils; fertilizers, fertilizer ingredients, and their improvement for agricultural use; soil management and crop production on dry and irrigated lands, and the quality of irrigation water and its use by crops; and for the classification of soils in a national system and indication of their extent and distribution on maps, and determination of their potential productivity under adapted cropping and improved soil management, $2,680,000, including not to exceed $100,000 for construction or acquisition of buildings, facilities, and equipment for the station at Brawley, California.

Agricultural engineering: For investigations involving

the application of engineering principles to agriculture, including farm power and equipment, rural water supply and sanitation, and rural electrification; farm buildings and their appurtenances and buildings for processing and storing farm products, and the preparation and distribution of building plans and specifications; cotton ginning, and other engineering problems relating to the production, processing, transportation, and storage of agricultural products; $1,120,000.

National Arboretum: For the maintenance and development of the National Arboretum established under the provisions of the Act approved March 4, 1927 (20 U. S. C. 191–194), $152,700.

BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY AND PLANT QUARANTINE

Salaries and Expenses

For expenses necessary for investigations, experiments, demonstrations, and surveys for the promotion of economic entomology, for investigating and ascertaining the best means of destroying insects and related pests injurious to agriculture, for importing useful and beneficial insects and bacterial, fungal, and other diseases of insects and related pests, for investigating and ascertaining the best means of destroying insects affecting man and animals, and the best ways of utilizing beneficial insects, for carrying into effect the provisions of the Plant Quarantine Act of August 20,

1912, as amended (7 U. S. C. 151–167), the Honey Bee Act (7 U. S. C. 281–283), the Insect Pest Act (7 U. S. C. 141–144), the Mexican Border Act (7 U. S. C. 149), and the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U. S. C. 147a), as amended, authorizing the eradication, control, and prevention of spread of injurious insects and plant pests; including the operation and maintenance of airplanes and the purchase of not to exceed two, as follows:

Insect investigations: For the investigation of insects affecting fruits, grapes, nuts, trees, shrubs, forests and forest products, truck and garden crops, cereal, forage and range crops, cotton, tobacco, sugar plants, ornamental and other plants and agricultural products, household possessions, and man and animals; for bee culture and apiary management; for classifying, identifying, and collecting information to determine the distribution and abundance of insects; for investigations in connection with introduction of natural enemies of injurious insects and related pests and for the exchange with other countries of useful and beneficial insects and other arthropods; for developing methods, equipment, and apparatus to aid in enforcing plant quarantines and in the eradication and control of insect pests and plant diseases; and for investigations of insecticides and fungicides, including methods of their manufacture and use and the effects of their application, $4,100,000: *Provided,* That of

the amount allotted for oriental fruitfly, not to exceed $250,000 may be used for contracts with public or private agencies for research without regard to provisions of existing law, and the amounts obligated for contract research shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That $50,000 shall be transferred to applicable appropriations of the Public Health Service for investigations and studies of effects of insecticidal and fungicidal residue on human health.

Insect and plant-disease control: For carrying out operations or measures to eradicate, suppress, control, or to prevent or retard the spread of Japanese beetle, sweetpotato weevil, Mexican fruitflies, phony peach and peach mosaic, cereal rusts, pink bollworm and Thurberia weevil, golden nematode, citrus blackfly, white-fringed beetle, and the Hall scale, including the enforcement of quarantine regulations and cooperation with States to enforce plant quarantines as authorized by the Plant Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912, as amended (7 U. S. C. 151–167), and including the establishment of such cotton-free areas as may be necessary to stamp out any infestation of the pink bollworm as authorized by the Act of February 8, 1930 (46 Stat. 67), and for cooperation with States in the compensation of growers for losses resulting from the destruction of or for not planting potatoes and tomatoes on lands infested or exposed to infestations of the golden nematode for the purpose author-

ized by the Golden Nematode Act (Public Law 645, approved June 15, 1948), and for the enforcement of domestic plant quarantines through inspection in transit, including the interception and disposition of materials found to have been transported interstate in violation of Federal plant quarantine laws or regulations, and operations under the Terminal Inspection Act (7 U. S. C. 166), $4,185,900: *Provided,* That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay the cost or value of trees, farm animals, farm crops, or other property injured or destroyed, except potatoes and tomatoes as authorized under the Golden Nematode Act: *Provided further,* That, in the discretion of the Secretary, no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the control of sweetpotato weevil in any State until such State has provided cooperation necessary to accomplish this purpose, or for barberry eradication until a sum or sums at least equal to such expenditures shall have been appropriated, subscribed, or contributed by States, counties, or local authorities, or by individuals or organizations for the accomplishment of this purpose, or with respect to the golden nematode except as prescribed in section 4 of the Golden Nematode Act.

Foreign plant quarantines: For operations against the introduction of insect pests or plant diseases into the United States, including the enforcement of foreign-plant quaran-

tines and regulations promulgated under sections 5 and 7 of the Plant Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912, as amended (7 U. S. C. 151–167), the Insect Pest Act of 1905 (7 U. S. C. 141–144), and the Mexican Border Act of 1942 (7 U. S. C. 149), for enforcement of domestic-plant quarantines as they pertain to Territories of the United States and enforcement of regulations governing the movement of plants into and from the District of Columbia promulgated under section 15 of the Plant Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912, as amended, and for inspection and certification of plants and plant products to meet the sanitary requirements of foreign countries, as authorized in section 102 of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U. S. C. 147a), $2,325,000.

Control of Emergency Outbreaks of Insects and Plant Diseases

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the joint resolution approved May 9, 1938 (7 U. S. C. 148–148e), including the operation and maintenance of airplanes and the purchase of not to exceed two, and surveys and control operations in Canada in cooperation with the Canadian Government or local Canadian authorities, and the employment of Canadian citizens, $850,000.

Control of Forest Pests

For expenses necessary for carrying out operations, measures, or surveys necessary to eradicate, suppress, con-

trol, or to prevent or retard the spread of insects or diseases which endanger forest trees on any lands in the United States, and for such quarantine measures relating thereto as may be necessary pursuant to the Plant Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912, as amended (7 U. S. C. 151–167), including the purchase (not to exceed three) and operation and maintenance of airplanes, construction and alteration of necessary buildings, not to exceed $23,500 for the purchase of one building at Greenfield, Massachusetts: *Provided*, That the cost of constructing or altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed $2,500, as follows:

Gypsy and brown-tail moths: Gypsy and brown-tail moths, pursuant to section 102 of the Act of September 21, 1944 (7 U. S. C. 147a), $539,500.

Forest Pest Control Act: For carrying out the provisions of the Act approved June 25, 1947 (16 U. S. C., Supp. I, 594–1—594–5), $900,000.

White pine blister rust: White pine blister rust, pursuant to the Act of April 26, 1940 (16 U. S. C. 594a), $3,280,000, of which amount $508,750 shall be available to the Department of the Interior for the control of white pine blister rust on or endangering Federal lands under the jurisdiction of that Department or lands of Indian tribes which are under the jurisdiction of or retained under restrictions of the United States; $1,727,800 of said amount to

the Forest Service for the control of white pine blister rust on or endangering lands under its jurisdiction; and $1,043,450 of said amount to the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine for leadership and general coordination of the entire program, method development, and for operations conducted under its direction for such control, including, but not confined to, the control of white pine blister rust on or endangering State and privately owned lands.

FOREST SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary including not to exceed $10,000 for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706 (a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as amended by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); to experiment and make investigations and report on forestry, national forests, forest fires, and lumbering, but no part of this appropriation shall be used for any experiment or test made outside the jurisdiction of the United States; to advise the owners of woodlands as to the proper care of the same; to investigate and test American timber and timber trees and their uses, and methods for the preservative treatment of timber; to seek, through investigations and the planting of native and foreign

species, suitable trees for the treeless regions; to erect necessary buildings: *Provided,* That the cost of any building purchased, erected, or as improved, exclusive of the cost (not to exceed $1,000) of constructing a water-supply or sanitary system and of connecting the same with any such building, and exclusive of the cost of any tower upon which a lookout house may be erected, shall not exceed $15,000, with the exception that any building erected, purchased, or acquired, the cost of which was $15,000 or more, may be improved out of the appropriations made under this chapter for the Forest Service by an amount not to exceed 2 per centum of the cost of such building as certified by the Chief of the Forest Service, and that not to exceed $8,000 may be expended for the installation of an elevator in the Yeon Avenue warehouse in Portland, Oregon; to protect, administer, and improve the national forests, including tree planting and other measures to prevent erosion, drift, surface wash, soil waste, and the formation of floods, and to conserve water; to ascertain the natural conditions upon and utilize the national forests, to transport and care for fish and game supplied to stock the national forests or the waters therein; to collate, digest, report, and illustrate the results of experiments and investigations made by the Forest Service, as follows:

General administrative expenses: For general adminis-

tration, including expenses of the National Forest Reservation Commission as authorized by section 14 of the Act of March 1, 1911 (16 U. S. C. 514), $665,000.

National forest protection and management: For the administration, protection, use, maintenance, improvement, and development of the national forests, including the establishment and maintenance of forest tree nurseries, including the procurement of tree seed and nursery stock by purchase, production, or otherwise, seeding and tree planting and the care of plantations and young growth; the operation and maintenance of aircraft and the purchase of not to exceed three; the maintenance of roads and trails and the construction and maintenance of all other improvements necessary for the proper and economical administration, protection, development, and use of the national forests, including experimental areas under Forest Service administration, except that where direct purchases will be more economical than construction, improvements may be purchased; the construction (not to exceed $15,000 for any one structure), equipment, and maintenance of sanitary and recreational facilities; timber cultural operations; development and application of fish and game management plans; propagation and transplanting of plants suitable for planting on semiarid portions of the national forests; estimating and appraising of timber and other resources and development and application

of plans for their effective management, sale, and use; examination, classification, surveying, and appraisal of land incident to effecting exchanges authorized by law and of lands within the boundaries of the national forests that may be opened to homestead settlement and entry under the Act of June 11, 1906, and the Act of August 10, 1912 (16 U. S. C. 506–509), as provided by the Act of March 4, 1913 (16 U. S. C. 512); investigation and establishment of water rights, including the purchase thereof or of lands or interests in lands or rights-of-way for use and protection of water rights necessary or beneficial in connection with the administration and public use of the national forests; and all expenses necessary for the use, maintenance, improvement, protection, and general administration of the national forests, $26,890,000, of which not to exceed $75,000 shall be available for the purchase of three nursery sites, and not to exceed $5,000 shall be available for the purchase of administrative sites.

Fighting forest fires: For fighting and preventing forest fires on or threatening lands under Forest Service administration, including lands under contract for purchase or in process of condemnation for Forest Service purposes, and for liquidation of obligations incurred in the preceding fiscal year for such purpose, $6,000,000, of which $2,500,000 shall be apportioned for use, pursuant to section 3679 of

the Revised Statutes, as amended, only to the extent that the Secretary, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, finds necessary to meet emergency conditions.

Forest research: For forest research in accordance with the provisions of sections 1, 2, 7, 8, 9, and 10 of the Act approved May 22, 1928, as amended (16 U. S. C. 581, 581a, 581f–581i), including the construction and maintenance of improvements, as follows:

Forest and range management investigations: Fire, silvicultural, watershed, and other forest investigations and experiments under said section 2, as amended, and investigations and experiments to develop improved methods of management of forest and other ranges under section 7, at forest or range experiment stations or elsewhere, $2,995,000.

Forest products: Experiments, investigations, and tests of forest products under section 8, at the Forest Products Laboratory, or elsewhere, $1,300,000.

Forest resources investigations: A comprehensive forest survey under section 9, and investigations in forest economics under section 10, $880,000.

FOREST DEVELOPMENT ROADS AND TRAILS

For expenses necessary for carrying out the provisions of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act approved November 9, 1921, as amended (23 U. S. C. 23, 23a), relating to forest development roads and trails, including the

construction, reconstruction, and maintenance of roads and trails on experimental areas under Forest Service administration, $10,348,000, which sum is authorized to be appropriated by the Act of June 29, 1948 (Public Law 834), to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That this appropriation shall be available for the rental, purchase, construction, or alteration of buildings necessary for the storage and repair of equipment and supplies used for road and trail construction and maintenance, but the total cost of any such building purchased, altered, or constructed under this authorization shall not exceed $15,000 with the exception that any building erected, purchased, or acquired, the cost of which was $15,000 or more, may be improved within any fiscal year by an amount not to exceed 2 per centum of the cost of such buildings certified by the Chief of the Forest Service.

ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR NATIONAL FORESTS

Weeks Act: For the acquisition of forest lands under the provisions of the Act approved March 1, 1911, as amended (16 U. S. C. 513–519, 521), $100,000, to be available only for payment toward the purchase price of any lands acquired, including the cost of surveys in connection with such acquisition: *Provided,* That no part of such funds shall be used for the purchase of lands in the counties of Adair,

Cherokee, and Sequoyah, in the State of Oklahoma, without the specific approval of the Board of County Commissioners of the county in which such lands are situated.

Superior National Forest: For the acquisition of forest land within the Superior National Forest, Minnesota, under the provisions of the Act approved June 22, 1948 (Public Law 733), $150,000, to remain available until expended.

Special Acts: For the acquisition of land to facilitate the control of soil erosion and flood damage originating within the exterior boundaries of the following national forests, in accordance with the provisions of the following Acts authorizing annual appropriations of forest receipts for such purposes, and in not to exceed the following amounts from such receipts: Uinta and Wasatch National Forests, Utah. Act of August 26, 1935 (Public Law 337), as amended, $40,000; Cache National Forest, Utah, Act of May 11, 1938 (Public Law 505), as amended, $10,000; San Bernardino and Cleveland National Forests, Riverside County, California, Act of June 15, 1938 (Public Law 634), as amended, $22,000; Nevada and Toiyabe National Forests, Nevada, Act of June 25, 1938 (Public Law 748), as amended, $10,000; Angeles National Forest, California, Act of June 11, 1940 (Public Law 591), $20,000; Cleveland National Forest, San Diego County, California, Act of June

11, 1940 (Public Law 589), $5,000; Sequoia National Forest, California, Act of June 17, 1940 (Public Law 637), $35,000; in all $142,000.

FOREST-FIRE COOPERATION

For cooperation with the various States or other appropriate agencies in forest-fire prevention and suppression and the protection of timbered and cut-over lands in accordance with the provisions of sections 1, 2, and 3 of the Act approved June 7, 1924, as amended (16 U. S. C. 564–566), $9,500,000.

FARM AND OTHER PRIVATE FORESTRY COOPERATION

To enable the Secretary through the Forest Service to advise timberland owners and associations, wood-using industries or other appropriate agencies in the application of forest management principles to federally owned lands leased to States and to private forest lands, so as to attain sustained-yield management, the conservation of the timber resources, the productivity of forest lands, and the stabilization of employment and economic continuance of forest industries, and to carry into effect, through such agencies of the Department as he may designate, the provisions of the Cooperative Farm Forestry Act, approved May 18, 1937 (16 U. S. C. 568b), (not to exceed $490,382) and the provisions of sections 4 (not to exceed $671,392) and 5 (not to exceed $138,226) of the Act approved June 7,

1924 (16 U. S. C. 567–568), and Acts supplementary thereto; $1,300,000.

FLOOD CONTROL

For expenses necessary, in accordance with the Flood Control Act, approved June 22, 1936 (Public Law 738), as amended and supplemented, to make preliminary examinations and surveys, and to perform works of improvement, and to plan the agricultural phases of the development of the Columbia Basin area in accordance with the provisions of laws relating to the activities of the Department, to remain available until expended, $10,750,000, with which shall be merged the unexpended balances of funds heretofore appropriated or transferred to the Department for flood-control purposes: *Provided*, That no part of such funds shall be used for the purchase of lands in the Yazoo and Little Tallahatchie watersheds without specific approval of the county board of supervisors of the county in which such lands are situated, nor shall any part of such funds be used for the purchase of lands in the counties of Adair, Cherokee, and Sequoyah, in the State of Oklahoma, without the specific approval of the Board of County Commissioners of the county in which such lands are situated.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Act approved April 27, 1935 (16 U. S. C. 590a–590f),

which provides for a national program of erosion control and soil and water conservation, furnishing of subsistence to employees, operation and maintenance of aircraft, and the purchase and erection or alteration of permanent buildings: *Provided,* That the cost of any building purchased, erected, or as improved, exclusive of the cost of constructing a water supply or sanitary system and connecting the same with any such building, shall not exceed $2,500 except where buildings are acquired in conjunction with land being purchased for other purposes and except for eight buildings to be constructed at a cost not to exceed $15,000 per building: *Provided further,* That no money appropriated in this chapter shall be available for the construction of any such building on land not owned by the Government: *Provided further,* That in the State of Missouri where the State has established a central State agency authorized to enter into agreements with the United States or any of its agencies on policies and general programs for the saving of its soil by the extension of Federal aid to any soil conservation district in such State, the agreements made by or on behalf of the United States with any such soil conservation district shall have the prior approval of such central State agency before they shall become effective as to such district, as follows:

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Soil conservation research: For research and investigations into the character, cause, extent, history, and effects of erosion, soil and moisture depletion and methods of soil and water conservation (including the construction and hydrologic phases of farm irrigation and land drainage, and water regulation to conserve the soil and reduce fire hazards in the Everglades region of Florida, except that expenditures for all work in the Everglades region shall be limited to a sum not in excess of funds made available for such work by the State of Florida, or political subdivisions thereof); and for construction, operation, and maintenance of experimental watersheds, stations, laboratories, plots, and installations, $1,500,000.

Soil conservation operations: For carrying out preventive measures to conserve soil and water, including such special measures as may be necessary to prevent floods and the siltation of reservoirs, and including the improvement of farm irrigation and land drainage, the establishment and operation of conservation nurseries, the making of conservation plans and surveys, and the dissemination of information, $52,900,000: *Provided,* That no part of this appropriation may be expended for soil and water conservation operations in demonstration projects: *Provided further,* That not to

exceed $5,000 may be used for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706 (a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as amended by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a).

LAND UTILIZATION AND RETIREMENT OF SUBMARGINAL LAND

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1010–1012), and the provisions of the Act approved August 11, 1945 (7 U. S. C. 1011 note), $1,490,000.

WATER CONSERVATION AND UTILIZATION PROJECTS

For expenses necessary to carry into effect the functions of the Department under the Acts of May 10, 1939 (53 Stat. 685, 719), October 14, 1940 (16 U. S. C. 590y–z–10), as amended and supplemented, and June 28, 1949 (Public Law 132), relating to the construction, operation, and maintenance of water conservation and utilization projects, to remain available until expended, $400,000, which sum shall be merged with the unexpended balances of funds heretofore appropriated or transferred to said Department for the purposes of said Act.

PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION

CONSERVATION AND USE OF AGRICULTURAL LAND RESOURCES

To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, approved February 29, 1936, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590g–590q), including not to exceed $6,000 for the preparation and display of exhibits, including such displays at State, interstate, and international fairs within the United States; $282,500,000, to remain available until December 31 of the next succeeding fiscal year for compliance with the program of soil-building practices and soil- and water-conserving practices authorized under this head in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1950, carried out during the period July 1, 1949, to December 31, 1950, inclusive: *Provided*, That not to exceed $25,500,000 of the total sum provided under this head shall be available during the current fiscal year for salaries and other administrative expenses for carrying out such program, the cost of aerial photographs, however, not to be charged to such limitation; but not more than $5,000,000 shall be transferred to the appropriation account,

"Administrative expenses, section 392, Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938": *Provided further,* That payments to claimants hereunder may be made upon the certificate of the claimant, which certificate shall be in such form as the Secretary may prescribe, that he has carried out the conservation practice or practices and has complied with all other requirements as conditions for such payments and that the statements and information contained in the application for payment are correct and true, to the best of his knowledge and belief, under the penalties of title 18, United States Code: *Provided further,* That none of the funds herein appropriated or made available for the functions assigned to the Agricultural Adjustment Agency pursuant to the Executive Order Numbered 9069, of February 23, 1942, shall be used to pay the salaries or expenses of any regional information employees or any State information employees, but this shall not preclude the answering of inquiries or supplying of information at the county level to individual farmers: *Provided further,* That such amount shall be available for salaries and other administrative expenses in connection with the formulation and administration of the 1951 program of soil-building practices and soil- and water-conserving practices, under the Act of February 29, 1936, as amended (amounting to $285,000,000, including administration, and formulated on the basis of a distribution

of the funds available for payments and grants among the several States in accordance with their conservation needs as determined by the Secretary, except that the proportion allocated to any State shall not be reduced more than 15 per centum from the distribution for the next preceding program year, and no participant shall receive more than $2,500); but the payments or grants under such programs shall be conditioned upon the utilization of land with respect to which such payments or grants are to be made in conformity with farming practices which will encourage and provide for soil-building and soil- and water-conserving practices in the most practical and effective manner and adapted to conditions in the several States, as determined and approved by the State committees appointed pursuant to section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590h (b)), for the respective States: *Provided further,* That the county agricultural conservation committee in any county with the approval of the State committee may allot not to exceed 5 per centum of its allocation for the agricultural conservation program to the Soil Conservation Service for services of its technicians in formulating and carrying out the agricultural conservation program and the funds so allotted shall be utilized by the Soil Conservation Service for technical and other assistance in such county: *Provided*

further, That such amounts shall be available for the purchase of seeds, fertilizers, lime, trees, or any other farming materials, or any soil-terracing services, and making grants thereof to agricultural producers to aid them in carrying out farming practices approved by the Secretary under programs provided for herein: *Provided further,* That no part of any funds available to the Department, or any bureau, office, corporation, or other agency constituting a part of such Department, shall be used in the current fiscal year for the payment of salary or travel expenses of any person who has been convicted of violating the Act entitled "An Act to prevent pernicious political activities", approved August 2, 1939, as amended, or who has been found in accordance with the provisions of title 18, United States Code, section 1913, to have violated or attempted to violate such section which prohibits the use of Federal appropriations for the payment of personal services or other expenses designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress to favor or oppose any legislation or appropriation by Congress except upon request of any Member or through the proper official channels.

ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS AND MARKETING QUOTAS

To enable the Secretary to formulate and carry out acreage allotment and marketing quota programs pursuant to the provisions of title III of the Agricultural Adjustment

Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1301–1393), $32,300,000, of which not more than $5,500,000 shall be transferred to the appropriation account "Administrative expenses, section 392, Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938": *Provided,* That $4,000,000 of this appropriation shall be placed in reserve pending determination by the Secretary as to necessity of marketing quotas on the 1951 crops of wheat, corn, and rice, to be released in such amounts and at such times as determined by the Bureau of the Budget to be necessary in connection with such marketing quotas.

SUGAR ACT

To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948 (7 U. S. C. 1101–1160), $60,000,000, to remain available until June 30 of the next succeeding fiscal year: *Provided,* That expenditures (including transfers) from this appropriation for other than payments to sugar producers shall not exceed $1,500,000.

REMOVAL OF SURPLUS AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

The Department of Agriculture is authorized to pay out of funds made available by section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 612 (c)) transportation and handling charges on surplus commodities owned by the Department or any of its instrumentalities or agencies for the purpose of distribution to public welfare agencies.

NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT

To enable the Secretary to carry out the provisions of the National School Lunch Act (42 U. S. C. 1751–1760), $83,500,000: *Provided,* That no part of this appropriation shall be used for nonfood assistance under section 5 of said Act.

MARKETING SERVICES

For expenses necessary in conducting investigations, experiments, and demonstrations, as follows:

Market news service: For collecting, publishing, and distributing, by telegraph, mail, or otherwise, timely information on the market supply and demand, commercial movement, location, disposition, quality, condition, and market prices of livestock, meats, fish, and animal products, dairy and poultry products (including broilers), fruits and vegetables, peanuts and their products, grain, hay, feeds, cottonseed, and seeds, and other agricultural products, $2,050,000.

Market inspection of farm products: For the investigation and certification, in one or more jurisdictions, to shippers and other interested parties of the class, quality, and condition of any agricultural commodity or food product, whether raw, dried, canned, or otherwise processed, and any product containing an agricultural commodity or derivative thereof when offered for interstate shipment or when received

at such important central markets as the Secretary may from time to time designate, or at points which may be conveniently reached therefrom under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, including payment of such fees as will be reasonable and as nearly as may be to cover the cost for the service rendered, $780,000.

Marketing farm products: For acquiring and diffusing among the people of the United States useful information relative to the needed supplies, standardization, classification, grading, preparation for market, handling, transportation, storage, and marketing of farm and food products, including the demonstration and promotion of the use of uniform standards of classification of American farm and food products throughout the world, for making analyses of cotton fiber as provided by the Act of April 7, 1941 (7 U. S. C. 473d), for carrying out the provisions of section 201 (a) to 201 (d), inclusive, of title II of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U. S. C. 1291), including not to exceed $25,000 for employment at rates not to exceed $100 per diem, pursuant to the second sentence of section 706 (a), of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as amended by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), and not to exceed $20,000 for transportation and other necessary expenses including not to exceed $10 per diem of persons serving without compensation while away from

their homes or regular places of business, $1,260,000: *Provided,* That the Secretary may make available to any bureau, office, or agency of the Department such amounts from this appropriation as may be necessary to carry out the functions for which this appropriation is made, and any such amounts shall be in addition to amounts transferred or otherwise made available to appropriation items in this Act.

Tobacco Acts: To carry into effect the provisions of the Act to establish and promote the use of standards of classification for tobacco, to provide and maintain an official tobacco-inspection service, approved August 23, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 511–511q), the Act to provide for the collection and publication of statistics of tobacco by the Department, approved January 14, 1929 (7 U. S. C. 501–508), as amended, and the Act to prohibit the exportation of tobacco seed and plants, approved June 5, 1940 (7 U. S. C. 516), $1,660,500.

Cotton Statistics, Classing, Standards and Futures Acts: To carry into effect the provisions of the Act authorizing the Secretary to collect and publish statistics of the grade and staple length of cotton, approved March 3, 1927, as amended by the Act of April 13, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 471–476), and to perform the duties imposed upon him by chapter 14 of the Internal Revenue Code relating to cotton

futures (26 U. S. C. 1920–1935), and to carry into effect the provisions of the United States Cotton Standards Act, approved March 4, 1923, as amended (7 U. S. C. 51–65), $1,675,000.

Marketing regulatory Acts: For expenses necessary to carry into effect the provisions of the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, as amended (7 U. S. C. 499a–499r), the Act to prevent the destruction or dumping of farm produce (7 U. S. C. 491–497), the Act to provide standards for baskets and containers for fruits and vegetables, as amended (15 U. S. C. 251–256), the Act to fix standards for hampers, round stave baskets, and splint baskets for fruits and vegetables (15 U. S. C. 257–257i), the Act to provide export standards for apples and pears (7 U. S. C. 581–589), the United States Grain Standards Act (7 U. S. C. 71–87), the United States Warehouse Act (7 U. S. C. 241–273), the Federal Seed Act (7 U. S. C. 1551–1610), the Packers and Stockyards Act, as amended (7 U. S. C. 181–229), the Naval Stores Act (7 U. S. C. 91–99), and the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U. S. C. 135–135k), $3,550,000.

COMMODITY EXCHANGE AUTHORITY

To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1–17a), $650,000.

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION

For operating and administrative expenses, $6,854,000.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

To carry into effect the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended (7 U. S. C. 901-915), as follows:

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For administrative expenses, including not to exceed $500 for financial and credit reports, $8,150,000.

LOAN AUTHORIZATION

For loans in accordance with said Act, and for carrying out the provisions of section 7 thereof, to be borrowed from the Secretary of the Treasury in accordance with the provisions of section 3 (a) of said Act as follows: Rural electrification program, $350,000,000; and rural telephone program, $25,000,000: and additional amounts, not to exceed a total of $150,000,000 (including the uncommitted balance available as a carry-over from the fiscal year 1950), may be borrowed for the rural electrification program under the same terms and conditions if and to the extent that the Secretary of Agriculture shall certify, from time to time, to the Secretary of the Treasury that such additional amounts are required during the fiscal year 1951, under the then existing conditions, for the expeditious and orderly development of the program.

FARMERS' HOME ADMINISTRATION

To carry into effect the provisions of titles I, II, and the related provisions of title IV of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1000–1031), the Farmers' Home Administration Act of 1946 (7 U. S. C. 1001, note; 31 U. S. C. 82h; 12 U. S. C. 371; 35 D. C. Code 535; 60 Stat. 1062–1080); the Act of July 30, 1946 (40 U. S. C. 436–439); the Act of October 19, 1949 (Public Law 361); the Act of August 28, 1937, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590r–590x, 590z–5), for the development of facilities for water storage and utilization in the arid and semiarid areas of the United States; and the provisions of title V of the Housing Act of 1949 relating to financial assistance for farm housing (Public Law 171, approved July 15, 1949), as follows:

LOAN AUTHORIZATION

For loans (including payments in lieu of taxes and taxes under section 50 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, and advances incident to the acquisition and preservation of security of obligations under the foregoing several authorities): Title I and section 43 of title IV of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended and title V of the Housing Act of 1949 (except grants under 504 (a)) $56,350,000 (sums available for loans under title V of the Housing Act of 1949 to remain avail-

able until expended) ; title II of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, $85,000,000; the Act of August 28, 1937, as amended, $4,000,000: *Provided,* That not to exceed the foregoing several amounts shall be borrowed in one account from the Secretary of the Treasury on the request of the Secretary of Agriculture at such rate of interest as may be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, but not in excess of 3 per centum per annum; and the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to lend such sums to the Secretary upon the security of any obligations of borrowers from the Secretary under the provisions of said Acts: *Provided further,* That the Secretary may utilize proceeds from payments of principal and interest under such Acts to repay the Secretary of the Treasury the amounts borrowed therefrom for the purposes of such Acts: *Provided further,* That for the purpose of making loans pursuant to the foregoing authority, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public-debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under that Act are extended to include such loans to the Secretary: *Provided further,* That repayments to the Secretary of the Treasury on such loans shall be treated as a public-debt transaction.

GRANTS

For grants and for the grant portion of combination loans and grants for the purpose of section 504 (a) of the Housing Act of 1949, $650,000, to remain available until expended.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For the making, servicing, and collecting of loans and insured mortgages, the servicing and collecting of loans made under prior authority, the liquidation of assets transferred to Farmers Home Administration pursuant to the Farmers Home Administration Act of 1946, and the extension of financial assistance under the Housing Act of 1949, $27,700,000, together with a transfer to this appropriation item of not to exceed $80,000 of the fees and administrative expense charges made available by subsections (d) and (e) of section 12 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended.

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses, including not to exceed $5,000 for attendance at meetings or conventions of members of organizations at which matters of importance to the work of the Farm Credit Administration are to be discussed or transacted; library membership fees or dues in organizations which issue publications to members only or to members at a lower price than to others, payment for which may be made in

advance; not to exceed $20,000 for expenditures authorized by section 602 of the Organic Act of 1944 (12 U. S. C. 833)*; purchase of one passenger motor vehicle (for replacement only) for use in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; garage rental in the District of Columbia; payment of actual transportation and other necessary expenses and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of subsistence of persons serving, while away from their homes, without other compensation from the United States, in an advisory capacity to the Farm Credit Administration, except that such expenditures shall not exceed $10,000; examination of corporations, banks, associations, and institutions operated, supervised, or regulated by the Farm Credit Administration $585,000, together with not to exceed $2,325,000 of collections from Federal Farm Credit agencies of assessments and charges, to be advanced by transfer and counter warrant to this appropriation, to cover the cost of Farm Credit Administration facilities, examinations, and other services rendered to such agencies; $2,910,000.

Extension Service

payments to states, hawaii, alaska, and puerto rico

For payments to the States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico, for cooperative agricultural extension work as follows:

Capper-Ketcham, Bankhead-Jones, and related Acts:

Capper-Ketcham Act, the Act approved May 22, 1928 (7 U. S. C. 343a, 343b), $1,480,000; Bankhead-Jones Act, section 21, title II, of the Act approved June 29, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 343c), $12,000,000; Bankhead-Jones Act, section 23, title II, of the Act approved June 29, 1935, as amended by the Act of June 6, 1945 (7 U. S. C. 343d–1), $12,500,000; additional extension work, the Act approved April 24, 1939, as amended (7 U. S. C. 343c-1), $555,000; Alaska, the Act approved February 23, 1929 (7 U. S. C. 386c), extending the benefits of the Smith-Lever Act to the Territory of Alaska, $13,950, and section 3 of the Act approved June 20, 1936 (7 U. S. C. 343e), extending the benefits of the Capper-Ketcham Act to the Territory of Alaska, $10,000; the Act approved August 28, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 343f–343g), extending the benefits of section 21 of the Bankhead-Jones Act to Puerto Rico, $408,000; and section 506a of title V of the Housing Act of 1949 (Public Law 171), $33,050; in all, payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico, $27,000,000.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary to administer the provisions of the Smith-Lever Act, approved May 8, 1914 (7 U. S. C. 341–348), and Acts amendatory or supplementary thereto, and to coordinate the extension work of the Department

and the several States, Territories, and insular possessions, $900,000.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

For expenses of the Office of the Secretary of Agriculture, including the purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only; travel expenses, including examination of estimates for appropriations in the field; stationery, supplies, materials, and equipment; freight, express, and drayage charges; advertising, communication service, postage, washing towels, repairs and alterations, and other miscellaneous supplies and expenses not otherwise provided for and necessary for the practical and efficient work of the Department of Agriculture, $2,143,300, together with such amounts from other appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules in the Budget for the current fiscal year for such services and expenses, which several amounts or portions thereof as may be determined by the Secretary not exceeding a total of $109,280, shall be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation: *Provided, however,* That if the total amounts of such appropriations or authorizations for the current fiscal year shall at any time exceed or fall below the amounts estimated, respectively, therefor in the Budget for such year, the amounts transferred or to be transferred therefrom to this appropriation shall be increased or decreased in such amounts

as the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives of the Department, shall determine are appropriate to the requirements as changed by such reductions or increases in such appropriations or authorizations.

OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

For necessary expenses, including payment of fees or dues for the use of law libraries by attorneys in the field service, $2,450,000, together with such amounts from other appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules in the Budget for the current fiscal year for such expenses, which several amounts or portions thereof, as may be determined by the Secretary, not exceeding a total of $207,000, shall be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation: *Provided, however,* That if the total amounts of such appropriations or authorizations for the current fiscal year shall at any time exceed or fall below the amounts estimated, respectively, therefor in the Budget for such year, the amounts transferred or to be transferred therefrom to this appropriation shall be increased or decreased in such amounts as the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives of the Department, shall determine are appropriate to the requirements as changed by such reductions or increases in such appropriations or authorizations.

OFFICE OF FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL RELATIONS

For necessary expenses for the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations and for enabling the Secretary to coordinate and integrate activities of the Department in connection with foreign agricultural work, $600,000.

OFFICE OF INFORMATION

For necessary expenses in connection with the publication, indexing, illustration, and distribution of bulletins, documents, and reports, the preparation, distribution, and display of agricultural motion and sound pictures, and exhibits, and the coordination of informational work in the Department, $1,265,800, together with such amounts from other appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules in the Budget for the current fiscal year for such expenses, which several amounts or portions thereof, as may be determined by the Secretary, not exceeding a total of $16,200, shall be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation, of which total appropriation amounts not exceeding those specified may be used for the purposes enumerated as follows: For preparation and display of exhibits, $109,959; for preparation, distribution, and display of motion and sound pictures, $58,700; for farmers' bulletins, which shall be adapted to the interests of the people of the different sections of the country, an equal proportion of four-fifths of which shall be delivered to or sent out under the

addressed franks furnished by the Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress, as they shall direct (7 U. S. C. 417) and not less than two hundred thirty thousand eight hundred and fifty copies for the use of the Senate and House of Representatives of part 2 of the annual report of the Secretary (known as the Yearbook of Agriculture), as authorized by section 73 of the Act of January 12, 1895 (44 U. S. C. 241), $611,128: *Provided,* That if the total amounts of the appropriations or authorizations for the current fiscal year from which transfers to this appropriation are herein authorized shall at any time exceed or fall below the amounts estimated, respectively, therefor in the Budget for such year, the amounts transferred or to be transferred therefrom to this appropriation shall be increased or decreased in such amounts as the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives of the Department, shall determine are appropriate to the requirements as changed by such reductions or increases in such appropriations or authorizations: *Provided further,* That when and to the extent that in the judgment of the Secretary agricultural exhibits and motion and sound pictures relating to the authorized programs of the various agencies of the Department can be more advantageously prepared, displayed, or distributed by the Office of Information, as the central agency of the Department therefor, additional funds not exceeding

$300,000 for these purposes may be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation, from the funds applicable, and shall be available for the objects specified herein: *Provided further,* That in the preparation of motion pictures or exhibits by the Department, not exceeding a total of $10,000 may be used for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706 (a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as amended by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a): *Provided further,* That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the establishment or maintenance of regional or State field offices, or for the compensation of employees in such offices except that not to exceed $10,000 may be used to maintain the San Francisco radio office.

LIBRARY

For necessary expenses, including dues, when authorized by the Secretary, for library membership in societies or associations which issue publications to members only or at a price to members lower than to subscribers who are not members; $713,293.

TITLE II—CORPORATIONS

The following corporations and agencies are hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to each such corporation or agency and in accord with law, and to make

such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the Budget for the fiscal year 1951 for such corporation or agency, except as hereinafter provided:

Federal Crop Insurance Corporation.

Commodity Credit Corporation: Nothing in this chapter shall be so construed as to prevent the Commodity Credit Corporation from carrying out any activity or any program authorized by law: *Provided,* That not to exceed $16,000,000 shall be available for administrative expenses of the Corporation: *Provided further,* That all necessary expenses (including legal and special services performed on a contract or fee basis, but not including other personal services) in connection with the acquisition, operation, maintenance, improvement, or disposition of any real or personal property belonging to the Corporation or in which it has an interest, including expenses of collections of pledged collateral, shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses for the purposes hereof: *Provided further,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to discharge $170,515,131 of the indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation to the Secretary of the

Treasury by canceling notes in such amount issued by the Corporation to the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to section 4 of the Act of March 8, 1938, as amended (15 U. S. C. 713a–4).

Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation: Not to exceed $1,280,000 (to be computed on an accrual basis) of the funds of the Corporation shall be available for administrative expenses, including employment on a contract or fee basis of persons, firms, and corporations for the performance of special services, including legal services, and the use of the services and facilities of Federal land banks, national farm loan associations, Federal Reserve banks, and agencies of the Government as authorized by the Act of January 31, 1934 (12 U. S. C. 1020–1020h); and said total sum shall be exclusive of services and facilities furnished and examinations made by the Farm Credit Administration central office, interest expense, and expenses in connection with the acquisition, operation, maintenance, improvement, protection, or disposition of real or personal property belonging to the Corporation or in which it has an interest: *Provided,* That promptly after June 30 of each fiscal year all cash funds in excess of the estimated operating requirements for the current fiscal year shall be declared as dividends and paid into the general fund of the Treasury: *Provided further,* That the aggregate amount of bonds the Cor-

poration may issue and have outstanding at any one time shall not exceed $500,000,000.

Federal intermediate credit banks: Not to exceed $1,496,000 (to be computed on an accrual basis) of the funds of the banks shall be available for administrative expenses and services performed for the banks by other Government agencies (except services and facilities furnished and examinations made by the Farm Credit Administration central office, and services performed by any Federal Reserve bank and by the United States Treasury in connection with the financial transactions of the banks); and said total sum shall be exclusive of interest expense, legal and special services performed on a contract or fee basis, and expenses in connection with the acquisition, operation, maintenance, improvement, protection, or disposition of real or personal property belonging to the banks or in which they have an interest.

Production credit corporations: Not to exceed $1,358,000 (to be computed on an accrual basis) of the funds of the corporations shall be available for administrative expenses and services performed for the corporations by other Government agencies (except services and facilities furnished and examinations made by the Farm Credit Administration central office); and said total sum shall be exclusive of interest expense, legal and special services performed on a

contract or fee basis, and expenses in connection with the acquisition, operation, maintenance, improvement, protection, or disposition of real or personal property belonging to the corporations or in which they have an interest.

TITLE III—REDUCTIONS IN APPROPRIATIONS

Amounts available from appropriations are hereby reduced in the sums hereinafter set forth, such sums to be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury immediately upon the approval of this Chapter:

An amount of $199,990,000 in the revolving fund held in the Treasury available to the Governor, Farm Credit Administration, as authorized by the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act, as amended (12 U. S. C. 1020b), for resubscriptions to the capital stock of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation.

The total amount of $125,000,000 in the revolving fund appropriated to the Office of the Secretary, Treasury Department, as authorized by the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended (12 U. S. C. 698), for subscriptions to the capital stock of the Federal land banks.

TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. Within the unit limit of cost fixed by law, the lump-sum appropriations and authorizations made for the Department under this chapter shall be available for the purchase of not to exceed 497 passenger motor vehicles

for replacement only, and for the hire of such vehicles, necessary in the conduct of the work of the Department outside the District of Columbia.

SEC. 402. Provisions of law prohibiting or restricting the employment of aliens shall not apply to (1) the temporary employment of translators when competent citizen translators are not available; (2) employment in cases of emergency of persons in the field service of the Department for periods of not more than sixty days; and (3) employment under the appropriation for the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations.

SEC. 403. Appropriations and authorizations made in this chapter shall be available for health service programs as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150).

SEC. 404. Funds available to the Department during the current fiscal year shall be available for the payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672).

SEC. 405. Funds available to the Department of Agriculture during the current fiscal year may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

SEC. 406. Funds available to the Department of Agriculture may be used for printing and binding, including the purchase of reprints of scientific and technical articles.

SEC. 407. Of appropriations herein made which are available for the purchase of lands, not to exceed $1 may

be expended for each option to purchase any particular tract or tracts of land.

SEC. 408. No part of the funds appropriated by this chapter shall be used for the payment of any officer or employee of the Department who, as such officer or employee, or on behalf of the Department or any division, commission, or bureau thereof, issues, or causes to be issued, any prediction, oral or written, or forecast, except as to damage threatened or caused by insects and pests, with respect to future prices of cotton or the trend of same.

SEC. 409. Except to provide materials required in or incident to research or experimental work where no suitable domestic product is available, no part of the funds appropriated by this chapter shall be expended in the purchase of twine manufactured from commodities or materials produced outside of the United States.

SEC. 410. Not less than $575,000 shall be available for contracts in accordance with section 10 (a) of the Act of August 14, 1946 (7 U. S. C. 427i) from appropriations herein made for the Bureau of Agricultural Economics; Bureau of Animal Industry; Bureau of Dairy Industry; Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineer-

ing; Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine; Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry; Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics; and the Forest Service.

This chapter may be cited as the "Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1951".

CHAPTER VII—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

TITLE I

Office of the Secretary

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary of the Interior (hereafter in this chapter referred to as the Secretary), including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; for purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only at not to exceed $4,500; printing and binding; employment of a Director of the Oil and Gas Division without regard to the civil service laws; and teletype rentals and service; $2,315,000.

ENFORCEMENT OF THE CONNALLY HOT OIL ACT

For expenses necessary for controlling the interstate shipment of contraband oil as required by law (15 U. S. C. 715), including personal services in the District of Columbia; purchase of not to exceed four passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; and printing and binding; $200,000.

WORKING CAPITAL FUND

For establishment of a working capital fund, to be available without fiscal year limitation, for expenses necessary for the maintenance and operation of (1) a central reproduction service; (2) communication services; (3) a central supply service for stationery, supplies, equipment, blank forms, and miscellaneous materials, for which adequate stocks

or to landing forces and expeditions), except in accordance with regulations approved by the Secretary of Defense, which shall provide for uniform practices among all of the services.

SEC. 629. The provisions of the Act of February 9, 1946 (60 Stat. 3), shall be applicable to the appropriations of the Army and Air Force for military pay for the fiscal year 1950 and the current fiscal year, upon certification by the appropriate agency of the department concerned.

TITLE VII—REDUCTION IN APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 701. The contract authorization granted under the head "Ordnance for New Construction," in title IV of the "National Military Establishment Appropriation Act, 1950," is reduced by the sum of $31,460,000 and the amount of the limitation imposed by the proviso under said head on the total obligations to be incurred for armor, armament, and ammunition, for construction, conversion, or replacement approved during the fiscal year 1950, is also reduced by the sum of $31,460,000.

This chapter may be cited as the "Defense Appropriation Act, 1951".

CHAPTER XI—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Departments and Agencies

SEC. 1101. Unless otherwise specifically provided, the maximum amount allowable during the current fiscal year, in accordance with section 16 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 78), for the purchase of any passenger motor vehicle (exclusive of busses, ambulances, and station wagons), is hereby fixed at $1,400.

SEC. 1102. Unless otherwise specified and during the current fiscal year, no part of any appropriation contained in this or any other Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any officer or employee of the Government of the United States (including any agency the majority of the stock of which is owned by the Government of the United States) whose post of duty is in continental United States unless such person (1) is a citizen of the United States, (2) is a person in the service of the United States on the date of enactment of this Act who, being eligible for citizenship, had filed a declaration of intention to become a citizen of the United States prior to such date, or (3) is a person who owes allegiance to the United States: *Provided,* That for the purpose of this section, an affidavit signed by any such person shall be considered prima facie evidence that the requirements of this section with respect

to his status have been complied with: *Provided further,* That any person making a false affidavit shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $4,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both: *Provided further,* That the above penal clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law: *Provided further,* That any payment made to any officer or employee contrary to the provisions of this section shall be recoverable in action by the Federal Government. This section shall not apply to citizens of the Republic of the Philippines or to nationals of those countries allied with the United States in the prosecution of the war.

SEC. 1103. Appropriations of the executive departments and independent establishments for the current fiscal year, available for expenses of travel or for the expenses of the activity concerned, are hereby made available for living quarters allowances in accordance with the Act of June 26, 1930 (5 U. S. C. 118a), and regulations prescribed thereunder, and cost-of-living allowances similar to those allowed under section 901 (2) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, in accordance with and to the extent prescribed by regulations of the President, for all civilian officers and employees of the Government permanently stationed in foreign coun-

tries: *Provided,* That the availability of appropriations made to the Department of State for carrying out the provisions of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 shall not be affected hereby.

SEC. 1104. No part of any appropriation for the current fiscal year contained in this or any other Act shall be paid to any person for the filling of any position for which he or she has been nominated after the Senate has voted not to approve of the nomination of said person.

SEC. 1105. No part of any appropriation contained in this or any other Act shall be used to pay in excess of $4 per volume for the current and future volumes of the United States Code Annotated and such volumes shall be purchased on condition and with the understanding that latest published cumulative annual pocket parts issued prior to the date of purchase shall be furnished free of charge, or in excess of $4.25 per volume for the current or future volumes of the Lifetime Federal Digest.

SEC. 1106. Funds made available by this or any other Act for administrative expenses in the current fiscal year of the corporations and agencies subject to the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended (31 U. S. C. 841), shall be available, in addition to objects for which such funds are otherwise available, for personal services and rent in the District of Columbia; printing and binding; examination of budgets and estimates of appropriations in the field;

services in accordance with section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); and the objects specified in the sections of this title under the head "Departments and agencies", all the provisions of which shall be applicable to the expenditure of such funds unless otherwise specified in the Act by which they are made available: *Provided*, That in the event any functions budgeted as administrative expenses are subsequently transferred to or paid from other funds, the limitations on administrative expenses shall be correspondingly reduced.

SEC. 1107. No part of any funds of or available to any wholly owned Government corporation shall be used for the purchase or construction, or in making loans for the purchase or construction of any office building at the seat of government primarily for occupancy by any department or agency of the United States Government or by any corporation owned by the United States Government.

SEC. 1108. Funds of corporations and agencies, subject to the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, covered by the provisions of this or any other Act shall be available during the current fiscal year for payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672).

SEC. 1109. No part of any appropriation contained in this or any other Act, or of the funds available for expenditure

by any corporation included in this or any other Act, shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided,* That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of the United States, is not a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further,* That any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation or fund

contained in this or any other Act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both: *Provided further,* That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law: *Provided further,* That, as applicable to the Departments of Agriculture and Interior, nothing in this section shall be construed to require an affidavit from any person employed for less than sixty days for sudden emergency work involving the loss of human life or destruction of property, and the payment of salary or wages may be made to such persons from applicable appropriations for services rendered in such emergency without execution of the affidavit contemplated by this section.

SEC. 1110. No funds made available by this or any other Act shall be withdrawn from one appropriation account for credit to another, or to a working fund, except as authorized by law: *Provided,* That, except as otherwise specifically provided by law, any funds so withdrawn and credited shall be available for the same purposes, and subject to the same limitations, conditions, and restrictions, as provided by the Act appropriating such funds: *Provided further,* That any such withdrawal and credit shall be made, without warrant action, by check: *Provided further,* That no funds withdrawn

and credited pursuant to section 601 of the Act of June 30, 1932, as amended (47 Stat. 417; 31 U. S. C. 686), shall be available for any period beyond that provided by the Act appropriating such funds.

SEC. 1111. Section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U. S. C. 665), is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3679. (a) No officer or employee of the United States shall make or authorize an expenditure from or create or authorize an obligation under any appropriation or fund in excess of the amount available therein; nor shall any such officer or employee involve the Government in any contract or other obligation, for the payment of money for any purpose, in advance of appropriations made for such purpose, unless such contract or obligation is authorized by law.

"(b) No officer or employee of the United States shall accept voluntary service for the United States or employ personal service in excess of that authorized by law, except in cases of emergency involving the safety of human life or the protection of property.

"(c) (1) Except as otherwise provided in this section, all appropriations or funds available for obligation for a definite period of time shall be so apportioned as to prevent obligation thereof in a manner which would indicate a

necessity for deficiency or supplemental appropriations for such period; and all appropriations or funds not limited to a definite period of time, and all authorizations to create obligations by contract in advance of appropriations, shall be so apportioned as to achieve the most effective and economical use thereof. As used hereafter in this section, the term 'appropriation' means appropriations, funds, and authorizations to create obligations by contract in advance of appropriations.

"(2) In apportioning any appropriation, reserves may be established to provide for contingencies, or to effect savings whenever savings are made possible by or through changes in requirements, greater efficiency of operations, or other developments subsequent to the date on which such appropriation was made available. Whenever it is determined by an officer designated in subsection (d) of this section to make apportionments and reapportionments that any amount so reserved will not be required to carry out the purposes of the appropriation concerned, he shall recommend the rescission of such amount in the manner provided in the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, for estimates of appropriations.

"(3) Any appropriation subject to apportionment shall be distributed by months, calendar quarters, operating seasons, or other time periods, or by activities, functions, proj-

ects, or objects, or by a combination thereof, as may be deemed appropriate by the officers designated in subsection (d) of this section to make apportionments and reapportionments. Except as otherwise specified by the officer making the apportionment, amounts so apportioned shall remain available for obligation, in accordance with the terms of the appropriation, on a cumulative basis unless reapportioned.

"(4) Apportionments shall be reviewed at least four times each year by the officers designated in subsection (d) of this section to make apportionments and reapportionments, and such reapportionments made or such reserves established, modified, or released as may be necessary to further the effective use of the appropriation concerned, in accordance with the purposes stated in paragraph (1) of this subsection.

"(d) (1) Any appropriation available to the legislative branch, the judiciary, or the District of Columbia, which is required to be apportioned under subsection (c) of this section, shall be apportioned or reapportioned in writing by the officer having administrative control of such appropriation. Each such appropriation shall be apportioned not later than thirty days before the beginning of the fiscal year for which the appropriation is available, or not more than thirty

days after approval of the Act by which the appropriation is made available, whichever is later.

"(2) Any appropriation available to an agency, which is required to be apportioned under subsection (c) of this section, shall be apportioned or reapportioned in writing by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. The head of each agency to which any such appropriation is available shall submit to the Bureau of the Budget information, in such form and manner and at such time or times as the Director may prescribe, as may be required for the apportionment of such appropriation. Such information shall be submitted not later than forty days before the beginning of any fiscal year for which the appropriation is available, or not more than fifteen days after approval of the Act by which such appropriation is made available, whichever is later. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall apportion each such appropriation and shall notify the agency concerned of his action not later than twenty days before the beginning of the fiscal year for which the appropriation is available, or not more than thirty days after the approval of the Act by which such appropriation is made available, whichever is later. When used in this section, the term 'agency' means any executive department, agency, commis-

sion, authority, administration, board, or other independent establishment in the executive branch of the Government, including any corporation wholly or partly owned by the United States which is an instrumentality of the United States.

"(e) (1) No apportionment or reapportionment which, in the judgment of the officer making such apportionment or reapportionment, would indicate a necessity for a deficiency or supplemental estimate shall be made except upon a determination by such officer that such action is required because of (A) any laws enacted subsequent to the transmission to the Congress of the estimates for an appropriation which require expenditures beyond administrative control; or (B) emergencies involving the safety of human life, the protection of property, or the immediate welfare of individuals in cases where an appropriation has been made to enable the United States to make payment of, or contributions toward, sums which are required to be paid to individuals either in specific amounts fixed by law or in accordance with formulae prescribed by law.

"(2) In each case of an apportionment or a reapportionment which, in the judgment of the officer making such apportionment or reapportionment, would indicate a necessity for a deficiency or supplemental estimate, such officer shall immediately submit a detailed report of the facts of

the case to the Congress. In transmitting any deficiency or supplemental estimates required on account of any such apportionment or reapportionment, reference shall be made to such report.

"(f) The officers designated in subsection (d) of this section to make apportionments and reapportionments may exempt from apportionments receipts from industrial and power operations available under law and any appropriation made specifically for—

"(1) interest on, or retirement of, the public debt;

"(2) payment of claims, judgments, refunds, and draw-backs;

"(3) any item determined by the President to be of a confidential nature;

"(4) payment under private relief Acts or other laws requiring payments to designated payees in the total amount of such appropriation;

"(5) contingent expenses of the Senate or of the House of Representatives.

"(g) Any appropriation which is apportioned or reapportioned pursuant to this section may be divided and subdivided administratively within the limits of such apportionments or reapportionments. The officer having administrative control of any such appropriation available to the legislative branch, the judiciary, or the District of Columbia,

and the head of each agency, subject to the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, shall prescribe, by regulation, a system of administrative control (not inconsistent with any other accounting procedures prescribed by or pursuant to law) which shall be designed to (A) restrict obligations against each appropriation to the amount of apportionments or reapportionments made for each such appropriation, and (B) enable such officer or agency head to fix responsibility for the creation of any obligation in excess of an apportionment or reapportionment.

"(h) No officer or employee of the United States shall authorize or create any obligation (A) in excess of an apportionment or reapportionment, or (B) in excess of the amount permitted by regulations prescribed pursuant to subsection (g) of this section.

"(i) (1) In addition to any penalty or liability under other law, any officer or employee of the United States who shall violate subsection (a), (b), or (h) of this section shall be subjected to appropriate administrative discipline, including, when circumstances warrant, suspension from duty without pay or removal from office; and any officer or employee of the United States who shall knowingly and willfully violate subsection (a), (b), or (h) of this section shall, upon conviction, be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned for not more than two years, or both.

"(2) In the case of a violation of subsection (a), (b), or (h) of this section by an officer or employee of an agency, or of the District of Columbia, the head of the agency concerned or the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, shall immediately report to the President, through the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and to the Congress all pertinent facts together with a statement of the action taken thereon."

SEC. 1112. No part of the funds of, or available for expenditure by any corporation or agency included in this Act shall be available to pay for annual leave accumulated by any officer or employee during the calendar year 1950 and unused at the close of business on December 31, 1950.

This Act may be cited as the "General Appropriation Act, 1951".

INDEX

CHAPTER I—DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Page

Federal contribution 2

CHAPTER II—LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

Architect of the Capitol 12
Botanic Garden 15
Capitol Police 9
Education of House and Senate Pages 11
General Provisions 28
Government Printing Office 22
House of Representatives 3
Legislative Counsel, office of 11
Library of Congress 16
Miscellaneous 12

CHAPTER III—DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND THE JUDICIARY

Department of State 30
- American sections, international commissions 40
- Buildings fund 33
- Contributions to international organizations 34
- Emergencies in the diplomatic and consular service 34
- Foreign Service retirement and disability fund 33
- General provisions 46
- Institute of Inter-American Affairs 45, 94
- International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico 37
- International contingencies 36
- International information and educational activities 42
- Missions to international organizations 35
- Philippine rehabilitation 45
- Representation allowances 33
- Salaries and expenses 30

Department of Justice 48
- Federal Bureau of Investigation 51
- Federal Prison System 54
- Federal Prison Industries, Inc 94
- General provisions 58
- Immigration and Naturalization Service 52
- Legal Activities and General Administration 48
- Office of Alien Property 56

Department of Commerce 59
- Census, Bureau of 61
- Civil Aeronautics Board 69

Department of Commerce—Continued Page
Civil Aeronautics Administration 63
Coast and Geodetic Survey 69
General provisions 84
Foreign and Domestic Commerce, Bureau of 71
National Bureau of Standards 79
Office of the Secretary 59
Patent Office 73
Public Roads, Bureau of 73
Weather Bureau 83
The Judiciary 85
Court of Claims 86
Court of Customs and Patent Appeals 86
Customs Court 86
General provisions 93
Other courts and services 87
Supreme Court of the United States 85

CHAPTER IV—TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS

Treasury Department 96
Administrative Services, Office of 96
Bureau of Accounts 97
Bureau of Customs 100
Bureau of Engraving and Printing 104
Bureau of Internal Revenue 101
Bureau of the Mint 107
Bureau of Narcotics 103
Bureau of the Public Debt 98
Coast Guard 108
General Counsel's Office 96
Secret Service Division 105
Treasurer's Office 100
Post Office Department 111
Claims 113
General Administration 111
General provisions 113
Postal Operations 112
Transportation of Mails 113
Government Corporations 114
Export-Import Bank of Washington 114
Reconstruction Finance Corporation 115

CHAPTER V—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

Department of Labor 117
Apprenticeship, Bureau of 119
Employment Security, Bureau of 119
General provisions 123
Labor Statistics, Bureau of 122
Secretary, Office of 117
Wage and Hour Division 123
Women's Bureau 123

Page

Federal Security Agency 125
Administrator, Office of 148
American Printing House for the Blind 125
Columbia Institution for the Deaf 126
Education, Office of 130
Employee's Compensation, Bureau of 125
Food and Drug Administration 126
Freedmen's Hospital 128
General provisions 149
Howard University 128
Public Health Service 133
Saint Elizabeths Hospital 142
Social Security Administration 144
Vocational Rehabilitation, Office of 131
National Labor Relations Board 151
National Mediation Board 152
National Railroad Adjustment Board 152
Railroad Retirement Board 153
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service 154

CHAPTER VI—DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Acreage allotments and marketing quotas 192
Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry, Bureau of 168
Agricultural Economics, Bureau of 157
Agricultural Research Administration 159
Alaska, research on agricultural problems of 161
Animal Industry, Bureau of 164
Commodity Credit Corporation 209
Commodity Exchange Authority 197
Conservation and use of agricultural land resources 189
Control of Forest Pests 175
Dairy Industry, Bureau of 168
Entomology and Plant Quarantine, Bureau of 171
Experiment Stations, Office of 162
Extension Service 202
Farmers' Home Administration 199
Farm Credit Administration 201
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation 198, 209
Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation 210
Federal Intermediate Credit Banks 211
Flood control 185
Foreign Agricultural Relations, Office of 206
Forest Service 177
General provisions 212
Human Nutrition and Home Economics, Bureau of 164
Information, Office of 206
Library 208
Marketing services 194
Marketing quotas and acreage allotments 192

Page
National School Lunch Act 194
Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering, Bureau of 169
Production and Marketing Administration 189
Production Credit Corporations 211
Removal of surplus agricultural commodities 193
Reduction in appropriations 212
Research and Marketing Act of 1946 156
Rural Electrification Administration 198
Secretary of Agriculture, Office of 204
Soil Conservation Service 185
Solicitor, Office of 205
Strategic and critical agricultural materials, research on 161
Sugar Act 193
Working capital fund, Agricultural Research Center 160

CHAPTER VII—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bonneville Power Administration 219
Fine Arts, Commission of 219
Fish and Wildlife Service 245
General provisions 251
Geological Survey 238
Indian Affairs, Bureau of 224
Land Management, Bureau of 220
Mines, Bureau of 239
Park Service, National 243
Reclamation, Bureau of 229
Secretary, Office of the 216
Southeastern power marketing 217
Southwestern Power Administration 217
Territories and island possessions 248
    Administration of Territories and possessions 248
    Alaska Railroad 250
    Alaska Road Commission 248
Virgin Islands Corporation 254

CHAPTER VIII—EXECUTIVE AND INDEPENDENT OFFICES

American Battle Monuments Commission 261
Atomic Energy Commission 262
Bureau of the Budget 258
Civil Service Commission 266
Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion 269
Council of Economic Advisers 259
Displaced Persons Commission 270
Executive Office of the President 256
Federal Communications Commission 271
Federal Power Commission 272
Federal Trade Commission 273
General Accounting Office 274
General Provisions 319, 330
General Services Administration 274
Housing and Home Finance Agency 288, 323

Page

Indian Claims Commission 290
Inland Waterways Corporation 329
Interstate Commerce Commission 290
Interstate Commission on Potomac River Basin 292
Motor Carrier Claims Commission 292
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics 293
National Capital Housing Authority 294
National Capital Park and Planning Commission 295
Office of Selective Service Records 296
Philippine Alien Property Administration 259
Philippine War Damage Commission 296
Securities and Exchange Commission 297
Smithsonian Institution 298
Tariff Commission 300
Tax Court of United States 301
Tennessee Valley Authority 301, 330
United States Maritime Commission 301
Veterans' Administration 309
War Claims Commission 318

CHAPTER IX—CIVIL FUNCTIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Alaska communications system 334
Cemeterial expenses 332
Entombment of unknown serviceman, World War II 333
Flood control 335, 338
General provisions 344
Panama Canal 341
Panama Railroad Company 343
Rivers and harbors 335, 336
Soldiers' Home, United States 341

CHAPTER X—DEFENSE

Air Force, Department of the 386
Aircraft and related procurement, construction of 386
Air Force Reserve 393
Air National Guard 394
Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps 393
Contingencies 396
Maintenance and operations 388
Military personnel requirements 390
Real property, acquisition and construction of 388
Research and development 392
Salaries and expenses, administration 395
Special procurement 388
Army, Department of the 348
Army National Guard 369
Army Reserve Officers' Training Corps 372
Chemical Service 366
Contingencies of the Army 348
Engineer Service 363

Army, Department of the—Continued Page
Finance Service 350
General Staff Corps 349
Medical and Hospital Department 362
Military Academy 367
National Board for Promotion of Rifle Practice 373
Ordnance Service and Supplies 365
Organized Reserves 371
Quartermaster Service 354
Salaries 375
Signal Service 360
Training 367
Transportation Service 359
General provisions 396
National Security Council 345
National Security Resources Board 345
Navy, Department of the 376
Aircraft and facilities 379
Civil engineering 383
Construction of aircraft and related procurement 380
Island governments 386
Marine Corps troops and facilities 379
Medical care 383
Military personnel, Navy 376
Military personnel, Marine Corps 378
Military personnel, Marine Corps Reserve 378
Naval petroleum reserves, operation and conservation of 386
Naval vessels, increase and replacement of 382
Navy personnel, general expenses 377
Ordnance and facilities 382
Ordnance for new construction 382
Research 384
Service-wide operations 385
Service-wide supply and finance 384
Ships and facilities 381
Ships, construction of 381
Reduction in appropriations 411
Secretary of Defense, Office of the 346
Claims 347
Retired pay 348

CHAPTER XI—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Relating to departments and agencies 412

Union Calendar No. 696

81ST CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 7786

[Report No. 1797]

A BILL

Making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

By Mr. CANNON

MARCH 21, 1950

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

cember 7, 1941, and September 2, 1945: *Provided*, That the written recommendation for the award of the decoration, or device in lieu of decoration, for such act or service be made not later than 1 year subsequent to the date of approval of this act.

SEC. 2. The act of June 26, 1946 (60 Stat. 309), is hereby repealed.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out all after the words "authorized by" down to and including "manner" in line 7, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "act of Congress to be awarded to any person for any act or service performed while on active duty in the military or naval forces of the United States or while serving with such forces."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article on the state of Europe by Roscoe Drummond.

Mr. PASSMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a table of figures.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances.

Mr. BARTLETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter.

Mr. CROOK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an excerpt from the CIO Union News of Indianapolis, Ind.

Mr. EVINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. TAURIELLO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter and a resolution received from the American Protestant Hospital Association.

Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances.

Mr. YOUNG asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, in one to include an editorial, in the other to include a short statement of the secretary of state of Ohio.

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article appearing in the Reader's Digest.

Mr. STEFAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include newspaper editorials and articles.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial appearing in the Deseret News of Salt Lake City relating to an address on farm legislation by his colleague, Mr. LOVRE.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article by Walter Johnson entitled "Country Lawyer."

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD of March 23 at the conclusion of the debate on the commodity credit bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of Kansas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks on the omnibus appropriation bill and include tabular matter.

Mr. HOPE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. WEICHEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include newspaper articles.

Mr. RIEHLMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a speech made by Mr. LOVRE at Salt Lake City on the farm program.

Mr. HESELTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous material.

Mr. MICHENER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article entitled "Unfair Attack."

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa asked and was given permission to have stricken from the RECORD of March 31 his extension of remarks appearing on page A2550, and to extend his remarks and include a corrected and revised copy of the table.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in four instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances.

Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JACOBS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article from the Washington Post.

Mr. MITCHELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous material.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a statement from the American Legion.

Mr. LARCADE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article from the Washington Post and from the Marine News of New York.

Mr. WERDEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. SADLAK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two separate instances and in each to include an article.

Mr. SHAFER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in four instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FLOOD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a speech by Mr. WALTER at Easton, Pa., on Friday, March 31, before the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Mr. FURCOLO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 193. Concurrent resolution providing for adjournment of the House until April 18, 1950.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 128]

Allen, Ill	Hall,	Pfeifer,
Andrews	Leonard W.	Joseph L.
Angell	Hand	Pfeiffer,
Bailey	Hare	William L.
Barden	Hart	Philbin
Barrett, Pa.	Hays, Ohio	Plumley
Battle	Hébert	Powell
Bennett, Fla.	Hedrick	Ramsay
Biemiller	Heffernan	Redden
Bolling	Heller	Reed, Ill.
Bosone	Hobbs	Reed, N. Y.
Buchanan	Hoffman, Ill.	Ribicoff
Buckley, Ill.	Hull	Rich
Buckley, N. Y.	Jackson, Calif.	Rivers
Bulwinkle	Javits	Sabath
Burdick	Kee	St. George
Burnside	Kelly, N. Y.	Sasscer
Carlyle	Keogh	Scott,
Carroll	Kunkel	Hugh D. Jr.
Case, S. Dak.	Lane	Shelley
Cavalcante	Lanham	Short
Celler	Latham	Simpson, Pa.
Chesney	Lichtenwalter	Sims
Chudoff	Linehan	Smathers
Clement	Lyle	Smith, Ohio
Combs	Lynch	Staggers
Coudert	McConnell	Sutton
Davenport	McDonough	Taylor
Davies, N. Y.	Mason	Tollefson
Dawson	Miles	Towe
Dingell	Miller, Md.	Wadsworth
Donohue	Monroney	Wagner
Douglas	Morgan	Walsh
Doyle	Multer	Welch
Gavin	Murphy	Wheeler
Gilmer	Nixon	Whitaker
Gordon	Norton	White, Idaho
Gossett	O'Brien, Ill.	Wickersham
Granahan	O'Brien, Mich.	Widnall
Grant	O'Konski	Willis
Green	Pace	Wolcott
Gwinn	Patman	Wood

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 303 Members answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1951

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951,

and for other purposes; and pending that I ask unanimous consent that time for general debate be equally divided, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and one-half by myself; that debate be confined to the bill; and that following the reading of the first chapter of the bill, not to exceed 2 hours general debate be had before the reading of each subsequent chapter, one-half to be controlled by the chairman and one-half by the ranking minority member of the subcommittee in charge of the chapter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object. There has been a great deal of confusion on both sides of the aisle as to the amount of general debate and also as to what are the plans for considering the bill. I understand the request is that we continue indefinitely, one-half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and the other half by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, there is no disposition on the part of the committee to restrict any Member who wishes to debate this bill. We will not close general debate as long as anybody wants to talk.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. On either side?

Mr. CANNON. On either side.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I think that is quite fair.

Mr. CANNON. So far as we are concerned, general debate is unlimited.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I appreciate the views of the gentleman from Missouri. I want to say that general debate on appropriation bills is historic. It is the only opportunity a great many Members have to express themselves on different subjects. There was a rumor we were going to try to close debate today or tomorrow and try to read the bill by next Thursday. Of course, it is impossible to finish the bill by that time, and I am delighted with the assurance of the gentleman from Missouri that we are to have unlimited debate.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, speaking for this side of the House, I have only had a request for 15 minutes under general debate. Whenever there is nobody to debate, of course, we will proceed to read the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Well, there might a Democrat or two who will want to speak after we get through.

Mr. CANNON. Either Democrat or Republican who desires to speak will be afforded that opportunity, and no limitation will be placed upon him as long as he talks about the bill.

I may say, however, that the idea of taking up time which should be devoted to the discussion of the appropriation bill with a discussion of extraneous matters, or on subjects, which have no germaneness or relevancy to the bill, is one of the evils which we seek to cure by bringing in all appropriations in a single bill. The attention of the House and the country should be centered on this one bill. If anyone desires to discuss something foreign to the bill, let him speak in the morning or secure a special order and take all the time he needs. This bill is too important to be sidetracked by some Member's whim. We should have full debate on this bill. We want all the information we can get on it. If anybody wants to talk about it, he is perfectly free to talk about it as long as he likes, but if he is not interested in the bill and wants to talk about something else, let him select some more opportune time rather than detract from the consideration of the pending bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The quorum call a few moments ago disclosed the fact that 303 Members are here. Does not the gentleman from Missouri believe we should have the full membership present when we vote on this most important bill?

Mr. CANNON. I am not the keeper of the conscience of other Members of the House. If they want to stay away, that is their prerogative and that is for them to decide. If they want to represent their constituents by remaining away from the sessions of the House, it is not incumbent upon me to raise any objection.

But I give notice now that if general debate is concluded we will read the bill for amendment. The House will proceed to business as long as the Committee on Appropriations has a bill on the floor.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman realizes that both he and I are members of the economy bloc, and I appreciate the good work he has already done.

Mr. CANNON. I welcome the gentleman's cooperation. And I trust we will have the assistance of the gentleman in economizing on this bill by defending it against proposals to increase it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Both of us being in the so-called economy bloc, we will naturally want the largest possible attendance of Members when we vote on the bill. When we have a large number of Members present the views which I hold are more likely to prevail.

Mr. CANNON. If the gentleman will have his Members present, I assure him we will have our Members present.

Mr. RANKIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, what is the gentleman's proposal about debate on this measure?

Mr. CANNON. To continue general debate indefinitely, one-half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from New York and one-half by myself.

Mr. RANKIN. When you finish general debate is it the gentleman's intention to take the bill up under the 5-minute rule?

Mr. CANNON. At the conclusion of general debate we will read the first chapter. There will be not to exceed 2 hours of general debate on each subsequent chapter, following which we will read the chapter under the 5-minute rule, as we have done heretofore under the rules of the House, and under control of the committee responsible for the chapter.

Mr. MICHENER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I want to get this clear. As I understand, we are to proceed with general debate, and anything that has anything to do with the entire bill will be in order under the general debate.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MICHENER. Debate on the bill may run for days.

Mr. CANNON. As long as anybody wants to talk on it.

Mr. MICHENER. At the conclusion of that general debate, chapter 1 may be debated for another 2 hours?

Mr. CANNON. Chapter 1 consists of one item only, an item which requires no general debate. At the conclusion of general debate we will read the first chapter and then have not to exceed 2 hours of general debate on the second chapter. We will then proceed to read the chapter for amendment.

Mr. MICHENER. That will be repeated on every chapter?

Mr. CANNON. On every subsequent chapter.

Mr. MICHENER. Then the chapter will be read under the 5-minute rule and all amendments thereto will be disposed of before the succeeding chapter is debated for 2 hours?

Mr. CANNON. Exactly.

Mr. MICHENER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KEEFE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I should like to get this clear if I can. The gentleman has said that he will proceed with unlimited debate, and that he does not want to restrict anyone in the matter of general debate, except that the debate shall be confined to the bill. But then the unanimous-consent request further provides that one-half of this unlimited time shall be controlled by the gentleman from Missouri and one-half by the gentleman from New York. The gentleman from Missouri has indicated that he has had requests for only 15 minutes of that time. I am unable to understand just how this division of an unlimited, unnamed amount of time is to be made.

Suppose the gentleman from Missouri has no further request for time after 30 minutes. Are we to understand that that will be the extent of time available to the other side?

Mr. CANNON. In such event, I shall be glad to yield any portion of my time to either side of the aisle. I shall be especially glad to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin. It will be a pleasure to yield the gentleman all the time he desires.

Mr. KEEFE. I am very happy to hear the gentleman say that because I would like at least an hour to discuss some features of this bill in general debate which cannot be discussed without at least that much time, in order that Members may have as much information as possible on the subject.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman shall have time without restriction.

Mr. KEEFE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, are we to understand that the gentleman from Missouri, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, intends to make a point of order against any Member speaking out of order? How is the gentleman going to determine whether or not a Member is speaking out order when there is something like $27,000,000,000 involved in this appropriation which certainly covers most of the business of America.

If the gentleman is going to make a point of order against a Member talking about the economy of our Nation and the problems of the people, surely debate is going to be badly limited and we will not be doing justice to the American people who ought to have full information.

Mr. CANNON. That would be for the Chair to determine.

Mr. JENSEN. Of course, Mr. Speaker, I will not object, except to say that I trust and am sure the majority of the Members of the House hope that the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] will not make points of order against Members on the ground that they are speaking out of order when so much is involved in this bill. I think we should have the greatest leeway to discuss these things.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would think that this appropriation bill actually being 11 bills in one, and covering everything in the Government, a Member speaking on the bill would have a rather wide range.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the Speaker. I was hoping the Speaker would say just that.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] A qorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 129]

Allen, Ill.	Cavalcante	Gordon
Anderson, Calif.	Celler	Gossett
Andrews	Chesney	Granahan
Angell	Chiperfield	Grant
Bailey	Chudoff	Green
Barden	Clemente	Gregory
Barrett, Pa.	Combs	Hall,
Battle	Coudert	Leonard W.
Bennett, Fla.	Cox	Hand
Biemiller	Davenport	Hart
Bolling	Davis, Wis.	Hays, Ohio
Buchanan	Dawson	Hébert
Buckley, Ill.	Dingell	Heffernan
Buckley, N. Y.	Donohue	Heller
Bulwinkle	Douglas	Hobbs
Burdick	Doyle	Hoffman, Ill.
Byrne, N. Y.	Elliott	Holifield
Carlyle	Engel, Mich.	Hull
Carroll	Gavin	Jackson, Calif.
Case, S. Dak.	Gilmer	Javits
Kee	Norton	Scott, Hardie
Kelly, N. Y.	O'Brien, Ill.	Scott,
Keogh	O'Brien, Mich.	Hugh D., Jr.
Kunkel	O'Konski	Short
Lane	Pace	Simpson, Pa.
Lanham	Patman	Sims
Latham	Pfeifer,	Smathers
Lichtenwalter	Joseph L.	Smith, Ohio
Linehan	Pfeiffer,	Sutton
Lyle	William L.	Taylor
Lynch	Philbin	Teague
McConnell	Plumley	Towe
McDonough	Powell	Wagner
Mason	Ramsay	Walsh
Miles	Redden	Welch
Miller, Md.	Reed, Ill.	Wheeler
Mitchell	Reed, N. Y.	Whitaker
Monroney	Regan	White, Idaho
Morgan	Ribicoff	Widnall
Morton	Rivers	Wolcott
Multer	Sabath	Wolverton
Murphy	St. George	Wood
Nixon	Sasscer	Woodhouse

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 296 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1951

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 7786, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, we have called the roll this morning three times in 2 hours. It is to be regretted that a deliberate and carefully organized filibuster is under way on this particular bill. The time of the House is valuable, and especially so just at this time. Not only should we be proceeding with the business of the House and conserving the time of the House but we should have some regard for the taxpayers whose money we are wasting in this filibuster. It costs the taxpayers over $75,000 a day to run the House 5 days a week. That means thousands of dollars for every hour we waste in unnecessary roll calls and dilatory tactics in which the gentlemen on that side of the aisle are indulging this afternoon.

I might add that the further effect of this filibuster is to keep the House here longer this summer. There is no reason why we should not go ahead and pass this bill and get away from here before June 30 and go home and learn what the people are thinking. Partisan tactics like this not only delay the proceedings of the House and interfere with the consideration of this bill but also delay adjournment next June.

I trust we may have a little cooperation from the other side of the aisle in transacting the business of the House and the Nation. It is to be regretted that it will go out to the people of the United States tomorrow that there was a deliberate program here this afternoon to obstruct the orderly consideration under the rules of the House of one of the important bills of this session of Congress.

Mr. Chairman, we submit to the House today the largest peacetime appropriation bill in the history of the Nation—the largest in the history of any nation since time began. It is indissolubly associated with the welfare and prosperity of the people, and the security and preservation of our form of Government. And it comes at a critical period in national postwar adjustment and international relations.

The bill, with an amendment providing for foreign aid which will be offered by direction of the committee, and the tabulation of permanent and indefinite appropriations in the report, sets out in full, and in understandable terms, the total proposed expenditures of the United States Government for the fiscal year of 1951. Taken in connection with the latest authoritative estimate of the national income for 1951, and the daily Treasury report on the public debt, we have a comprehensive picture which shows at a glance the financial condition of the Federal Government; whether the Nation is living within its income; the effect of any amendment; of any proposed increase or decrease in appropriations, and the impact of such increase or decrease on Treasury balances and the national credit.

For more than a century we have been passing appropriation bills and spending money without reference to any definite central fiscal program, without any specific knowledge of their ultimate effect on national finances or national solvency. But in this bill the Nation is brought face to face with its fiscal problems and to that extent is in a better position to make its choice between unlimited appropriations and deficit spending.

In one respect, Mr. Chairman, this bill may be said to be not only an appropriation bill, but a tax bill as well. There was a time when we drafted the appropriation bills on the basis of the amount of revenue we had to spend. We shaped the coat to the material available. But we have long since ceased to consider appropriations from the point of view of what we have to spend. We now make the appropriations and spend the money and taxes must be levied to conform to the appropriation bills and to supply the money we have already spent.

We now shape the coat according to the latest fashion or caprice, and when the cloth is insufficient, we simply borrow more material, as a matter of course.

Contrary to the intentions of the founders of our Government—and in contravention of every rule of sound business procedure—the House by multiplying authorizations and increasing appropriations has made the Committee on Ways and Means a mere port of call and I am today asking the members of that great committee to cooperate with us in opposing increases in the appropriations carried in this particular bill and in discouraging the enactment of further bills authorizing new and expanded appropriations when we do not have enough money to finance the authorizations already on the statute books.

This bill is, in effect, both an appropriation bill and a tax bill. If you make

appropriations here, you must levy taxes to provide the money. By your action on this bill you decide whether we must increase taxes or whether we may lower them. To reduce taxes you must first reduce expenditures. I hope the Members will have this in mind when amendments are offered to increase items in this bill.

This bill is the composite product of the work of 45 men, and a dozen subcommittees, with the most efficient staff ever mobilized on appropriations. I want to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the 12 chairmen and the members of their committees who wrote this bill, whose names appear at the head of each section of the report.

I might say equal credit is due members on both sides of the table, and here in the House, to Members on both sides of the aisle. This is not a political bill. The unanimity with which every subcommittee reported the respective chapters of the bill, with possibly one or two exceptions, indicates the unity of purpose and the hearty cooperation of all members of the subcommittees, regardless of party affiliation, and the care and diligence with which they have worked to bring out the best bill possible. They have worked indefatigably since the beginning of the session. They have held long and exhaustive hearings, considering budget estimates, analyzing the justifications, examining the representatives of spending agencies, and all others who desired to be heard. And the chapters are carried in the bill before you represent their considered and, with few exceptions, their unanimous judgment. I want to take advantage of this opportunity to call to the attention of the Congress and the country their industry and patient cooperation in presenting here what they collectively consider the best bill which can be written under current limitations The various chapters are incorporated in the bill just as the subcommittees wrote them without change or modification in any respect or in any particular.

The bill before you proposes appropriations in the total amount of $27,266,403,664. Expenditures from that amount during the succeeding fiscal year are estimated to total $23,423,832,918. Such expenditures will be augmented by expenditures from prior appropriations to the extent of $7,079,776,516, making an expenditure total for the coming year 1951 of $41,459,268,346.

The estimated receipts of the Government, as of March 15, 1950, as informally reviewed by the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation amount to $37,300,000,000. The net result, therefore, indicates a deficit of $4,159,268,346.

The committee has effected appropriation reductions by a total of $1,385,377,504. Expressed in terms of expenditure, the reduction is $979,489,060.

A notable feature of the bill is the reduction of appropriations for 1951 below the appropriations for the current year. Heretofore, the budget estimates have been the criterion by which we judged the degree of retrenchment. The subcommittees were urged to keep the appropriations below the estimates, but, in formulating this bill the appropriations for the current year were made the target, and subcommittees were urged to keep appropriations under those of the fiscal year 1950, a new objective in appropriations, and with such success that the pending bill is not only $1,385,377,504 below the 1951 estimates, but it is $832,014,180 below the 1950 appropriations.

But this is not the full measure of the economies effected by the bill. To this saving must be added the new obligations incurred by mandatory legislation, enacted in the last session of Congress. By passing fifteen different pay and travel acts, by increasing Federal Security, Veterans' Administration, Fair Labor Standards obligations of the Government, and other laws requiring direct appropriations and contract authority involving increases in expenditures, the Congress has arbitrarily increased the mandatory appropriations, above what we had to provide last year, $2,350,700,000, statutory requirements over which the Committee on Appropriations has no option or control. When this sum is added to the amount this bill cuts from the 1950 appropriations, it will be seen that the pending bill is $3,182,714,180 less than the amounts carried in the annual appropriation bill for 1950, a record never before equaled in the fiscal history of the Republic.

But even with these exceptional savings, the bill is still $4,159,268,346 in excess of the national revenues for the fiscal year, and there is a natural desire throughout the country for a balanced budget. The country demands that we keep appropriations within the revenues and that is a very natural and timely request of the Congress.

This, however, is not a peacetime budget; the country is at war, both technically and in fact. No treaty of peace has been signed. Although we have made every effort and every possible concession to bring about a formal agreement for the usual treaty marking the close of hostilities, a treaty of peace is as far away today, if not farther, than it was in 1945, 5 years ago, when the last gun was fired. We have no choice, therefore, except to maintain an alert state of preparedness, a readiness for any eventuality; and we are actually spending every day in this cold war more than we spent per day in the Civil War, in the Spanish-American War, and in the First World War combined. If permanent peace were assured; if there were no threats of attack and invasion from abroad, we could balance the budget very easily; we could cut taxes in half; we could make substantial reductions in the national debt; but, paraphrasing a very famous statesman: "Gentlemen cry Peace! Peace! when there is no peace. The next gale that sweeps from the north may bring to our ears the clash of resounding arms." This is a war budget, and no war budget was ever balanced by this or any other nation. We cannot balance this budget. It would be the height of folly to attempt it under present international conditions. But while we cannot economize at the expense of national safety and national defense, we can and we must make corresponding reductions in reducible domestic expenditures.

The acid test in passing on demands for domestic expenditures is not whether the money would be well spent—the invariable plea for every sort of appropriation and authorization offered on this floor—the test is not whether the money will be well spent, whether there is need for the expenditure. The question in this national crisis is: Can we do without it? And if that question can be answered in the affirmative on any proposal for expenditure here, the proposal should be rejected. That is the only thing to be considered in writing or amending this bill: Can we dispense with the appropriation under consideration either temporarily or permanently? If we can, it has no place in this bill; if it is in the bill it ought to be taken out.

Mr. Chairman, a circular letter has been issued by an organization registered under the Antilobby Act, known as the Council of State Chambers of Commerce, in which it is charged that this bill was "poorly and hurriedly drawn." In view of the fact that the circular letter has been sent to all Members of Congress and distributed to the press let us examine into the facts, if any, supporting this statement. Is there any basis for such statement? This bill was written by the same men who wrote these reports last year. We had the same subchairmen this year we had last year. We had the same committee personnel this year we had last year and the same committee staff and there was no such charge last year. The men who wrote this bill, the chairmen of these subcommittees, are all able and experienced men. They have served here for many years. They have been very carefully screened before they were assigned to the Committee on Appropriations, and the committee screened them even more carefully. I think you cannot find in the House men better prepared and better qualified to write this bill. Why should men with more experience and a better knowledge of the subject this year write a poorer bill this year than last year? Why, it is absurd. The charge is made with deliberate propaganda intent and is without any basis of fact whatever.

Then this circular says the bill and report were hurriedly done. Last year was organization year. We were late in getting started. We started our first hearings on January 26. But this year, with organization intact, we began hearings on January 5. What is hurried about that, Mr. Chairman? Nobody suggested that last year the bill was hurriedly prepared. The truth about the matter is we have given more time to the hearings than usual. We have heard more people than heretofore. Not only were all subcommittees in session longer but the whole committee met to consider this bill on Monday morning at 10 o'clock, prepared to give 4 days to the reports from subcommittees. We announced we would begin Monday morning and report the bill Thursday night.

But the subcommittees had so thoroughly processed the bill and there was such general agreement on both sides of

the table in the subcommittees that when we met no one had any amendments to offer.

On each chapter, in turn, the chairman and the ranking minority member of the committee reporting the chapter were called upon. There was no limitation placed upon time. They were free to talk as long as they liked and any other member of the committee who desired time was recognized.

After debate was concluded and there was no one asking to be recognized, the question was asked on each chapter: Is there anyone who desires to offer any amendment at any point in this chapter? And we did not leave the chapter as long as anyone desired to offer amendments.

Mr. Chairman, what is hurried about that?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. The gentleman said there were no amendments offered. They were a few, very few I admit.

Mr. CANNON. I accept the gentleman's statement.

Mr. CANFIELD. I offered one, too.

Mr. CANNON. I did not say no amendments were offered. I said that the chapter remained open as long as anyone desired to offer amendments.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. The gentleman recalls I offered an amendment and it was for the recision of funds heretofore appropriated, a recision which we should have adopted.

Mr. CANNON. That is not in contravention of what I said. I did not say no amendments were offered. I said that no chapter was closed as long as anyone desired to offer an amendment.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman just said that there were no amendments offered.

Mr. CANNON. No; I did not say that. I said that no chapter was closed as long as anyone desired to offer an amendment.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman said that afterwards. Will the gentleman permit the Reporter to read his word back?

Mr. CANNON. May I ask the gentleman, if he desired to offer an amendment anywhere in the bill which he was not given an oportunity to offer?

Mr. JENSEN. Absolutely. But, the gentleman said that no amendments were offered, and I offered three of them. If the gentleman will permit the reporter to read back his language, he will find that he said no amendments were offered.

Mr. CANNON. I am not certain whether I made that statement or did not make the statement, but whether it was made or not made is wholly inconsequential. The question here is, Was the bill considered hurriedly? Was anyone denied an opportunity to debate or amend this bill anywhere? I now submit that question to anybody on the floor. Did anybody desire to offer an amendment which he did not have an opportunity to offer?

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Would the distinguished gentleman from Missouri ask the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], which amendment he claims to have offered which he was not given the opportunity to offer in the full committee?

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman knows I did not make any such statement.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman made the statement just now when he said "absolutely" in answer to a question of the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JENSEN. I did not say the gentleman did not give me a chance to offer an amendment.

Mr. ROONEY. I want the RECORD to be straight on this, because no amendment sought to be offered in the full Appropriations Committee was refused consideration by the chairman of the committee. That is the record.

Mr. JENSEN. All right. Now, the gentleman from Missouri, the chairman of the full committee's first statement was that no amendments were offered. Finally the gentleman from New Mexico rose and corrected him, and he said he stood corrected, and if you will take the time to let the reporter read the words of the gentleman from Missouri I will leave it to the House.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman is now graciously admitting that no amendment offered by him was refused consideration. Is that not the fact?

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman from Missouri said that after the gentleman from New Mexico had called his hand.

Mr. ROONEY. Well, let us say it now, I will ask the gentleman.

Mr. JENSEN. Say what?

Mr. ROONEY. Will the gentleman now admit that he was not refused consideration to offer any amendment?

Mr. JENSEN. Why, I never contended that I had been refused.

Mr. ROONEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. I think the record should show that so far as the Federal Security Agency and the Labor Department sections of this bill are concerned, that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] who was in charge of the bill as chairman of the subcommittee, made a statement of about a minute and a half before the full committee, and the gentleman from Wisconsin made no statement with respect to that bill before the full committee and indicated in a statement to the full committee that he reserved the right to make a statement on the floor and to offer amendments on the floor; is that not true?

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman's statement is wholly beside the point.

Mr. KEEFE. As usual.

Mr. CANNON. The statement was made there that the consideration of this bill was hurried. Now, I ask if there is anyone who can give any instance at any time, anywhere, in the subcommittee, or in the full committee, where he was not afforded an opportunity to talk if he wished to talk, to debate if he wished to debate, or to offer an amendment if he wished to offer an amendment.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman also make that statement regarding the first committee meeting of the first session of the Eighty-first Congress when he presided; when there were several amendments offered by your side of the aisle and the minority had amendments to offer, we stood up and tried our level best, the gentleman from New York and I did, to offer amendments, but got no recognition from the gentleman. He would not even look our way.

Mr. ROONEY. May I inquire if the gentleman from Iowa was present that day?

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman knows very well that I was present.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman is so anxious to get away from the point before the House.

Mr. JENSEN. If the gentleman will stay with the facts, I will not ask him questions.

Mr. CANNON. The charge is made here that consideration of this bill was hurried. I asked anyone here who desired at any time to interrogate a witness or to debate the bill or to offer an amendment if he was denied the opportunity to say so. And no one can cite any such instance. In other words, the charge is absolutely without foundation. If this bill was rammed through as they charge, where was it rammed through? When was it rammed through, and who rammed it through? The circular is a canard.

It throws a little light on this scurrilous letter when it is noted that the gentleman whose name is signed to it was particularly exuberant when the Eightieth Congress convened. Thirty or forty people from the outside had been brought down to investigate the Government. He was so enthusiastic that he gave an elaborate dinner for them at one of the famous hostelries down town. I have not heard that he has provided a dinner for any of the Appropriations Committee or for any party fishermen in this session. In other words, this circular is pure propaganda. The bill was not hurriedly considered, and statements to that effect are without foundation of fact and for political effect.

He does grudgingly make one concession. He says, after about four pages of unsupported abuse:

The committee deserves credit for initiating the single or omnibus appropriation bill. This form of bill makes good sense to the

layman. It enables him to see at a glance where over-all Federal spending policies and objectives are taking us.

In justice to the United States Chambers of Commerce, which might be erroneously confused with the organization distributing this circular, let me say that there is no relation between the two. On the contrary, the United States Chamber of Commerce in its daily letter, says:

A significant test of the willingness of the Congress to economize is before you in H. R. 7786, the first consolidated appropriation bill. The board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States realize the nature of the difficulties faced by the Committee on Appropriations. The board feels that the Committee on Appropriations has made a meritorious beginning. It recommends that the House employ its best endeavors to enforce further reduction in the measure under consideration.

The printed transcripts of the hearings on this bill were made available and distributed to the press and the members of the committee and the House and the public in general much earlier than ever before. Never before were the printed hearings available to the press and the public as early as this year. So everyone has had ample opportunity to familiarize himself with the proceedings of the committee as hearings progressed.

Mr ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Is it not a fact that the press and radio have had a better opportunity, as a result of the way in which the hearings were released this year, to digest and report to the Republic on the items contained in the appropriation bill?

Mr. CANNON. That is true. There has been no previous instance in the history of the appropriation bills in which the proceedings of the committee were available so soon and in such detail.

However, it has had one untoward effect. As a result of this unrestricted publicity, the agencies affected, the organized groups of interest, and the professional lobbyists have been clamoring against practically every reduction in the estimates, and are even urging increases in the bill over and above the budget estimates. I think there is hardly a reduction made by the committee in this bill in the estimates in which there have not been some interested lobbys, somewhere, protesting against the reduction. Never before has there been such pressure on the committee and here in the House against savings recommended by the committee.

The press and radio over the country daily carry reports of amendments which they say will be offered to increase amounts throughout this bill. In view of these intemperate assaults on the bill and announced intentions of increasing it, when it is already over $4,000,000,000 above the national income, I feel warranted in speaking a little more plainly than under other cricumstances. The balance sheet of the Nation is anything but favorable. As a matter of fact if the United States were a private enterprise, any bank cashier or any man in the country would refuse to lend the Government another dime—if he did not bring proceedings to throw it into bankruptcy. The expenditures for the current year, and for the coming year are billions of dollars in excess of the national income. We carry a staggering public debt, unparalleled in history, of more than a quarter of a trillion dollars, a sum so large as to be utterly incomprehensible to the finite mind of man. And we are increasing it by huge sums every year. Why, the interest on the public debt alone is more than all the expenditures of the Government for all purposes in 1933. At the same time—and this is one of the alarming features—our national income is decreasing. Collections of Federal excise taxes dropped more than 12 percent in February as compared with the corresponding month a year ago.

From the start of the fiscal year July 1 to March 1, which is the latest figure available, collections totaled $25,101,625,577, or a drop in national income of $657,676,007 from the corresponding figure of last year.

Corporation income-tax payments for the first 8 months of the fiscal year totaled $17,933,807,743, or a decline of $480,114,129 for the same period a year ago.

Totals on income-tax payments up to March 15 are not yet available. But the press carries forecasts of a drop in revenues variously estimated at of something between a billion and a billion and a half dollars below the message estimates—money we thought we were going to get when we were projecting our fiscal program for the coming year last January.

It is said to be anywhere from a billion to a billion and a half dollars below what we anticipated. There seems to be general agreement that the revenue cannot, under most favorable circumstances, be less than three-quarters of a billion below the January figure. In addition to this steady and drastic decline in revenues, it is now proposed to reduce excise taxes. We are told a bill is on the drafting board which will reduce the Federal income from this source in an amount approximately a billion dollars annually. I am not discussing the merits of tax reduction or the merits of discontinuing excise taxes, but I do say that when you figure the financial picture and the fiscal status of the Government, not only is the national income from every source declining, but it is now proposed to further reduce it by reducing the taxes which are already bringing in an inadequate amount to take care of the appropriations carried in this bill. In short, we are carrying a national debt so vast that no one can predict when it will be paid. So acute is the situation that unforeseen national catastrophe might mean repudiation. How are we to pay it, when at the most prosperous time in the history of the Nation, with wages higher than ever before, with business paying larger dividends than ever before, with people generally more prosperous than they ever have been, instead of decreasing the debt, we are increasing it. When can we expect to pay it?

I want to appeal to the House not to increase this bill. A single increase in any item would be an unfortunate precedent. May I plead with the Members of the House to close ranks and oppose any increase anywhere in any item in this bill.

To be continually living beyond our means indicates not only a deplorable lack of business acumen, but a still more deplorable lack of moral fiber and stamina; a state of irresponsibility characteristic of the aborigine, consuming tomorrow's food today, without thought of the consequences.

I realize the strong appeal of amendments to increase appropriations for national defense. Nothing could be more important than adequate protection of the Nation. That takes first priority. But the best national defense lies in national solvency. You cannot win a war without money. You cannot avoid a war without money. Insolvency invites attack, and it is more important to avoid a war than to win a war. We must stay solvent, as well as strong in armament and in military might. The two go together. We cannot attain national security by bankrupting the country.

In this connection, let me say that there is always the possibility that we can be stronger with less expenditure for armaments than we are making today. It has been claimed by some of our critics, and I submit it for the consideration of the House when they take up the study of this bill, that there is more waste in the 71 percent of the bill devoted to war, past wars, and future, than anywhere else in the bill. Whether that is true would have to be demonstrated. I do not vouch for such statement, but I do say that there is always a possibility that a better allocation of the money provided in the bill may contribute to the solution of the problem of adequate defense.

On the other hand, there are those who insist that there should be still further reductions in the budget estimates and that the bill should be amended, in detail and as a whole, to reduce the amount of the appropriations carried in the bill, to reduce expenditures for the fiscal year 1951. With this school of thought I take no issue. If there are items in the bill which can be reduced without reducing provisions for any service below the minimum actually required, it should be reduced. Let them take it up on this floor.

But, I do take issue emphatically, however, with all proposals for blind blanket cuts; on any proposal for a percentage cut in the bill or a cross section cut in the bill. If such amendments should be agreed to, provisions must be made for effecting such cuts. Either the responsibility for allocation of such reductions must be delegated to the President or the bill must be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions. The latter is impractical. The several chapters of the bill vary in susceptibility to reduction. Some provide for services less imperative than others. Some for services which could not be cut at all if the Government is to continue to function effectively. There is no logical method of determining the respective percentage to be taken from the several respective chapters on a percentage or lump-sum reductions. On the

other hand to delegate to the President the authority to allocate the reductions would be for Congress and the legislative branch of the Government to abdicate and transfer its constitutional powers to the executive branch of the Government which is in contravention of every tenet of the Constitution which specifically provides that the representatives of the people in Congress assembled shall control the purse strings of the Nation. To attempt to provide otherwise is subversive of the basic principles on which our Government is founded.

Let me say again, Mr. Chairman, that I favor cutting this bill where it can be consistently shown it can be cut; where it can be constructively reduced without injury to the service.

I am more concerned with amendments which propose to increase the bill than with amendments that seek to reduce the bill. We must conserve every dollar, every penny. In this national emergency we cannot afford to waste one dime. Our principal trouble today is debt. We cannot cure it by more debt. Deficit spending does not remedy anything. It merely postpones the inevitable reckoning to a less propitious date, to a more evil day. The longer postponed, the greater the escapable evil, snowballing, mushrooming, and skyrocketing with every passing hour.

I trust the committee will have the cooperation of Members on both sides of the aisle in passing a bill which will secure maximum results with the least possible expenditure.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed 55 minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY].

(Mr. WORLEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Chairman, for the last time I rise as a Member of the House to address the Chair and my colleagues. I dislike farewells, but for the past several days I have devoted a good bit of thought to just what I should say at this moment. I thought of stating my views on such ponderous and complex themes as world conditions, the H-bomb, taxes, tariffs, and the farm program. I thought of pointing with pride and viewing with alarm. But finally, I concluded, that after all, my views on these problems were not of such great importance or consequence because my votes on these and other matters are a thing of the past. They have been recorded.

On many, many occasions, Mr. Chairman, during the past 10 years, I have felt discouraged. I have, on those depressing occasions, and especially during those grave wartime days, thought that I would be happy to see the day come when I would leave this service. But strangely enough, when the time has actually arrived to leave the House, those memories have faded, and in their stead I remember only the most pleasant associations I have had with each of you.

This job has been most fascinating. The associations made, the genuine fellowships enjoyed, and the pleasure derived from rendering public service have all added to the extreme sense of satisfaction I feel. I am and have always been most grateful for the confidence placed in me by my people back home and by my colleagues. I have been given every consideration and cooperation from men on both sides of the aisle and in turn have tried to extend the same to all of you.

It seems to me that the problems of a Congressman have developed more rapidly in the past 10 years than ever before. Before I became a Member of this body, I thought about all my Congressman had to do was answer that letter I wrote him in regard to a rural route or post-office application. It did not occur to me then that perhaps thousands of other constituents were also writing him about something equally or perhaps more important. The Congressman of today is looked to for practically everything under the sun. He must have knowledge of taxes, tariffs, farm problems, military needs, human rights, business and labor legislation, in addition to scientific information on guided missiles and sonic devices. We are well aware that many men spend their lives studying a single subject whereas Members of Congress must be somewhat of an authority on all these, and many more when they are called upon to vote on the measure involved. In my opinion, it is virtually impossible for the average Member to be as well informed on these and a score of other matters as he would like to be. The reason for that is simply because there are not enough hours in the day to discharge the multitude of demands made upon us and still devote the desired time to legislative measures before the House. Certainly I have found that to be true. While the recent reorganization bill was a step in the right direction it still is not the answer. The number of requests from the people will no doubt increase rather than decrease, as the years go on. If a Member meets those requests, he must necessarily have more help of the proper kind if he is to properly discharge his greater responsibilities as a voting Member.

Certainly no one among us has attained or is likely to attain any financial security through his pay as a Congressman. I also know that from my own experience. While the pay scale sounds big to the people back home, it is difficult for them to realize the extraordinary demands constantly made upon men in public life which are never made upon those in private life, not to mention campaign expenses. We all have known men who have made great personal sacrifices to remain in the House—some have come here strong in health and comfortable of purse and dedicated themselves to this service. We have seen their savings fade away to such a point that when the end has come, their survivors had nothing but the anticipated death benefit granted by Congress. While the responsibilities of this office cannot be measured in dollars and cents, I do feel that greater remuneration would at least in some degree compensate for the responsibilities involved. In my opinion, the time is fast approaching, if indeed it is not already here, when only those with independent means can afford to serve in the Congress. As I see it, such a result would be the very antithesis of democracy.

And so, Mr. Chairman, in conclusion I would like to express my deep appreciation to you, not only as one of the ablest servants this country has ever known, but also as a friend who has never been too busy to give of his sound and generous counsel; to my colleagues in the Texas delegation; to the distinguished majority leader, JOHN MCCORMACK; to the majority whip, PERCY PRIEST, with whom I entered Congress; to my fellow Democrats; to the able leadership on the Republican side of the aisle, Minority Leader JOE MARTIN, to CHARLEY HALLECK and LES ARENDS, and all the other Members of the Republican Party; to Lew Deschler and to the staff and employees of the House, whose diligence makes our tasks easier; to the members of my committee with whom I have enjoyed working; to the personnel in my office, without whose loyalty and help I could never have properly served my constituency, and to the people of the Eighteenth Congressional District, who have placed their trust in me, I am deeply grateful. The votes of confidence from them have made it possible for me to serve them and my country to the best of my ability and to serve with you, which has been the greatest honor of my life. I have never known a more conscientious, harder working, or finer group of people. So long as the people of this country send such representation to Congress I have no fear for our democratic processes and institutions. God bless you all.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, Judge WORLEY is now leaving the House. He is leaving a host of friends on both sides of the aisle. I doubt if within my memory we have had the pleasure of serving with a more popular Member than he.

He has a distinguished legislative record. We all know that. He has rendered outstanding service to the people of his great district and to the people of the entire Nation.

Judge WORLEY, we wish you the best of everything. We know that you will have a great judicial record. May the Lord bless you and always take good care of you. We hate to see you go, but we are still with you in spirit and in feeling.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, the district which Mr. WORLEY represents once included the district I represent. We have worked closely together through the years. I rise to join the chairman of the Texas delegation [Mr. THOMAS] in paying a word of tribute to our friend who is retiring from this body. He has

performed a great service to the Nation and to the pepole of our State.

His record reflects credit upon his family, his friends, his district, and the Nation. He is made of the right kind of material. He is typically Texan all the way through to the very marrow of his bones. He carries with him to this high post on the court an innate and unfailing sense of fairness which will serve the Nation well in the days to come.

Mr. Chairman, I could not refrain from paying this tribute to my close personal friend and to one of the most popular men, as our colleague from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] has said, who has ever served here in the House of Representatives in my time.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield.

Mr. Chairman, I am filled with conflicting emotions at this moment as we say farewell to our colleague GENE WORLEY. I am supremely happy that he is to go on the important bench of the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals and I also feel a note of sadness realizing that we are not to have the benefit of his services in the Congress after today.

May I say that I became acquainted with Mr. WORLEY early in his congressional career due to the fact that I have a number of friends living at Amarillo, Tex., who are likewise close friends of Judge WORLEY. It fell to our lot to be conferees, representing the House, in one of the most difficult problems and sharpest controversies that I have experienced in 12 years in Congress. The other body and the House were in sharp disagreement in 1944 over legislation for a soldier voting plan, and for weeks the House and Senate conferees met daily in a long-drawn-out effort to reconcile our differences. In the end a compromise was agreed upon and approved by both bodies that I think was fairly satisfactory, When one serves for many weeks wrestling with a difficult problem he becomes well acquainted with his fellow conferees and he learns of their character. GENE WORLEY is a man of noble character. I was with him when this Government sent a delegation, appointed by the President, by the President pro tempore of the Senate, and by the Speaker of the House, to assist in launching the new government of the Republic of the Philippines. I doubt if anyone in Congress has had more intimate relations with GENE WORLEY than have I, and I think I can say truly that he personifies the soul of honor. He will make a fine member of the court along with our former colleague Judge Noble Johnson, and with my very good and close friend and splendid public servant, Judge Ambrose O'Connell. Probably no one in Congress is more intimately acquainted with Judge O'Connell than I am since he grew up in Iowa only a short distance from my home.

Judge WORLEY has gone up in the world because of his own ability, and I predict that he will go even higher. I am truly happy over his elevation to the judgeship and yet there is a lingering note of sadness that he will not be with us again.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. I should also like to join with our distinguished colleagues from Texas, and the other Members of this body in paying a well-deserved and high tribute to our friend GENE WORLEY, who is leaving the Congress, and going to the bench, entering what I am sure will be another distinguished career.

He and I, with other colleagues, came here at the same time in the Seventy-seventh Congress. I have had the very great pleasure of intimate and personal association with him, resulting in warm and lasting friendships. He has demonstrated great character and ability and served his country well. As he has served here in Congress I know he will continue to serve well his country on the bench. Judge WORLEY, as you leave us and enter your new career on the bench, I wish you continued success and good luck.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. FOGARTY. I, too, want to add my small word of tribute this afternoon to our esteemed colleague, GENE WORLEY of Texas. I, too, came to the Congress in January of 1941 with him. I have found him to be one of the outstanding Members of the House for the past 10 years, and although I am sorry to see him go, I know he is going into a job for which he is well qualified. He is deserving of the security which the job he is going to promises for himself and his family.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I also came to the Congress with GENE WORLEY. It was not very long after that Congress was in session in January 1941, that I came to appreciate the earnest seriousness with which GENE WORLEY approached the work of legislating in this body.

You may recall that in February of 1941 we had the original lend-lease bill before the House. At that time both of us being freshmen, GENE and I were sitting back somewhat bewildered but attempting in our own way to study that bill, and to appreciate some of the significance of the step we were about to take in international affairs. From that very moment I have appreciated the counsel and assistance in my legislative work which I have always received from GENE WORLEY. Certainly we shall miss him greatly in this body. I am sure he has the good wishes of every Member on both sides for his continued success in the judicial post which he soon will assume.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. In order that there may be some expression from the minority members of this body, I take this opportunity to rise to join with the others who have expressed their gratification for the distinction which has come to our colleague.

Having served with him for over 10 years, those of us who have been associated with him know the quality of mind he had and the character that he possesses. We feel honored to think that he has been selected for this position of great responsibility.

As a matter of fact, it is my observation that men who are appointed to public office, whether judicial or administrative in the executive department, if they have served a period of apprenticeship as Members of this body, perform the responsibility of their office with a degree of far greater capacity, success, and effectiveness than those who were appointed from other fields of endeavor.

I am sure I speak the sentiment of every member of the minority party in wishing—I still, out of habit, will call him Representative GENE WORLEY, even though we may call him Judge—but to wish for him the very best of success in his new endeavor. It must be a matter of great pride and satisfaction to him to realize, as he must, that he takes with him the close affection and great admiration of his colleagues for that is the testimonial of a decade of constant, conscientious, and constructive public service.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, as a youngster in my teens I heard a little poem that I think just fits the great character and sunny disposition of our very dear friend, GENE WORLEY. Fact is, the author must have had Genial GENE in mind as he penned these lines:

Making friends is a lot of fun,
Shaking hands with everyone;
Hearing what each has to say
As we meet them day by day.

Swapping smiles and trading cheer
Makes us happy while we're here
'Cause all the joy of life depends
Just on the art of making friends.

GENE WORLEY is a friend. He has been my friend. I know that he has been the friends of every Member of this body, regardless of his politics. In addition, GENE is a gentleman of the old Chesterfield vintage—a man of splendid background and wide experience. He is well versed in the law and he has that judicial temperatment so vitally necessary to make a good judge. GENE will give a sympathetic hearing and an understanding heart to those who appear before him. The President is to be congratulated upon his wisdom in making this appointment, GENE, and the people of the great district he has so ably represented are to be congratulated upon this recognition. He will make a splendid jurist. GENE, in the words of the Book of Books, "May your leaf never wither and whatsoever you do, may it prosper." Good luck, and come back to see us when you can.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, all Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle will agree with me that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY]

has proven himself one of the finest, most conscientious Members of Congress. Coming from a district just across the line from my State, I made his acquaintance very early during my first term in 1943. Since then I have learned to love and admire him; his good wife and mine are close friends; and I am proud to call him a friend. We will miss him here, but we applaud his elevation to the judiciary which he richly deserves, and where because of his training and temperament he will serve with distinction. On this occasion I say to Judge WORLEY—

I touch my heart as the Easterners do;
May the love of Allah abide with you;
Wherever you come, wherever you go;
May the beautiful palms of Allah grow.
Through days of labor and nights of rest,
May the love of Allah keep you blest.
I touch my heart as the Easterners do;
May the love of Allah abide with you.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, it has been my distinct privilege and pleasure to serve on the Committee on Agriculture with Hon. GENE WORLEY, of Texas, for many years. I want to say that he has endeared himself with the membership of the committee by his attentiveness and devotion to his duty. His pleasing smile will be greatly missed when he assumes his new duties as a member of the judiciary. He is able, he is friendly, he has a very fine record as a member of the Committee on Agriculture, and as a Member of this House.

I wish him Godspeed in his new work.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I want to join with other Members who have paid this tribute to a splendid Member of the House of Representatives. I am sure that all would like to join in paying this tribute today to GENE WORLEY. He has been a very very able Member of Congress; a conscientious workman on the Committee on Agriculture; but in paying tribute to him we cannot help but have feelings of sorrow at his leaving the House, although we are glad to know that his duties in his new position will keep him here in Washington. We know that he has a splendid record in the Congress; that he is possessed of a sterling character; that he understands the problems of people; that he is well informed in the law, and we can see that he will carry to the judiciary a basis for a sound and fine record which he leaves in this House.

We wish him the very best, and we know that GENE WORLEY will do his best to make his record there a splendid one, as he has made it here in this House.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RAYBURN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the distinguished Speaker of the House.

Mr. RAYBURN. I would not take a moment except for the fact that ever since I have known GENE WORLEY there has been a deep attachment between us. For himself alone, I can say that I have not seen a man, a young man, come to this House with more sterling qualities of character or more promise from the native ability that is his. If he had chose to stay here he could one day have been at the top, because he has character and a lovely personality and plenty of ability.

The thing that moved me closest to him, of course, was the fact that he came to my home town to choose his wife, a lady of great charm and ability. Her father and mother, Mr. and Mrs. Morgan Spivey, great people, still live there. She comes from the right kind of stock, and so does GENE WORLEY, because I know the families on both sides. GENE has now taken the name of Worley very high, and in my opinion will take it higher; but he and Anne have done me the honor to name a son, Sam Rayburn Worley, and the son will really cap the climax and do the job for the name.

EUGENE WORLEY A FINE REPRESENTATIVE

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to see my friend GENE WORLEY leave the House of Representatives. One of the most vivid impressions that I have of the Seventy-eighth Congress was the debate on the soldier vote bill.

GENE WORLEY was in charge of the bill. He was in a tough spot because there was a very violent disagreement as to what kind of a bill should be passed and the division was more pronounced in his party than in the minority party. His conduct at that time stamped him in my mind as having a judiical temperament. He was scrupulously fair to the divergent groups and was considerate to those who differed with him. They were given as much time to present their views as those who agreed with the chairman of the committee.

Mr. WORLEY exemplified the tolerance and understanding that marks a good legislator as well as the good judge. He was a fine companion and it has been a privilege to come to know him as a competitor in our gymnasium and on the golf course. He has a happy and congenial family and in every way has measured up to the responsibilities of a father and a husband.

Though we have lost a good legislator I am glad that he will continue in the public service. He will prove to be a fine judge and I think the President is to be congratulated on appointing him. GENE WORLEY is a fine example of the opportunity that Congress offers to its Members of making lasting friends. All I hope is that my friend will continue to enjoy good health, as that is all he needs to make a fine record on the bench.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Ninety-one Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 130]

Allen, Ill	Battle	Bonner
Allen, La.	Bennett, Fla.	Bosone
Angell	Bentsen	Boykin
Barden	Biemiller	Buchanan
Barrett, Pa.	Blatnik	Buckley, Ill.
Buckley, N. Y.	Hobbs	Pfeiffer, William L.
Bulwinkle	Hoffman, Ill.	Philbin
Burke	Holifield	Powell
Byrne, N. Y.	Hull	Rains
Carlyle	Jackson, Calif.	Redden
Case, S. Dak.	Javits	Reed, Ill.
Celler	Kee	Reed, N. Y.
Chesney	Kelly, N. Y.	Ribicoff
Chudoff	Keogh	Richards
Clemente	King	Rivers
Combs	Kirwan	Roosevelt
Coudert	Kunkel	Sabath
Davenport	Lane	Sadowski
Dawson	Lanham	St. George
Dingell	Latham	Sasscer
Donohue	Lesinski	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Douglas	Lichtenwalter	Shelley
Doyle	Linehan	Short
Durham	Lucas	Sims
Engle, Calif.	Lyle	Smathers
Fellows	Lynch	Smith, Ohio
Fisher	McCarthy	Smith, Va.
Fogarty	McConnell	Sutton
Frazier	McDonough	Taylor
Gavin	McMillen, Ill.	Teague
Gilmer	Mason	Towe
Gordon	Miles	Wagner
Granahan	Miller, Md.	Walsh
Granger	Monroney	Welch
Grant	Morgan	Wheeler
Green	Morton	Whitaker
Hall, Leonard W.	Multer	White, Idaho
Hand	Murphy	Widnall
Hart	Nixon	Willis
Hays, Ohio	Norton	Winstead
Hébert	O'Brien, Ill.	Withrow
Heffernan	O'Brien, Mich.	Wolcott
Heller	O'Konski	Wolverton
Herlong	Pace	Wood
Herter	Patman	
Hinshaw	Pfeifer, Joseph L.	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and Mr. KILDAY having assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 7786, and finding itself without a quorum, he directed the roll to be called, when 294 Members answered to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks at the close of the remarks with reference to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this bill comes before the committee with direct appropriations out of the general Treasury of $27,266,000,000, and with indirect or permanent appropriations, made in some other way than in this bill for the departments that are covered by it, of $11,592,000,000. In other words, it provides that there will be taken out of the Treasury of the United States $38,859,000,000. It carries cuts in the direct appropriations of $1,385,000,000. I will not at this time go into the total of those cuts; I intend to speak about that later. Some departments are cut as much as they should be; others are not. Generally through the bill, the items of administrative expenses are altogether too liberal, and there is too much provision

for unnecessary personnel. I am thankful for the cut that has been made, but I want to see other cuts made and as the bill progresses and is read I hope to be able to point out different items where I believe savings can be made of very substantial amounts.

We were handicapped as we approached the consideration of this bill, first because of the fact that it was a new method of doing things and we were having the whole thing at once, all the items were to go in one bill. We were further handicapped by two new approaches to the fiscal affairs of the Government on the part of the Budget. The United States Code, section 532 of title 31, under "Money and Finance," provides:

> There shall be submitted in the annual budget following every estimate for a general or lump-sum appropriation, except public buildings or public works constructed under contract, a statement showing in parallel columns first the number of persons, if any, intended to be employed, and the rates of compensation to each; and the amounts contemplated to be expended for each of any other objects or classes of expenditures specified or contemplated in the estimate shall include a statement of estimated unit cost of any construction work proposed to be done; and, second, the number of persons, if any, employed, and the rate of compensation paid each, and the amount expended for each other object or class of expenditures, and the actual unit cost of any construction work done out of the appropriation corresponding to the estimate so submitted during the completed fiscal year next preceding the period for which the estimate is submitted. Other notes shall not be submitted following an estimate embraced in the annual budget other than such as shall suggest changes in form or order of arrangement of estimates and appropriations and reasons for such changes.

Then there is another provision, title 5, section 674:

> The estimates of expenditures and appropriations set forth in the budget to be transmitted by the President to the Congress on the first day of the next ensuing regular session shall conform to the classification herein provided, and the rates of salary and the compensation schedules shall not become effective until the first day of the fiscal year estimated for such budget.

That requires certain things in the nature of information to be furnished with the budget; in other words, I have here the budget for the fiscal year 1950. I turn to the heading "Secretary of Agriculture." We are given the details of all the employees in the form that has been known for years as green sheets. The budget deliberately failed to comply with the law in that it did not give us any of the information that the law requires and we need. Now all that is omitted, and the committee when it goes to work on these situations is unable to follow the thing through in the way that it used to. In other words, we used to be able to tell by looking at the page in the budget just how many increases in salary had been made and just how the pay roll was made up. Now they came before us this year without any information such as that, and when you ask them for it and get it, it is given in a way that is entirely different from the way it had been given in the past. It was not full enough so that it would enable the committee to get at the picture of the employment in the different agencies of the Government as we used to. The failure to submit this information was, in my opinion, a direct and deliberate violation of the law on the part of the budget.

The minority as best it could tried to get that information where it might be available. Unless it is in the budget and available to the committee when witnesses first come before us it is absolutely impossible for the facts to be brought out so that we can catch these different agencies and bureaucrats on the things they have done, how they have used the hot money they have left the 1st of June to raise salaries, how they have used different items for the doing of various things that it was not contemplated should be done when the money was appropriated.

Then we have a performance budget against the project budget and that tends to cover the thing up a little more so that it makes it much more difficult for the Appropriations Committee to get at just what is involved and to keep track of what is going on.

I want to go over these bills a little bit in detail—I am not going to take a long time now—and call attention to a few facts that seem to me should be brought to your attention.

The legislative branch bill was cut moderately well. There are some items for administrative expenses that possibly can still be reduced. Frankly, I believe that almost everywhere the picture is about the same. The independent offices bill was cut probably a larger amount than any other bill. In a great many ways the items were very satisfactory.

There are a couple of items I wonder whether they are real savings or whether they are going to turn out to be ephemeral. There is one item for the Veterans' Administration. The amount provided for veterans' pensions amounts to about $100,000,000. Those are not exact figures. I will not try to give them now. Another item for the veterans' training is about the same amount. But I do not know enough about that chapter and the justifications and all that sort of thing, so that I would want to say that was not an actual savings. But we have to pay whatever it figures out anyway, and most every year the Veterans' Administration comes back for more money.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. At this point in the RECORD I would like to ask the gentleman, and also the gentleman from Missouri, a question. In view of the letters that Members of Congress are receiving with respect to action of the Veterans' Administration in the curtailment of hospital services alleged to be in process of curtailment, especially in the psychiatric end of hospitalization for veterans, can the gentleman state now whether or not the Committee on Appropriations has ever cut any request for those purposes that have been made either by the Bureau of the Budget or the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. TABER. Well now, I can say this with reference to the hospital picture: The Independent Offices Committee, when it brought in its report a year ago, carried a provision stating that they had not cut the funds necessary for the care of the sick and the disabled veterans 1 penny, and that they did not expect the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to contract his services at all. Now I will say this, that they gave the full amount asked for that purpose by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. I will say this that on two occasions since that appearance before the Independent Offices Committee the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs has been before the Committee on Appropriations: At one time he came before the Deficiency subcommittee, as I remember it, and another time before the Independent Offices Committee on a deficiency item. There was nothing in the deficiency estimates or nothing in the testimony of the Administrator with reference to any shortage of funds with reference to the hospitals that are provided for the care of veterans.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman yield to ask the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations a question? I would like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations if he concurs in the statement that has been made by the gentleman from New York with respect to the actions of the Committee on Appropriations in giving to the Veterans' Administration every dollar that was recommended by the Bureau of the Budget and the head of the Veterans' Administration for hospitalization purposes?

Mr. CANNON. Unfortunately I was in conference and I did not hear the statement of the gentleman, but from what the gentleman says I take it for granted that it related to curtailment of hospital services.

Mr. KEEFE. That is right.

Mr. CANNON. The bill does not cut the estimate for hospital services.

Mr. KEEFE. And the committee has not cut the hospital service?

Mr. CANNON. There is no retrenchment for hospital services.

Mr. KEEFE. I mean in the bill last year; not this year but last year.

Mr. CANNON. The committee never cut an appropriation for hospital service in any bill either this year or last year.

Mr. KEEFE. Then the record should be clear that the protests received as to the actions of the Veterans' Administration in curtailing services in hospitals to veterans is not the result of any action on the part of the Committee on Appropriations in failing to make funds available in an amount that represents their demands, or requests that have been made to the Congress by the Bureau of the Budget or the Administrator of Vetans' Affairs for those services?

Mr. CANNON. I am not familiar with the correspondence which the gentleman has received, but I will say again that we have not cut the funds for hospital service in this bill or in any former bill.

Mr. KEEFE. I would like to get this clear because I know that many Members of Congress are receiving letters from all over the country with respect to this very situation, and I want to make it

clear, if I can, in the RECORD. May I say to my friend from New York, that if there is any deficiency it does not result from any action that has been taken either by the Committee on Appropriations or action by the Congress itself in not providing every dollar of funds that has been requested.

Mr. RABAUT. Would it not be a little bit more orderly if we saw something of that letter? Nobody knows anything about it.

Mr. KEEFE. If the gentleman has not received the letter, he is one of the few Members of Congress who have not.

Mr. TABER. There was a statement, and I will repeat it, in the report of the Independent Offices Committee last year when their bill came in indicating that they had not cut the amount required to take care of the sick and disabled in the hospitals, that they had no intention of cutting it, and they expected the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to see that the funds were used for that purpose. That statement was right in the report. It is true also that in the bill we are now presenting there is no cut in the hospital picture.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. General Gray admits that he did not ask for this necesasry money for the personnel in the hospitals. He admits that some mistake was made. I am reliably told that he is going to ask for more money, I think in a deficiency bill in the Senate, to provide more personnel for the hospitals. They have been cut too much, but it was not the fault of the Congress in any way, he has stated to me and to others.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Carrying on a little further the statement that was made about Veterans Administrator Gray, in the past 10 days the delegation from Kansas had occasion to talk to him about this very situation. During the course of that conference Administrator Gray admitted that any lack of service or personnel for veterans in our hospitals was not due to any shortcoming of Congress but was his own fault for not keeping his finger more closely on the funds granted him for fiscal 1950, which were $566,666,400 for the care of these patients in our hospitals. That was exactly the amount he asked for, that was exactly the amount the House of Representatives gave him, and it was exactly what the Senate gave him, so that he knew at least 19 months before exactly how much money he was going to have to care for the veterans in our hospitals during fiscal 1950.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I wonder if the gentleman can tell the House whether or not the item in the budget for fiscal 1950 to cover the 16,000 Veterans' Administration beds cut back by the President is in the 1951 budget now under consideration?

Mr. TABER. There has never been a time when the President could not have proceeded with the construction of those hospitals for which the funds were provided.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Do I correctly understand the gentleman to say, then, that the money is there but the President has not taken advantage of it.

Mr. TABER. That is so.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I know that in certain parts of Pennsylvania the hospital service has been drastically curtailed; in fact, it is quite critical. I have that from the highest source outside of the Administrator himself. What I should like to know is, does the gentleman from New York think the situation will be corrected so that this curtailment will not last any considerable length of time? This is a severe blow to the necessary services.

Mr. TABER. I will give the gentleman as good a picture of it as I can.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WIER. I want to make this statement, because the answers that were given to the gentleman from Wisconsin just do not make sense. Within my district is Fort Snelling, the Twin Cities hospital. It has recently closed 200 beds and released 100 professional employees. Whose responsibility is that, ours or Gray's?

Mr. TABER. The only way the Congress has in any satisfactory manner, to find out how much money is required for the operation of these hospitals and for the proper care of the veterans is to get that information from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and his staff. I just want to say this: We do not have before us any budget estimate for the care of veterans in hospitals in the nature of a deficiency estimate at the present time. That is the reason I conferred with the clerk of the committee just now. I wanted to be sure I made that statement correctly.

If we are to proceed to do anything about any deficiency item we would naturally expect to have a budget estimate from the Department. It is almost impossible to handle that kind of a situation without that being made available to you. There is no deficiency bill in the other body at this time and there is none that the House has considered or had any hearings on. There are some estimates, but none that have been marked "urgent" and none relating to the care of veterans in hospitals.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am reliably told that word has gone out to doctors and some of the other personnel in the hospitals to hold the cots in abeyance until a survey has been made. I understand that most of the survey has been made, and I am reliably told that General Gray will ask for a deficiency appropriation in order to cover the personnel back or keep them in the Veterans' Administration offices and hospitals.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. SCRIVNER. As recently as last week I made a personal check with the Bureau of the Budget and as of that time the Veterans' Administrator had not yet made any request of the Bureau of the Budget for any deficiency appropriation for the operation of hospitals for the fiscal year 1950.

Mr. TABER. I have checked as of today, and there is nothing of that kind hanging before the Congress at this time.

I will now go down through the items in the bill. With reference to the Department of Labor, I believe that administrative expenses there could be cut and should be cut. I believe they have more money than they need.

The Federal Security Agency, too, I think, has more money for administrative expenses than it needs.

The General Services Administration has more money than it needs, beyond doubt.

The Housing and Home Finance Agency has been cut some, but it could still stand more of a cut on the administrative expenses.

The Department of Agriculture has become in one way or another a very large agency. At the present time the direct and indirect appropriations of funds runs something like this, without the losses of the Commodity Credit Corporation, if any. There are $764,000,000 in direct appropriations; $126,000,000 in permanent appropriations; $21,000,000 in trust funds; $520,000,000 in loan authorizations; $20,000,000 in operating expenses of the Commodity Credit Corporation; amounting in all to $1,451,000,000. In addition to that there will be whatever losses the Commodity Credit Corporation reports and are certified by the Treasury Department indicating that we would have to make an appropriation to make that Corporation good.

If the losses on the 1st of July run up to a very large figure, the amount is likely to be for agriculture something in the nature of $2,500,000,000.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. VURSELL. The gentleman from New York has brought out that he believes there should be substantial reductions made in the administrative departments of the Government. To be practical about it, how can we get at it? Would it be possible to make a cut in each department of the unnecessary employees over a certain amount, and leave it to the department to absorb this cut in the various departments? Everyone knows there is waste in government where politics comes in, and whether it is a Republican or a Democratic administration, the big bureaucracy has a heyday. It ought to be stopped somewhere along the line and in my judgment that is where we ought to come in. I do

not know what is the proper approach but I think an approach should be made and it should be backed by the Members on both sides for economy in government.

Mr. TABER. Those who know best about where the savings can be accomplished are members of the subcommittees who have served on each bill. I hope that as these chapters are read, wherever there is an item of administrative expense or anything else that has not been cut fairly and sufficiently, that an effort will be made by someone to reduce it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

I hope that we will be able to cut the bill down.

I am not going to take much longer at this time, but just to show you how serious Federal expenditures are, the cost of the budget that we have before us and the incidents that go with it, will run in the neighborhood of forty-one or forty-two billion dollars. That means $285 for each man, woman, and child in the United States. It means almost as much as the income of lots of these families, perhaps it means more than the income of lots of these families. When you get to that point you are at a point where the people of the United States must begin to wake up and to realize how much it means to them to see that the expenditures of the Government are kept within bounds and that we are able to come somewhere near balancing our budget and keeping the Nation right-side up.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. VURSELL. The gentleman has served on the Committee on Appropriations either as chairman or ranking minority member for many years. The question I wish to ask him is this: From the gentleman's long years of experience, taking into consideration that we are employing in the Federal department today about 2,000,000 people, does the gentleman believe that if we should cut out the useless and unnecessary employees in every department of the Government, we would be able to reduce this budget by a billion dollars and still not hurt the efficiency or the economy or the administration of the Government in any way?

Mr. TABER. The total personnel cost in this budget is right around $7,000,000,000. In my opinion we could come very close to a billion dollars in reductions of personnel without in the slightest degree impairing the efficiency of the Government.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman from New York and also the gentleman from Missouri have been discussing the bad shape of our national finances. I presume the gentleman from New York noticed the item in the press either yesterday or this morning to the effect that the net-income returns are falling about $1,000,000,000 less than anticipated by the administration; in other words, we are going to have a deficit in this fiscal year of at least $6,000,000,000 rather than the $5,000,000,000 many have assumed it would be. In the opinion of the gentleman from New York, would it not have been good business had that information been available last Friday when only 86 Members of this House, including the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Minnesota now speaking, saw fit to vote against that $3,096,000,000 bill? If we do not vote against some of these expenditures, how are we ever going to balance the budget?

Mr. TABER. We are never going to balance the budget unless we make it our business to see that funds are not appropriated unless they are absolutely necessary to keep this country going.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. FORD. The gentleman is familiar with the legislation passed by the House and the Senate last session setting up the General Services Administration as recommended by the Hoover Commission. Can the gentleman tell me whether or not in fiscal year 1951 we are going to see material savings as the result of the passage of that legislation, savings promised to us by the Hoover Commission and the people who sponsored the legislation? And if so, can the gentleman refer me to information that will prove the point?

Mr. TABER. Frankly, it is set up here as $861,000,000 appropriations. I cannot turn to the amount for last year, but my recollection is that the amount this year is larger than the amount made available last year.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. If the gentleman will yield I will give him the figures.

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. The request was for $300,000,000 more for this year than for last, but that is not quite a comparable figure, because in that figure there are items assigned to the General Services Administration which had not been assigned to the agencies which it took over.

Mr. FORD. Leaving aside those additional functions that have been given to General Services Administration, would the gentleman say there had been any saving?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. A money savings?

Mr. FORD. Yes.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. There has not been any money savings. The intention was to create the saving by proper administration of the supplies and the items that come under the new agency and to believe that they will in the future produce a saving.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. May I say to the gentleman from Michigan that the Hoover Commission when created by the Congress was directed to do two specific and principal things. One was to find ways and means of obtaining greater economy in the conduct of our public affairs, and the other was to find ways and means of obtaining greater efficiency in the handling of those affairs. The office of General Services was set up for two reasons, if I remember correctly. One was to give a better administration of various agencies of the Government and to put them into one organization as it were, and the other was to relieve the President of some of the personal responsibilities that have been placed upon him as a result of the agencies being made independent under the law which are now in the Office of General Services, so that there will only be one man reporting to him instead of a dozen or so.

The study of the Hoover Commission, to the best of my memory, demonstrated that by the creation of the Office of General Services we would have more efficient and a better streamlined organization that would save a great deal of time for the President over a period of time if properly administered as planned and as recommended and should bring savings of about 20 percent on the previous cost of all of the various organizations that would be included under that office, bearing in mind, of course, that historically the Government continues to cost more and more and more. I hope we can reach the place where we may reverse that trend, but it has been the historic record of most requirements that it is pretty difficult over a long period of years to cut the cost of that particular department of Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I hope that explains the situation as I see it to the gentleman. I am not sure that there are savings reflected by this appropriation bill, but I believe the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from California are correct. It is rather difficult to get an accurate view of it at this time because all of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission which surrounded the Office of General Services have not been put into effect as yet.

Mr. FORD. It is not the fault of the Congress those recommendations have not been put into effect.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I agree with the gentleman, yet I must say that the Congress of necessity should give some leeway—some time—for this new organization to get into operation and under way.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Along the same line and in reference to this economy matter, is it not the purpose of plan 18 to transfer certain employees who have to do with Government buildings from, for example, the postal department over into General Services?

Mr. TABER. That is true.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Let us go one step further. There is also in contemplation at least the plan that when those postal employees go over into General Services they are going to take with them the higher rate of pay which the postal employees have over and

above those employees who were in General Services. That is true, is it not?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Is the gentleman asking me or the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, anybody that knows the answer.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. There is some cut, but that is my understanding of it, because of the fact that they had held a higher pay rate.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. And certain group advantages.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman asked me a question. Now let me answer.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, I am not going to listen to the gentleman take all week to do it.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I do not think the gentleman controls the floor.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Here is the proposition—I do not care how much the gentleman talks, but here is what they propose to do. The postal employees ha e certain vested rights, they say, in pensions, retirement pay, or whatever it is, so when they go over into general services they are going to be bracketed in there at the same rate of pay that they get in the postal service, which is higher than employees in the general service are going to get for the same kind of work. Well, I can see the justice in giving those who go out of the Postal Department into General Services the same rate of pay when they move over there, but what I cannot see is this: General Services employees get a longer vacation with pay and sick leave than do the fellows in the postal service, so when the postal-service fellows go over they will not only take over their higher schedule of pay, but they will also get the advantage of the longer leave of the General Services. Do you not see it is heads I win and tails I lose? Now, there is no economy in that, and there is no use pretending there is.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr .Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I have just listened to the gentleman from Michigan and his speech, or dissertation, or whatever you want to call it—address or something of that sort. Of course, one of the arguments we have and one of the things you are up against is whether you are going to take away from the men in the custodial service of the Post Office Department the rates of pay that they now have, and as I understand this plan, as I understand the recommendation, it is simply this: That in order that you do not continue that practice, where in many instances the custodial employees of the Post Office Department are receiving more compensation than the postmaster, who is responsible for the post office in which he works, that you should transfer all custodial services over into the Office of General Services, making one general supervision of custodial services. But you are transferring men now in the post-office service at the same rate of pay, and they will continue to receive that until someone else is appointed, and then they come in under a lower rate of pay to fill the vacancy as these men go. If the gentleman from Michigan would have his way, he would keep them all in the Post Office Department at the higher pay and never correct the inequities and inequalities that now exist, and all the Hoover Commission tried to do was to correct that situation.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. Mention was made a few minutes ago of the bill that passed the House authorizing $3,096,000,000 for various forms of foreign aid. Included in that is an amount for fiscal advisers for these foreign governments, and a number of the governments in the Marshall plan have come close to balancing their budget. I believe we were told in the hearings that Britain has balanced its budget.

Mr. TABER. They paid a billion dollars, pretty near, on their debt, as the result of what they have gotten from us.

Mr. VORYS. What I wanted to ask the gentleman was this: Since the subcommittee is studying here in more detail the $15,500,000 for personnel for the ECA, does the gentleman know how much of that is being spent for advisers to tell these other countries how to balance their budgets?

Mr. TABER. There is a very considerable amount that is being spent for advisers, business advisers, and governmental advisers. Just exactly what the figure is I could not tell offhand. I do not have it in my head. We will have the detail of that when the item for the ECA and other activities comes up.

Mr. VORYS. Will the gentleman attempt to find out whether we could secure the services of any of those experts to advise us on how to balance our budget here?

Mr. TABER. I hope that would be better than they have been in other places.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. Can it not be said for the benefit of the gentleman from Michigan that Mr. Jess Larson, the Administrator of the General Services Administration, is at least taking an inventory, and he has recently discovered among other things that the Government has stock-piled fluorescent bulbs sufficient to last the Government for the next 100 years.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman has been very persuasive, I will say. He has persuaded the Committee on Appropri[illegible]ns to recommend $836,000,000 as [illegible]st $680,000,000 for the same activi[illegible]ast year. He must be a good man.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I wonder if the gentleman will comment on this new idea of bringing all appropriations here in a one-package bill?

Mr. TABER. I am afraid it takes away the sense of responsibility the individual subcommittees have to cut. Perhaps they will break in; perhaps they will get that same idea we tried to inspire in them 2 years ago and 3 years ago. But while there have been cuts here, they have not been as deep as I should like to see and they have not been as general as I should like to see them.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not possible to cover a lot of items with this one-package idea that the average Member of Congress cannot find time to study?

Mr. TABER. Frankly, it is harder for a Member of Congress to have the whole of it in one package than it is to have it in 10 or 12.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Is it not easier to see how much it is all going to cost under the package bill?

Mr. TABER. It is easier to see what the over-all governmental cost is. That cost runs about $285 a head for every man, woman, and child in the United States.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a brief observation?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The gentleman from Ohio made a real contribution to this House when he mentioned that there was not going to be any wholesale cutting of the small-salaried people in the jobs of elevator operator, janitor, and other custodial jobs in any department. It seems to me when we start economizing we ought to begin in the upper brackets and cut some of the swivel-chair executives down there in the various departments. I cannot go along with trying to cut the little fellow.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

(Mr. STEFAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

HOW SAFE IS AMERICA?

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to have this opportunity to address my fellow Members concerning certain of the many problems today confronting our country which is involved in a world-wide cold war with those whose ideologies are repugnant to our people who cherish our democratic way of life.

I ask this question: How safe is America?

After 2 months of hearings on the bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and also sitting in as a member of the Central Appropriations Committee reviewing the figures and reports of other subcommittees for all appropriations of Government during the next fiscal year, I cannot agree with the feelings of some of the Members that the United States is entirely safe in case an emergency should arise.

Let us look at some of the facts that were developed during our hearings.

Much has been said in the past and will be said in the future concerning our people in Government. I have been a Member of Congress some 16 years, and during that period of time I have found that the vast majority of our Government employees are sincere, loyal, and hard-working individuals. They feel the responsibility which is theirs and perform their appointed tasks diligently without thought of favor.

Two years ago our committee was able to bring to the attention of the Congress some security risks in the Department of State. As a result, Congress wrote a provision in the bill giving the Secretary of State the power to remove from service any employee who, in his opinion, was a menace to the safety of the United States.

Again, this year, during the hearings covering the Department of Commerce, the security situation gave our committee concern, with the result that a provision was written into the Commerce bill giving the Secretary of Commerce the same power to remove any employee, as had previously been given to the Secretary of State.

The Members of Congress may rest assured that our committee has carefully analyzed the problems of all agencies coming before it and has not hesitated to thoroughly look into any problem which would reflect against a strong and secure United States.

Apropos to my previous statement that I have faith in the loyalty of our hard-working Government employees, I want to point out that during Director Hoover's testimony before our committee in connection with the appropriation for the FBI, he pointed out that more than 2,000,000 loyalty forms had been processed by the FBI. From this number, field investigations were opened in 11,403 instances. Less than four-tenths of 1 percent of the employees submitting loyalty forms were subject to investigations. Our committee wholeheartedly agreed with Mr. Hoover in his statement that this program, which has resulted in cleaning out certain types of individuals in the Government service, is well worth while.

The undesirable Government employee who today is being rooted out is dangerous but not our greatest danger. I feel that a greater danger faces our country today from the activities of the subversives who are endeavoring by every means to overcome our present democratic way of life. We cannot afford to overlook the brutal truth that today we are involved in a cold war which threatens the very future of our Nation.

None are so blind as those who will not see that we must not be lulled into a false sense of security which would permit our enemies from within to accomplish what foreign aggressors from without have failed to do through the tragedy of two great wars during our generation.

I am not now nor have I been an alarmist. I do not wish to alarm or frighten our people against a nonexistent enemy. I do feel, however, that I would be remiss in my responsibility to the citizens of this Nation if I failed to bring to their attention the very real danger which we face today. I also feel that at the same time we should put on notice those elements who are opposed to our way of life that we are aware of their conniving treachery and that we are fully capable of maintaining and will maintain a free and democratic United States.

Let us look into the record of the hearings before our committee concerning the dangers facing us today.

Mr. Hoover, during his testimony, advised our committee that the work in the internal-security field has increased tremendously; that, as a matter of fact, it is heavier now than it was at the peak of World War II. The cessation of hostilities increased rather than decreased the investigative burdens in this particular field.

The orbit of Communist control has extended from one-seventh of the world's population in 1917 to one-third of the world's population at this time. We have seen country after country fall under control of this menace until, at the present time, the United States stands as the strongest bulwark against the expansion of this ideology on a world-wide basis.

This growth is reflected in our country today. Communists have intensified their program. Their underground activities have increased proportionately.

I ask again, How safe are we? Mr. Hoover pointed out to our committee that, allied with the Communist Party in its subversive activities are a number of infiltrated Communist-front groups and certain foreign-nationality groups which are a constant menace to our way of life. Certain foreign countries are endeavoring to infiltrate our country for the purpose of securing confidential information about secret operations to which they have no right.

Our committee was advised that investigations of such groups and individuals are of a continuing nature. It was pointed out that the experiences of World War II, which brought about the downfall of entire nations through fifth-column activities, did not occur overnight. Such activity develops over a long period of years.

This is the activity which is taking place in our country today. We must be ever alert to combat these tactics.

What is the extent of communism in our country today? Mr. Hoover advised us that the Communist Party of the United States, which follows the Moscow line for the overthrow of our Government by force and violence, has a membership of approximately 54,174 persons. They spread throughout the length and breadth of our land. They can be counted in every State in the Union. They are the problems of all who cherish our present way of life. Let us not be mislead by the numerical strength alone of these traitors. They possess a fanatic loyalty to their masters abroad. They have boasted that for every member of the party they have 10 willing and subservient stooges to carry on the program of the party. This means that our potential fifth column numbers approximately 540,000 persons who support the Communist philosophy.

Again, I say, be alert, be aware, and do not permit ourselves to nurture false hope that a real and pressing danger does not exist.

The Communists use every known artifice to gain their ends.

Those who are desirous of entering our country to carry on their nefarious plots find many avenues of approach open to them.

For example, during our hearings we were advised by representatives of the Immigration and Naturalization Service that there are an estimated three to three and one-half million aliens in our country today.

The justifications of the Immigration Service points out that large numbers of aliens and stowaways on vessels coming to the United States are successful in landing illegally in this country.

We were advised that such illegal entrants into our country constituted a major segment of the problem of the Immigration Service.

Further, I wish to point out that our borders, both to the north and to the south, are unfenced. It is known to all that the traffic across these borders is very heavy, making it possible for those having subversive inclinations to enter our country by these routes. Thousands of aliens enter our country illegally from Mexico. It was stated that it is simply impossible to guard the Rio Grande River in such a manner that persons could not illegally enter our country. During the fiscal year 1949 alone 289,400 persons who had entered our country illegally from Mexico were apprehended. The heavy traffic across our northern and southern borders makes possible illegal entry of those who may seek to destroy our democracy.

In connection with our displaced-persons program our committee was advised that even though investigations are conducted concerning these unfortunates some would get by the Immigration Service on forged documents, regardless of how meticulous the Immigration Service is in its investigative procedures. Advice had previously been received by the chairman of our committee from competent people connected with CIC and the IRO in Europe that the investigation of these people as to their subversive background is utterly ridiculous; that there is not a question of doubt but that one or thousands of them could come into this country who had been active members of the Communist Party behind the iron curtain.

Further, there are many aliens in our country today who have been determined to be undesirable and are subject to deportation but who cannot be deported, since it is impossible to secure travel documents for them. Many of these individuals are from the iron-curtain countries.

During our hearings, Mr. Kelly of the Immigration and Naturalization Service stated that they had between 3,500 and 4,000 such cases at that time. These people, these undesirables, are free among our people today. They are not

in detention quarters but are released either on bond or on parole. The Immigration and Naturalization Service has stated that they endeavor to keep them located; however, they are free to go where they please.

Of those under deportation still in our country, there are approximately 100 free on bond, who are subversives. It is a shameful travesty of justice that these subversives, faithful to a foreign ideology which would destroy our way of life are free to roam our country spewing their venom of hate for all to see and to hear. How safe are we when such events as these can and do occur in our everyday life?

Another group of aliens from eastern Europe arrived in this country en route to South American countries, for which they had secured visas. They appear to be people of considerable means.

They made no move to continue their passages, their visas expired, and the limited number of days which were granted to them by the Immigration Service also expired. They were released on bond and they report to the Immigration Service at stated periods. Our committee was advised that we now have these people on our hands whether we like it or not, and that there is a good possibility that they will not now be accepted by the South American countries to which they were destined.

Turning again to another phase of this matter, you know that under the Foreign Agents Registration Act those agencies and individuals representing foreign countries must register with the Department of Justice.

At the close of the last fiscal year every iron curtain country had agents registered under this law. It is interesting to note that Earl Browder, whose background is known to all, was registered as an agent of the Soviet Union.

These representatives are free to travel about our country at will. We can rest assured that our representatives in their countries have no such freedom of movement.

We ask ourselves, are there other such groups active throughout our country today? The answer is yes; the foreign intelligence services through their networks are exceedingly active. Their objectives are: Information on atomic research, radar, jet propulsion, guided missiles, the securing of topographical maps of our coastal lines, our airports and military landing fields, data on biological warfare, and our industrial and military resources, among others. These groups are ever alert to secure any and all data to be forwarded to their homelands. They are endavoring day and night to secure our know-how and to find wherein we may be vulnerable.

Again I say, our enemies are ever alert. I wonder how many of my colleagues are aware of the fact that representatives of foreign embassies in Washington carefully scrutinize, review, and index every page of our appropriations hearings. This is a must, and they are among the first to secure copies of the hearings so that they can keep currently abreast of developments in our various branches of Government activity. They do not let to chance the securing of information which may be of importance to their governments.

The many matters which I have mentioned here today are those which I feel are of paramount importance to each and every one of us. Too often we are lulled into complacency, feeling that no real danger is being faced by our country during these critical days. I have mentioned but a few of the facts secured through our hearings, which show that the danger from subversive forces is real.

I, for one, am thoroughly aware of the dangers we face during our present cold war. We must lend our every effort to continue a strong internal defense. We must be constantly alert to render ineffective the efforts of the subversives in our midst. We cannot be penny-wise and pound-foolish. Keeping strong our agency that bears the responsibility for our internal security, is the best insurance the people of the United States can buy.

It is for this reason that your committee has approved the full amount of the budget estimate submitted to the Congress for the activities of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Mr. Hoover, during the presentation of his testimony, pointed out that the increase in funds requested by his Bureau, if approved, would permit increased coverage of investigative matters in the internal security field.

He advised your committee that the Communist Party has increased its activities among front groups. It has revived its drive to expand the united front program. One of the great dangers of communism is the ability of its espousers to infiltrate and corrupt various spheres of American life.

The Communist Party has endeavored to exploit youths, veterans, civil rights, foreign nationality groups, educational and many other groups.

They have developed one of the greatest propaganda machines that civilization has ever known.

Mr. Hoover further advised your committee that in the light of developments during the past year, the Communist Party has become increasingly security conscious. They are developing an underground apparatus and are decentralizing their operations. This decentralization has almost tripled the number of Communist Party clubs.

These developments have made more difficult the continued coverage of party activities. Mr. Hoover feels that with the additional men requested, an increased coverage which he deems absolutely essential can be had.

Your committee has no hesitancy in reposing its faith in Mr. Hoover and the FBI.

All of us in this Chamber remember the dark days of the early thirties when no home appeared safe. During those days crime was rampant; the kidnaper was collecting tremendous sums from families whose loved ones had been kidnaped. The extortionist was waxing rich by plying his criminal activities; the bank robber became so bold that no banker could be sure his institution would not be prey of these vultures.

In the face of this increasing criminal menace, a series of so-called crime bills were passed by Congress, the enforcement brunt falling upon the shoulders of Mr. Hoover and the men of the FBI.

They measured up to the task. Bank robbery and extortion became unprofitable pursuits. The kidnaper found that he was to spend his remaining days in prison. In only two kidnaping cases throughout the years has the FBI failed in solving the crime. These two are still under investigation.

Through the years which followed, additional tasks were assigned to the FBI and in every instance the job was well done. The back of the vicious criminal had been broken. Through the war period and up to the present time, the FBI, although having many additional duties assigned to it, has continued to investigate violations of the law without fear or favor.

When the war clouds gathered in the late thirties, the FBI was designated by the late President Roosevelt as the coordinating agency for the internal security of our country.

The manner in which Mr. Hoover and his staff performed their duties during that critical period is history.

The sneak attack on Pearl Harbor found the FBI prepared. Prior to that time, Mr. Hoover, fearing eventual war, had quietly compiled information on those whose ideologies were not those of our country so that at a moment's notice they could be taken into custody if the safety of our country was in jeopardy.

Immediately after Pearl Harbor, the men of the FBI took into custody some 16,000 potentially dangerous enemy aliens thereby removing the threat of sabotage in those critically dark days. Throughout the war period, the FBI continued its excellent work. A monument to its efficiency is the fact that there was not one single case of foreign-inspired sabotage during the entire war period. Foreign espionage rings were controlled—these spies ending up in our prisons. It can be told now that also during that critical period of our country's history, men of the FBI served with distinction throughout the Western Hemisphere.

During the cold war which has followed the shooting war, the FBI has continued to bear the coordinating responsibility for the internal security of our Nation.

Our committee has been advised of the developments of subversion in our country and of the steps taken by the FBI to overcome these activities. Mr. Hoover is acutely aware of the dangerous situation now confronting us and his every effort and resource are being expended to nullify the efforts of those who wish to destroy our way of life. He and his Bureau have been pilloried by the Communist and his stooges who have stopped at nothing in order to shake the country's faith in this organization. The charges of Gestapo, of secret police, and of national police have ben voiced long and loud by many of those whose questionable activities have been uncovered by the FBI.

Those who know Mr. Hoover know how repugnant to him is a national po-

lice. He has long advocated against such a police. He has refused to be named the investigator, prosecutor, and judge, which would be a forerunner of a police state. He has stated publicly that his is the responsibility to secure the facts through impartial investigation and that the prosecution and judgment are for the prosecutor and the courts. We need never fear any abuse of power by Mr. Hoover and the FBI.

His service is a monument to a man's devotion to his countrymen and I, for one, feel a great sense of security knowing that the ever watchful FBI is guarding the internal security of our country.

I am sure you will agree with me that our danger today is real. There are many loopholes through which the subversive and his clan can enter our country for the purpose of corrupting our way of life. We must be vigilant. We must insure our continued internal security against these elements. Approval of the pending appropriation request for the FBI is a step in that direction. I so recommend its approval.

UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY

Our hearings for appropriations for the Department of State contained considerable matter regarding the foreign policy of the United States Government. It was my privilege to ask a half a dozen witnesses from the Department of State to explain our foreign policy. One excellent explanation was given by Assistant Secretary Howland Sargeant and is already printed in the hearings, and I recommend the reading thereof.

However, since the hearings were held, I have had another explanation from Mr. Nelson T. Johnson of the Far Eastern Commission. I had previously discussed with Mr. Johnson the difficulty which seems to beset many people who try to define United States foreign policy. It is Mr. Johnson's thought that the constantly reiterated statement that the United States has no foreign policy is based upon a widely prevalent tendency to confuse policy with action. It is enlightening to note that Mr. Jonson and other members of the Department of State feel that the United States has pursued a very definite policy in its relation with the outside world. Mr. Johnson tells me that our policy is to promote and maintain by every means at our disposal the spiritual and material interests of the Nation and its people at home and abroad. Mr. Johnson's argument is that hundreds of indivdual and separate actions are taken every day by the United States Government pursuant to that policy. Such actions are taken by many agencies of the United States Government, chiefly, however by the Department of State which is the executive department principally charged with the field of foreign relations. It is the feeling of Mr. Johnson that while such actions must be in line with policy, they must be distinguished from policy.

On the subject of policy, Mr. Johnson tells me this policy is based upon certain principles which set forth our national ideals and desires in the field of foreign relations. He states that these principles are important because they have been fed into the minds of our people by teachers, parents, and by their political leaders, and that it is at all times necessary when an agency of the United States Government takes action in the foreign field that it coordinate or aline action with these principles. When action fails to conform to these well-known principles, the Government begins to hear at once from the people whose support it seeks, for these principles have now become a part of the national thinking in regard to how, when, and why Government should act at home and abroad to promote and maintain the Nation's spiritual and material interests.

Because of the great importance to our people who are confused as to what the foreign policy of the United States is today, it should be important to state that these principles are older than the United States Government and that they go back to the first State paper issued under the authority of the United States of America to explain actions which we intended to take to promote our spiritual and material happiness and security and to achieve our independence as a Nation. Because of this importance and because of so much confusion, I am including a compilation of 14 of these fundamental principles which it seems must inform United States action in foreign affairs if such actions are to be supported by the American people. Mr. Johnson has compiled this list of Fundamental Principles Underlying United States Foreign Policy, and I include it as part of my remarks in order to complete this statement on United States foreign policy:

FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES UNDERLYING UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY

1. The right of a people to determine for themselves how they shall be governed. (self determination): This principle is set down in the second paragraph of the Declaration of Independence.

2. Good-neighbor policy: In his Farewell Address, Washington put it this way: "Observe good faith and justice toward all nations. Cultivate peace and harmony with all."

3. Avoid inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachment for others: In his Farewell Address, Washington said: "The Nation which indulges toward another an habitual hatred or an habitual fondness is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest. Antipathy in one nation against another disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur. * * *

"So likewise, a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest * * * gives to ambitious, corrupted, or deluded citizens (who devote themselves to the favorite nation) facility to betray or sacrifice the interests of their own country without odium, sometimes even with popularity, gilding with the appearances of a virtuous sense of obligation, a commendable deference for public opinion."

4. Noninvolvement in the affairs of other nations: In his Farewell Address, Washington said it this way:

"The great rule of conduct for us in regard to foreign relations is, in extending our commercial relations to have with them as little political connection as possible."

This principle is closely related to the next.

5. Nonintervention in the domestic or foreign affairs of other nations: Washington said in his farewell address: "It must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves by artificial ties in the 'ordinary' vicissitudes of her politics or the 'ordinary' combinations and collisions of her friendships or enmities."

Note here the emphasis President Washington laid upon the word "ordinary". This principle has been enunciated again and again by United States Presidents and Secretaries of State in successive administrations from Washington's down to the present.

6. The open door or equality of opportunity and nondiscrimination in international trade: President Washington said it this way in his Farewell Address: "Our commercial policy should hold an equal and impartial hand, neither seeking nor granting exclusive favors or preferences; * * * constantly keeping in view that 'tis folly in one nation to look for disinterested favors from another; that it must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under that character."

7. No permanent alliances: In his Farewell Address, President Washington said:

"It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliances with any portion of the foreign world, so far, I mean as we are now at liberty to do it. * * *

"Taking care always to keep ourselves by suitable establishments on a respectable defensive position, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies."

8. Right of expatriation: By the act of July 27, 1868, Congress had this to say:

"SEC. 1999. Whereas the right of expatriation is a natural and inherent right of all people, indispensable to the enjoyment of the rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness * * * any declaration, instruction, opinion, order, or decision of any officer of the United States which denies, restricts, impairs, or questions the right of expatriation, is declared inconsistent with the fundamental principles of the Republic."

9. Security for ourselves along our boundaries: The emergence of this principle and the way it has been acted upon by successive administrations receives emphasis from the expansion of the United States control and jurisdiction over the continental lands westward from the Original Thirteen States until the Pacific Ocean was reached. It was this principle that moved Thomas Jefferson to send Lewis and Clark out upon the journey of exploration of the Northwest, and to declare that the United States would view with concern the transfer of New Orleans from Spain to France; the acquisition of the Northwest Territory in 1787; Tennessee in 1796; the Louisiana Purchase, 1803; West Florida, 1810; the rectification of the boundary between Canada and the United States, 1842; the annexation of Texas, 1845; California, 1848; the Gadsden Purchase, 1853; and so on.

10. Noninterference with and noncontrol by any European power over the affairs of governments of former colonies in this hemisphere, that have declared their independence and maintained it: President Monroe stated this principle in his message to Congress of December 2, 1823. He was disturbed about rumored movements on the part of European countries in trying to encourage resumption by Spain of control over former colonies.

11. Noncolonization by any European power within this hemisphere: President Monroe, disturbed over the activities of the Russians along the northwest coast of this continent stated this principle in his message to Congress of December 2, 1823.

12. Nonextension to this hemisphere by European powers of governmental systems

hostile to our system of democratic government: President Monroe stated this principle in his message to Congress of December 2, 1823.

This principle has been appealed to in recent years, when we have been disturbed over rumored attempts by Nazi or Fascist organizations to extend their systems to this hemisphere.

13. Freedom of the seas: A principle of international law for which we have stood time and time again.

14. The freedom of men and women to travel upon their legitimate and innocent occasions without unnecessary or unreasonable let or hindrances: This is a principle that is suffering through ever-increasing restrictions upon travel.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. I notice the gentleman from Nebraska has brought into the Well of the House one portion of the bill now before us. I know the distinguished gentleman who is now about to address us has also read and examined the Budget, which is a printed document of great size, which is submitted to the Congress each year and referred to the Committee on Appropriations. As a matter of fact, is it not true that in the Budget which is submitted to the Congress, and then referred to the Committee on Appropriations, anyone can see there a one-package bill and determine from examining the Budget itself just exactly what the President's estimates of expenditures are and what the revenues will be. Is that not true?

Mr. STEFAN. That is correct.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Nebraska yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. I just want to make this observation in answer to the statement or question of the gentleman from Wisconsin, that while the budget estimate shows what the President and his Bureau of the Budget requests, it does not show the action of the Appropriation Committee of Congress which can only be shown at one time by a one-package appropriation bill.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachuetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Can the gentleman tell me why, from among the personnel who served the United States in the armed services, more persons were not selected to handle our affairs of state abroad; men whose loyalty cannot be doubted? I cannot understand this hasty selection of persons, some of whom have spent comparatively few years in the United States and who have been citizens of the United States only a short time. Can the gentleman answer those questions?

Mr. STEFAN. I cannot; I am sorry.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I rose to ask the gentleman before, and now, if it was his intention to include with his remarks the list that he now has upon the tabletop in front of him.

Mr. STEFAN. I did not intend to include that with my remarks. I have it here for the information of every Member of the House. I understand, however, that another Member of the House is going to talk about this subject and he will undoubtedly include them with his remarks.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I would like to say as one Member of the House that it should be included so that it will be obtainable, because we have found at home a rising tide of interest in this subject and we dislike to talk in generalities. It seems to me we have reached a point in the discussion where we should be able to give specific information and anything the gentleman can supply will be very helpful.

Mr. STEFAN. I thank the gentleman. I wish to say to the members of the committee, I know it is very hard for all of you to go through these hearings on all of these bills, but I assure you that I personally know that every volume of this appropriation bill, which contains more than 70 percent of our requests for running our Government during the next fiscal year, is today being indexed page by page, and item by item, by the very efficient staffs of the legations, the embassies and the consulates of foreign governments whose staffs have been increased 100 percent, especially those representing countries behind the iron curtain. The employment in the Russian delegation in the United Nations, when the Assembly is in session, always increases from 50 to over 100, and I notice that the number of representatives of foreign governments who are presently in a diplomatic status in the District of Columbia, have increased over 100 percent. It is a very important problem, and if we are, as the chairman says, nearing a hot war, beware, America.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Nebraska yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Is it not the fact that as a result of this situation which the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska describes, it becomes necessary for the subcommittees on appropriations to hear a great deal of the pertinent testimony off the record?

Mr. STEFAN. I thank the gentleman. I will say that in making up my brief statement on this warning to America, I took into consideration many of the statements that were told to us off the record, and for reasons of security. When you take the floor, there are so many things that you do not dare to talk about. The gentleman will agree with me that the situation is alarming, will he not?

Mr. ROONEY. I certainly do. I will say to the gentleman from Nebraska that he is entitled to the commendation of this House for the presentation he has made here this afternoon. In my estimation, my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Nebraska, KARL STEFAN, is one of the ablest, if not the ablest, Member of the House Committee on Appropriations, and I heartily agree with what he has said here this afternoon.

Mr. STEFAN. I deeply appreciate the commendation of my subcommittee chairman.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman knows my opinion of his ability and his loyalty and his anxiety to rid the country of Communists and subversive persons, and to have a Foreign Service that is the finest and most loyal in the world.

Mr. STEFAN. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

FACILITATION OF THE WORK OF THE FOREST SERVICE

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 5839) to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of March 29, 1950.)

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RURAL REHABILITATION CORPORATION TRUST LIQUIDATION ACT

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 930) to provide for the liquidation of the trusts under the transfer agreement with State rural rehabilitation corporations, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of March 31, 1950.)

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. HOPE. Will the gentleman explain the differences between the conference report and the House version of the bill?

Mr. COOLEY. Actually, no very important changes were made in the House bill. The only very substantial change is with regard to the disposal of trust

assets. The bill now provides for an outright rate of the assets of the several corporations. It provides a 3-year period within which the State corporations may make application for a rate of such assets pursuant to the trust agreement. In the event no application for a rate of the trust assets is filed within 3 years, the House bill provided that such assets would be placed in a revolving fund to be used within the State for purposes of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act. The conference report, which is in the nature of a compromise between this provision and a provision in the Senate bill which provided that such assets would under such circumstances revert to the Treasury, authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into an agreement with any State rural rehabilitation corporation or other State agency having official jurisdiction of the trust assets which have been returned pursuant to the provisions of the act and for the administration of such funds by the Secretary, together with any other funds which may be transferred to the Secretary by such corporations or other agencies, to be used in carrying out within the State the general purposes of titles 1, 2, and 4 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act. This will permit States which want to have these funds administered by the Federal Government to provide by agreement a program very similar to that which has been in effect in the past or such other program as may be agreed upon and which might be compatible with the letter and spirit of the law. The statement of the managers on the part of the House, which has just been read, clearly indicates that the changes are not too important. I might observe, however, that such changes as have been made, I am certain, will meet with the approval of the officials of the Farmers Home Administration.

Mr. HOPE. There is a further provision, is there not, that if the funds are not claimed in either way by the States they will go into the General Treasury of the United States?

Mr. COOLEY. That is right.

Mr. HOPE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the committee of the conference has agreed on a bill to provide for the liquidation of the trusts under the transfer agreements between the Secretary of Agriculture and the various State rural rehabilitation corporations. The conference report (H. Rept. No. 1865) on the bill (S. 930) has been signed by the managers of the bill for the House and Senate and has been published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for March 31, 1950.

This bill, which originated in the House as H. R. 2392, was debated at length here in the House on March 1 and 2, and was passed. As will be seen from the conference report, only one significant change was made in the bill by the conference committee. That was the deletion of the revolving fund provision of section 2 (e) and the substitution for it of section 2 (f) as a compromise between the provisions of the House and Senate bills.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LIQUIDATION OF STATE RURAL REHABILITATION CORPORATION TRUST ASSETS

(Mr. COOLEY asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the addition of a new section 2 (f) was discussed in the House debates and was requested by numerous members of both Houses and the Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration in order that the bill might provide authority for the Secretary to contract with the State rural rehabilitation corporations or other State agencies or officials having jurisdiction of the corporate assets, hereinafter referred to as the "corporations" unless otherwise indicated, for the administration of all or a part of the corporate assets by the Farmers Home Administration.

While it is anticipated that some corporations may desire to have all of their assets returned to them for administration, it is anticipated that others will prefer to have all of their assets, except such as may be needed for their administrative expenses, administered by the Secretary through the Farmers Home Administration under section 2 (f) contracts, and that still others may prefer to have a part of their assets returned to them for use in carrying out particular projects, defraying their administrative expenses, et cetera, and to have the remainder of their assets administered under such section 2 (f) contracts. The bill permits such combination methods to be used.

Agreements entered into under section 2 (f) would provide for administration of the transferred assets by the Secretary upon such terms and conditions and for such periods of time as were mutually agreeable to the Secretary and the corporations. Agreement upon the rules and regulations governing the administration of the transferred assets would enable the corporations through their officials or designated representatives to keep abreast of the administration of their assets, should enable them to answer inquiries of State officials vested with authority to inquire into the administration of such assets, and should avoid any accounting problems with which the Secretary might otherwise be confronted at the termination of the agreements. The agreements could provide for administration of the transferred assets in the name of the United States and for use of its service agencies as at present, if that is considered desirable.

Agreements could be entered into under section 2 (f) for the purpose of permitting the Secretary to use corporation assets for the purposes of titles I and II of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, and for other purposes for which they were previously used by the Secretary, if they were transferred to him for those purposes. The agreements could also contain such other provisions as are deemed necessary, so long as they are consistent with the provisions of the bill.

Agreements entered into under section 2 (f) could permit the Secretary to use a reasonable percentage of the transferred assets for expenses of administration thereof, or any amounts appropriated by Congress for that purpose. Expenditures for such costs of administration should be kept reasonable, consistent with the services required to be performed. Since the administrative functions under section 2 (f) contracts will be substantially the same as they were under the trust agreements, it would seem that such expenditures by the Secretary could be kept within the rate heretofore charged by the Secretary against the trust assets in connection with his administration thereof through the Farmers Home Administration, except for the cost of special personnel employed under section 4 (a) to aid the Secretary in liquidating the trusts, returning the trust assets to the corporations or States, entering into contracts under section 2 (f), and so forth. There would seem to be no good reason why Congress should make appropriations for administration of such assets, but that is a matter for consideration in connection with annual Department of Agriculture appropriation acts.

The entering into of agreements under section 2 (f) would be entirely optional with the Secretary and each corporation or other State agency or official having jurisdiction of the corporate assets, and at the termination of the original agreement or last renewal thereof, the assets then remaining of those transferred to the Secretary for administration, would be returned to the corporation or other State agency or official having jurisdiction thereof, in the same manner and to the same extent as if the 2 (f) agreement had never been entered into.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KLEIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in four instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. TAURIELLO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article from the Buffalo Courier.

Mr. FLOOD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address.

Mr. CARNAHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. VELDE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, in each to include editorials.

Mr. JENISON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. POULSON (at the request of Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN) was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, and to include an editorial.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his re-

A-5821654, Perez, Ivy Gomez or Rose Perez or Ivy Duchesne Gomez or Ivy Gaston.
A-1879601, Perl, Eugene Jacob or Jacob Perl.
A-5064255, Perugino, Guiseppe.
A-6423807, Pirzio-Biroli, Giacomo.
A-4957358, Racey, Lawrence William or Lawence William Rase.
A-5407879, Ramirez, Jose Luis or Jose Ramirez or Luis Ramirez.
A-7044230, Rey, Joaquin Israel Trujillo.
A-7050671, Rey, Daisi Trujillo or Daisy.
A-6366413, Ribes, Elise (nee Fontenelle).
A-6459421, Ridgway, Jacqueline Marie Householder or Jacqueline Marie Householder (maiden name).
A-6372752, Ripley, Ronald Edward or Ronand Edward Page.
A-6372754, Ripley, Mervyn Keith or Mervyn Keith Page Ripley or Mervyn Keith Page.
A-6279244, Risteigen, Inga.
A-6279243, Risteigen, Gunhild.
A-6698873, Rodriguez-Esquivel, Juan or Ernest Gutierrez or Ernest Castro Gutierrez or Ernesto Gutierrez, or Ernesto Castro Gutierrez.
A-5129758. Salvemini. Giacomo or Jack Salvemini or Domenico Americo Sforza.
A-5796096, Santoya, Francisca Cruz or Francisca Cruz or Francisca Mata.
A-4209125, Sarafis, Christos Alexander.
A-3851318, Schiavi, Angelo.
A-5688544, Schmidt, Hilda Rose or Hilda Rose Manning or Hilda Rose Jackson.
A-5601137, Schmitt, Vilma (nee Zold).
A-4809719, Schnee, Rose or Rose Shapiro or Rose Meyer.
A-5257484, Serra, Juan Mari or Juan Mari.
A-4242776, Siebert, Walter Heinrich August or Walter Henry Siebert.
A-5377193, Siegel, Freida Rosalie (nee Rascha Fradel Siegel).
A-5610957, Silberman, Frank or Traian Lazar Zoladz or Frank Caberman.
A-5056181, Simoncic, Martin or John Weber.
A-2741589, Sofikitis, George Michael or Mike Sofikitis.
A-2518842, Sague, Abdul.
A-5886907, Simkunas, Antanas.
A-4541327, Solis-Ayerdi de Sanchez, Dolores or Dolores Solis de Sanchez or Dolores Solis de Vara.
A-6390856, Sourcin, Alice Paquerette.
A-2856317, Spanos, Petros.
A-6929710, Sparrow, Florence Blanche (nee Cann).
A-6018628, Starosciak, Sophia Jadwiga (alias Zofia Starosciak, alias Zofja Starościak).
A-1868401, Susan, Ferencz or Frank Susan.
A-5059057, Sutlovich, Frank Rudolph.
A-5374797, Szasz, Gustav.
A-3685757, Tamberg, Harry John (alias Harry J. Tamberg, alias John Tamawots, alias John or Johannes Tanawots or Tamawöts).
A-6805580, Tauber, Laszlo Nandor or Leslie Ferdinand Tauber.
A-9705985, Theocharides, Theocharis.
A-5427501, Thorne, Sidney Alphonso, or Sidney Durant.
A-3889128, Tieger, Mary (nee Weinstein or Glassman, nee Borochovitz or Berkowitz).
A-7759520, Tokcaer, Mursit Muradurresit.
A-3362361, Tom, Kim Fong or Tom Kim Fong.
A-5948146, Trpchevich, Traiche George (alias Nick George alias Mike George Trpchevich).
A-5908905, Vasquez, Santos.
A-1165476, Vasallo, Damiano.
A-9741750, Vatouios, Theochares Stamatios or Theocharis S. Vatouios or Harry Vatouios.
A-6136671, Vega-Munoz, Luis.
A-5817968, Verhelst, Alfons or Alfons August Verhelst or Alphonse Vereist.
A-6402296, Vidal, Jose or Llecha.
A-5949830, Wright, Thomas William.
A-5569145, Ybarra, Jose Martin.
A-5227047, Yuhas, Jan or John Yuhas.
A-2156898, Zech, Ludwig.
A-3460791, Zizzo, Antonino or Antonio Rizzo.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THEODORE CONSTANTIN TRANCU AND HIS WIFE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1305) for the relief of Theodore Constantin Trancu and his wife.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Theodore Constantin Trancu and his wife, Anne Denise, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted into the United States for permanent residence as of the date of their last entry into the United States upon payment of the required head taxes and visa fees.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct appropriate numbers from the nonpreference category of the proper immigration quota or quotas.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MIYOKO OISHI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7778) for the relief of Miyoko Oishi.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any provision of law excluding from the United States persons or races ineligible to citizenship, Miyoko Oishi shall be admitted to the United States for permanent residence, upon application hereafter filed, if she is otherwise admissible under the immigration laws.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert "That the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, relating to the exclusion of aliens inadmissible because of race shall not hereafter apply to Miyoko Oishi, the Japanese fiancée of Sergeant Eugene D. Wells, a citizen of the United States, and that the said Miyoko Oishi may be eligible for a nonquota immigration visa if she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that marriage between the above-named parties occurred within 3 months immediately succeeding the enactment of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARY FRANCES YOSHINAGA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7560) for the relief of Mary Frances Yoshinaga.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Mary Frances Yoshinaga, the foster daughter of Mr. and Mrs. James F. Austen, Jr., shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. James F. Austen, Jr., who are citizens of the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, solely for the purpose of section 4 (a) and section 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, and notwithstanding any provisions excluding from admission to the United States persons of races ineligible to citizenship, Mary Frances Yoshinaga, a minor half-Japanese child, shall be considered the alien natural-born child of Sergeant and Mrs. James F. Austen, citizens of the United States."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 131]

Barrett, Pa.	Heffernan	Patman
Bennett, Fla.	Heller	Pfeifer, Joseph L.
Bentsen	Herlong	Pfeiffer, William L.
Biemiller	Hoffman, Ill.	Philbin
Blackney	Hull	Powell
Boykin	Jackson, Calif.	Redden
Buchanan	Jennings	Reed, Ill.
Buckley, Ill.	Johnson	Reed, N. Y.
Buckley, N. Y.	Kee	Ribicoff
Bulwinkle	Kelly, N. Y.	Rivers
Byrne, N. Y.	Kennedy	Rooney
Carlyle	Kunkel	Sabath
Carroll	Lanham	Scott, Hardie
Case, S. Dak.	Larcade	Short
Chatham	Lesinski	Smathers
Chesney	Linehan	Smith, Ohio
Chudoff	Lyle	Sutton
Clemente	Lynch	Taylor
Combs	McCarthy	Towe
Cooley	McDonough	Wadsworth
Coudert	Mason	Walsh
Dawson	Miles	Welch
Dingell	Monroney	Wheeler
Donohue	Morgan	Whitaker
Douglas	Murphy	White, Idaho
Doyle	Nixon	Withrow
Gavin	Norton	Wood
Gilmer	O'Brien, Ill.	Woodhouse
Gordon	O'Brien, Mich.	
Hall, Leonard W.	O'Hara, Ill.	
Hand	O'Konski	
	Pace	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 331 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1951

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7786, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] had consumed 1 hour and 17 minutes, and the gentleman

from New York [Mr. TABER] had consumed 1 hour and 15 minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 hour to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

(Mr. VINSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I have a few comments, mainly of a general nature, to offer on this 1951 military budget.

The first is to pay tribute, sincerely, to this able Subcommittee on the Defense Establishment.

As usual, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL], and the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] have done a magnificent job on the most complicated and most important budget program of our Government.

Each of them has again earned, as they have each year, the praise and the deep appreciation of the House of Representatives and of all Americans for their splendid national defense work.

I congratulate the distinguished subcommittee chairman from Texas, and I congratulate the patriotic, hard-working Members on his subcommittee. All of us are greatly indebted to you gentlemen.

Now, members of the committee, let us get to some of the bedrock defense questions that influence this budget.

Let us take a moment on this highly publicized economy in national defense.

Now, I have not been one who blindly praises the Secretary of Defense. The fact is, I have voiced criticism of the Secretary now and then for various things he has or has not done. I will continue to do so in the future when it appears that the Department can benefit from counsel or guidance from the Congress in reaching policy decisions on national defense matters.

But the Secretary has fully earned credit in a specific area pertinent to this debate, and I believe in giving credit where credit is due.

There can be no doubt that Secretary Johnson, his comptroller, his management committee, and the three military Departments deserve the commendation of the entire Nation for having carried out so successfully the drive in the Department of Defense, as contrasted, I may say, to other branches of the Government, to squeeze the fat out of public expenditures.

Secretary Johnson's report of March 2 makes it evident that he is producing savings—very substantial savings—in the administration of the defense program. This is a great public service, especially in view of the general condition of the Federal budget. And it conforms fully to one of the objectives of the Congress as reflected in the amendments of last August to the Unification Act.

Mr. Johnson's report shows that about one and one-half billion dollars less were spent for national defense than were requested in 1950 by the President and would have normally been provided in supplemental requests. A little over $2,000,000,000 less were spent than the Congress authorized. In quick summary the picture looks about like this:

Requested in the President's 1950 budget	$14,218,000,000
Supplemental items (civilian pay increase, higher freight and passenger rates, Berlin airlift costs, etc.) absorbed by the Department of Defense	257,000,000
Theoretical budget total, 1950	14,475,000,000
Direct savings in appropriated funds	207,063,000
Reductions in armed forces (mainly in items of procurement)	434,494,000
Cost decreases	134,917,000
Savings and reductions (mixed)	815,619,000
Air Force funds placed in reserve by the President	735,754,000

Now, it appears to me that of the over $2,000,000,000 of unexpended funds provided for national defense by the Congress, about a third, or in the vicinity of $600,000,000, can properly be claimed as direct savings to the taxpayer without injury to the national defense. This is saving at a rate considerably higher than Secretary Johnson promised the Armed Services Committee a year ago when he asked for "authority, direction, and control" over the armed services, and he is, in my opinion, entitled to full credit and the compliments of the Nation for it. In the accomplishment of this fine piece of work, some 163,000 civilian employees have been released from the employ of the Department, and a large number of Service installations has been closed or put in an inactive status.

Here in Washington and vicinity, the number of civilian employees has declined from 29,758 to 28,421, a reduction of 1,337. This means that while there was an over-all reduction of 17.4 percent in civilian personnel—from 905,000 to 748,000 as of January 31—the Washington reduction was only 4.5 percent.

This over-all civilian personnel reduction is a great achievement. I fail to understand why the field employees can be reduced by four times the ratio of reduction in Washington. If it can be done in the field, surely it can be done here. I am utterly convinced that this phase of the economy drive has not received the attention it is due. As usual, we are reducing Federal employment in outlying areas but have shied away from applying the pressure to the Nation's Capital where, in my opinion, it should be first applied.

Now, let us give attention to some other points in this economy program.

I want to mention the recent reductions in the effectiveness of the armed forces, especially since these reductions have been widely confused with economies under unification.

A close examination of Mr. Johnson's report shows clearly evident reductions in the armed forces in an amount of about $435,000,000. Added to that is the $736,000,000 in funds appropriated last year to raise the Air Force from 48 to 58 groups which funds were placed in reserve by the President. This makes reductions in the amount of over $1,100,000,000 in the present or potential fighting effectiveness of the armed forces.

So what does it add up to?

It adds up to reductions in an amount of about $1,500,000,000 in the fighting capabilities of the armed forces—reductions, administrative cut-backs, not economies under unification.

I want to state emphatically that, in my judgment, Mr. Johnson's economy scalpel has not only carved away some service fat but has cut—deeply in some areas—into sinew and muscle of the armed services.

The Secretary is to be commended in glowing terms for cutting off the fat. But his economy program has also impaired the fighting effectiveness of the armed forces, and for this the Secretary is not, in my opinion, to be commended.

I regret deeply that in his zeal for economy, Secretary Johnson has weakened the national security in very important respects. And what has been his answer to that charge?

He answered only a few weeks ago in a speech delivered in the city of Washington that the Joint Chiefs of Staff have approved the existing budget—and, therefore, the inference was drawn that the Nation's military leaders are content with the funds requested of the Congress.

But, members of the Committee, in that very address the Secretary contradicted himself. He went on to say that the Joint Chiefs of Staff had requested $20,000,000,000 for national defense. This, in itself, answers the assertion that the Joint Chiefs of Staff are content with the existing national defense budget.

And let me say one thing more about this.

It is an open secret in Washington that the Secretary actually requested a considerably smaller budget for 1951 than was decided upon by the President. It follows, then, that the Secretary, if he had his way, would provide many billions less than the Joint Chiefs of Staff deem to be the minimum required for national security, and considerably less than the President himself considers necessary.

There are issues in this matter of reductions in the armed forces that go to the core of our system of government. They touch the very heart of our representative processes.

I say that until and unless the Constitution of the United States is amended to relieve the Congress of the United States of its responsibilities to provide for the common defense, to raise and support a navy, to provide and maintain an army, the Congress cannot—and, so far as I am concerned, must not—sit idly by and leave to administrative whimsy how small a national defense this Nation will have.

There are some who conceive that the role of the Congress is limited to imposing monetary ceilings on the armed forces—that the Congress has no control, and should have none, over how small the armed forces become.

I deny that categorically.

I say that to the extent that the Congress accedes to that concept, to that extent the Congress unconstitutionally delegates its responsibilities to the executive branch of the Government.

I say that when the armed forces are reduced by others than the Congress, and without prior consultation with the appropriate agencies of the Congress, the American people are thereby deprived of their Constitution-derived control, through their Congress, over the size and type of national defense they want their Government to maintain.

In our scheme of government the Commander in Chief commands the forces placed at his disposal by the Congress; it is not his prerogative under the Constitution to determine the size of those forces. It is the duty of the Department of Defense—which is a creature of the Congress—to request the Congress to provide the armed might that it believes the security of the Nation requires. It is the responsibility of the Congress to decide whether the forces shall be larger or smaller than requested.

Let us get this clear.

The President does not provide the armed forces. That is the function of the Congress. The Congress provides the forces; the President commands them, as Commander in Chief. If we ever get this principle of our Government distorted, our whole fabric of government will be in jeopardy.

But here we have a new concept. It holds that the executive department shall decide how small the armed forces shall be—not the Congress.

It concedes that the Congress can impose ceilings on military strength. But, the idea goes, the Congress cannot establish a floor.

The Appropriations Committee is to be complimented for its searching inquiries of the Secretary of Defense on this point in the hearings of last January.

However, it is not enough merely to point to the problem, important as the problem is a principle of government.

The more important thing is to prevent such unilateral action in the future. For this purpose I introduced a bill on March 6 which would limit the authority of the Secretary of Defense to withhold funds appropriated by the Congress to 5 percent of any particular item. If it is desirable or necessary to withhold more than that, the bill would require consultation with the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives prior to the taking of such action.

The Armed Services Committee will act on that bill at an early date. When it reports the bill, I am hopeful that the House will support it without a dissenting vote and thereby nail down the important principle that the Congress and not the Executive will determine the size of the national defense program to be supported and maintained by this Nation.

Let me call to your attention another point on these reductions.

A new thought is being germinated in Washington these days. It is that by reducing the armed forces we are, by some magical process, growing in strength and becoming militarily more effective.

This is one of the most remarkable ideas I have ever encountered.

It is plausible, of course, that the Army is more efficient today, for immediate combat purposes, than it was a year ago, and despite personnel reductions.

But the Army is much less effective—its fighting potential is lower—today than it was supposed to be on this date under congressional plans of a year ago. Its potential is weaker now, and this is the result of administrative cuts into the muscle of the armed forces.

The same is true of the Air Force. It is far less effective today than the Congress intended it to be today through the appropriation last year for 58 groups; and this is the result of the President refusing to spend $735,750,000 appropriated by the Congress and by Mr. Johnson refusing to allow the expenditure of $243,000,000 which the Congress had said should be spent.

And the Navy?

It has been reduced by 79 active ships. Does that make the Navy stronger? Of course not.

It has been reduced by five attack carrier air groups. Does that make the Navy stronger? Of course not.

The Marine Corps air arm has been reduced by seven fighter squadrons. I rather doubt that the marines have greatly improved in fighting ability from that.

The Navy and marines have been cut down by some 2,000 active airplanes, by almost 70,000 men. I suspect that the increased efficiency and greater fighting strength thus created has not thrown great fear in the hearts of our potential enemies or stiffened the will to resist of our friends abroad. These cuts reduce the fighting potential of the Navy and Marine Corps.

There can be no doubt that these reductions have scaled down the fighting potential of the armed services.

It is absurd to contend that the more you reduce the stronger you get.

I will have to leave it to others to sell this idea that we can rise by falling, that we can advance by retreating, that we can achieve strength through weakness.

Of course we must have economy in national defense.

But let us keep our eyes on our main goal—national security.

The purpose of unification is a sound national defense. Economy is a by-product.

Now, I want to turn to matters more directly involved in the appropriation now before the Committee. Let us talk first about procurement of aircraft.

Now, what does the Subcommittee on Appropriations themselves say about this as regards the Air Force

On page 312 of the subcommittee's report they say that—

> At the rate of aircraft procurement in the present bill, instead of having 48 modern groups in the United States Air Force in 1956, we will have 42 first-line groups.

The subcommittee goes on to say that—

> A projection of the same amount of funds annually for aircraft procurement—
>
> As provided in this bill—
>
> will produce at the end of fiscal year 1956 a lesser number of modernized groups than is contemplated under the present program for fiscal year 1951.

And that is not all. I find on page 312 that the subcommittee has this to say:

> World conditions do not indicate that such a downward trend—
>
> In air power—
>
> is justified.

But, instead of saying right there that the necessary air power should therefore be maintained, the subcommittee arrives at the conclusion that "a restudy and revaluation of military strength projected into future years should be made."

On page 272, the subcommittee says:

> Undoubtedly we are taking certain very grave risks in not being better prepared.

Then, from that honest and accurate admission, the subcommittee goes on to say:

> By and large the committee, in writing the bill, has followed the recommendations of the President and defense officials. This seemed to be the best that could be done under the circumstances.

So, here we have a new idea.

It is that we will knowingly fail to provide the air power the Nation needs.

It is that we will knowingly fail to provide the needed air power in the face of world conditions that, all of us realize, warrant, if anything, an increase, not a decrease, in the Nation's air power.

But what is the Congress to do about it? Why, to quote this report, "the best we can do" is to go along with erroneous decisions someone downtown has made, let our air power decline, put off the decision to tomorrow, next month, next year, and in the meantime, just start a study of the military strength projected into the future.

Now, I subscribe fully to the subcommittee's statement that our Air Force air power is declining, because I know the facts. The subcommittee has accurately represented the facts. It is to be complimented for setting them out so bluntly in its report.

Where I differ with the subcommittee is on its suggested remedy for our declining air power.

The subcommittee suggests only that a study be made.

I say that this Congress has a far greater and a more pressing responsibility than that, in the light of existing world conditions.

I say that it is far from enough merely to start a study and in the meantime approve a program which we know full well will wither American air power on the vine.

It is fine for the subcommittee to make a study. But what are we going to do in the meantime? Let our defenses deteriorate? Let our Air Force air power become second-rate? Let our potential enemies far surpass us in aerial power and in modern, first-line aircraft?

I say, let us have the study. That is fine. But while we are studying, let us hold American air power firm. Any other course of action would be injurious to the national defense. That is what General Eisenhower was trying to get over to the Senate committee a few days ago.

I say that this Congress is defaulting on its responsibility and misleading the people if it sends out word that we will have 48 modern regular groups in the Air Force, and then refuses to provide the number of aircraft necessary to maintain those groups.

This, members of the committee, is a step backward. It is a start toward the unilateral disarmament of our country. It is a refusal to face the facts in today's world. It is putting off to tomorrow what we know perfectly well we must do today.

The issue is very clear. It is clear to all of us here. It is clear to our friends overseas. It is clear to our potential enemies overseas. We cannot dodge it in this bill.

Either we are going to have an adequate air defense, or we are not.

Let us face the facts. Let us do what the situation requires. Let us not shrink in the face of national need. Let us get right down to brass tacks, stand up to our responsibility, and do exactly what we know has to be done in the interest of national defense.

Now, what are the facts?

Take the Air Force first. What has happened to our Air Force since the war?

Five years ago our Air Force had 273 groups. It was the greatest and most powerful Air Force in all the world. But by the middle of 1946 we had reduced it to 38 groups. It was then that we adopted a program looking to the rebuilding of the Air Force. Our plan was to get 55 groups by the end of 1947. That was to grow to 66 groups by the middle of 1948. Our goal was 70 groups. We were to reach that early in 1949.

And how long ago did the 70-group idea originate?

Here is what General Vandenberg, Air Force Chief of Staff, said on May 26, 1948:

> The Air Force has maintained since 1945 that the minimum Air Force we could afford to have was 70 groups. I want to emphasize two things: First, our program is not a new program, generated by present world uncertainties and apprehensions.
>
> Second. It is a peacetime program.

And what lay behind the 70-group concept? It was such thinking as that of the then Acting Secretary of State and former Assistant Secretary of War for Air, Hon. Robert A. Lovett, who said:

> This country has got to make up its mind whether it will be the leading air power. There is nothing more pathetic than a second-rate air power, because while you have a sense of security there is no security—as far as I know it is the cheapest way of buying security that there is.

We are now up to early 1948. We had the President's Air Policy Commission—the Finletter Commission. It strongly endorsed the 70-group program. That was followed by the Joint Congressional Aviation Policy Board which reviewed the findings of the Air Policy Commission. It, too, decided that the Nation must have 70 groups for its minimum protection.

So what did we do in the Congress? Did we start another study?

Why, of course not. We did what was right and proper. We knew the facts and acted on the facts. We added $822,000,000 in aircraft funds to the Air Force appropriations, over the protest of the late and beloved James Forrestal, then Secretary of Defense.

And at that time it was the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], who offered the amendment himself.

By December of 1948, the Air Force had reached a strength of 59 activated groups through our increased appropriation and was well on the road toward our goal of 70 groups.

Then came the 1950 budget. It was preceded by a month on the House floor by the so-called 70-group authorization bill that we reported from the Armed Services Committee. That 70-group authorization bill was passed by the House by a vote of 395 to 4. The Congress wanted it. The people wanted it. And the Congress unhesitatingly shouldered the responsibility.

The debate on the 1950 budget came along in April of 1949. We found that the administration had decided that the Nation did not need 70 groups after all. The new idea was that 48 groups would be enough. And then what did this Congress do?

Did the Congress say then that the best we could do was to go along with the President and the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Johnson?

We said emphatically no.

The House, and later the Senate, asserted that the writing of national defense policy is properly a function of the Congress.

The Congress did then what it should do now, on this budget.

And what was that policy established by the Congress?

It was the policy of the Congress to emphasize air power—to provide, in this year of atomic weapons, the aerial protection and aerial offense necessary for the minimum preparedness of our Nation.

And how did the House vote on that issue?

It voted 271 to 1 in favor of a bill that added $851,000,000 to the 1950 budget over the protest of Secretary of Defense, Mr. Johnson. And who led the fight? The distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], aided and abetted by the able chairman of the Defense Subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

By that vote, the Congress said that, instead of 48 groups, the Nation must—and would—have 58 groups. The Congress insisted upon another step along the road toward the goal of 70 groups.

And then what happened?

The President and the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Johnson, said the Congress was wrong. They said that the Executive, not the Congress, will decide how much air power this Nation will support and maintain. So $735,754,000 of the funds provided by the Congress for the Air Force were put in reserve. The Appropriations Committee has well stated in its report that this act amounted to an item veto which clearly transcends the authority of the President.

Then after the President held up the funds, Secretary Johnson decided that the air strength left in the Air Force was still too large.

So, now Secretary Johnson comes along and withholds $243,000,000 more of Air Force funds.

So what do we have? Of last year's appropriations, the executive branch has refused to spend $978,776,000 of Air Force funds provided by the Congress, on grounds that the Congress knows nothing about the problem and has no business providing more defense than the Executive Department decides it wants the Nation to maintain.

Now we have the 1951 budget which is before us today.

And what does it do to the Air Force?

Well, now we have a brand new approach. This budget says that we will still hang to the magical figure of 48, plus 11 Air National Guard groups. The figure 70 is now ridiculed. Someone thinks "48" sounds better. And here is the brand new wrinkle. The Secretary of Defense, Mr. Johnson, says we are not even to maintain the 48 groups in a modern condition. We are going to let six of those regular Air Force groups become second-line groups in a very few years by simply not providing enough money for new aircraft.

Now, members of the Committee, just where is this House going to stand? Just what is the House going to do about it?

Just at what place and when is the House going to exert its prerogatives, meet its responsibilities, and provide the defense it knows the Nation must have?

As one Member of the House, I say the place to stand is this 1951 budget.

And the time to stand is right now.

And the way to do it is to amend this bill at least so as to maintain 48 modern air groups in the Air Force. To do that will require an additional $200,000,000.

That $200,000,000 will enable the Air Force in fiscal year 1951 to procure approximately 77 additional aircraft, including medium bombers, medium and heavy transports, and helicopters, to rehabilitate 228 aircraft for the flying training program, and to modernize 71 B–29 aircraft as tankers for use in air-to-air refueling flights.

It is this additional sum of money that is absolutely necessary if we are to build up in an orderly fashion the 48-group program in the Regular Air Force. If the House refuses to make this money available, then by 1956 we will have only 42 modern regular groups.

I still maintain that the Congress should hold to the 70-group program in the Regular Air Force. If it was sound in 1948, as two exhaustive studies found it to be, then developments internationally since then, especially the Russian atom bomb explosion announced last September, make it even more necessary today.

And let me say to you that nothing has caused Russia to stop, look, and listen more than the ability of this Nation to conduct intercontinental bombing. Our ability to do so has been a powerful instrument for peace.

But, I am a realist.

I know that the Congress is at this time inclined to measure the adequacy of our defenses by dollars. I disagree sharply with that standard. I maintain that we must buy the defense the Nation must have, regardless of cost. I say that enemy capabilities, not dollars, determine our defense needs. But being a realist, I say that if we are to reduce to 48 Regular groups, well then, let us have 48 groups. And that requires an additional $200,000,000 in aircraft procurement funds in this bill for the Air Force.

You gentleman call for 48 Regular Air Force groups in this bill.

Well, let us have 48 modern groups. And let us provide the money that will maintain those 48 groups.

Now, to sum up, here we have the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], leading the fight in 1948 for additional air power.

Then, again, we have the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] leading the fight in 1949 for increased air power, ably supported and assisted by the distinguished subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

They knew at that time that the security of the Nation requires 70 modern Air Force groups. And they knew it then—well before we knew that Russia had the atom bomb.

It is universally known today that Russia is building the largest air force in the world. What are they building it for? They are building it for use whenever their carefully timed Pearl Harbor day comes around.

And here we are, the richest and most powerful Nation in the world, year by year withering our Air Force on the vine.

Now, the issue is clear-cut.

It is whether the Congress will say what kind of defense the Nation will have, or whether the creature of the Congress, the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Louis Johnson, will tell us what kind of defense he will let the Congress have.

A vote for the additional $200,000,000 for the Air Force means that the Congress fulfills its constitutional responsibility to provide for the common defense.

A vote against the $200,000,000 means that Mr. Louis Johnson tells the Congress the character of defense that he will let the Nation have.

And now, what about the air power of the Navy—air power that is just as much a part of the total air power of our Nation as the air power of the Air Force.

What does this bill do to naval aviation?

I can find only one comment in the subcommittee report that hints at the facts on naval aviation. It is a terse little remark on page 295 of the report, which says that the number of aircraft authorized to be procured by the Navy under this bill is 817.

Then the report says that this number does not represent actual requirements.

That is a mighty mild statement as compared with the facts.

For, in truth, this bill continues a trend which ultimately will virtually destroy naval aviation.

The subcommittee dismisses the situation with the mild observation that the number of aircraft provided for the Navy does not represent actual requirements.

The situation is infinitely more serious than that indicates.

Before looking at this bill's effect on naval aviation, let me trace briefly what has happened to naval aviation in the past 2 years.

Less than 2 years ago Congress passed and the President signed a bill providing for a 10,713-operating-plane Navy.

But in 1949 the naval air army was reduced from the 10,713 level to 7,783 aircraft—a reduction of almost 3,000 planes. Now, we go down from 7,783, the fiscal year 1950 level, to 6,233 aircraft proposed in this bill—a further reduction of over 1,500 planes. This makes a reduction in naval aircraft, in the past 2 years, while world conditions have become more grave, of 4,500 planes—a reduction of over 40 percent in 2 years. Almost 3,700 of the 4,500 reduction has been in Regular Navy and Marine Corps aircraft.

So we have had a steady decline in every phase of naval aviation since 1948. We have had a 40 percent reduction in the total operating aircraft of the Navy in 2 years. We have, in 2 years, cut almost in half the number of Regular Navy and Regular Marine Corps aircraft.

Now, what about this bill? Does it support this sharply reduced level of naval aircraft? Or is it so geared that naval aviation will be rendered impotent in the future?

Let us look at the facts.

The facts are that this bill leaves a deficiency in naval aircraft procurement of 1,349 planes. The bill authorizes the procurement of only 817 new naval aircraft. That is 1,349 fewer than the 2,166 aircraft needed by the Navy to maintain the 6,233 operating aircraft authorized by this bill.

And what effect will this have on naval aviation? Here is what Admiral Pride, Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics, told the Appropriations Subcommittee:

> It is significant that this procurement level of 817 aircraft, if continued, would result in a progressive reduction of the aircraft operating inventory to less than 3,000 aircraft, which is less than half the budgeted 1951 operating strength.

So now it is clear what is meant by the cryptic remark in the report of the subcommittee that naval aircraft procurement "does not represent actual requirements."

Why, the fact is, Mr. Chairman, it not only does not represent actual requirements, but it contemplates, within the near future, the cutting of naval aviation in half.

I defy any Member of this House to explain to me what can justify this violent reduction in naval aviation.

Why, even today naval air strength is lower than it was in December 1941, at the time of Pearl Harbor. Then, the Navy's aircraft operating level was 5,432 of Regular Navy aircraft. Then, aircraft deliveries were being made at a rate approximately 300 a month.

And what does this appropriation provide?

It provides only 4,389 Regular Navy operating aircraft—over 1,000 aircraft less than we had idn December 1941.

It provides for a monthly delivery rate of less than 70 aircraft. That is less than one-fourth the pre-Pearl Harbor rate.

So we have the same situation for the Navy, under this bill, that we have for the Air Force.

We are proposing an operating level of 6,233 naval aircraft. But we are knowingly failing to provide enough new aircraft to support that operating level.

We are killing this Nation's naval air power. That is what we are doing.

And what needs to be done about it?

I said a minute ago that the 817 naval aircraft proposed for procurement in this bill are 1,349 less than the 2,166 necessary to maintain the 6,233 operating aircraft authorized by this bill.

Of this deficiency of 1,349 planes, 530 are Regular Navy aircraft. The remainder, 819, are for the Naval Reserve.

In view of this situation, the very least we can do is to insist upon providing the Regular Navy with adequate funds to maintain the reduced number of first-line aircraft authorized for Regular Navy units in the next fiscal year.

And what is the Regular Navy's situation in first-line combat aircraft?

The total number of first-line aircraft required in Regular Navy combat units by the end of the next fiscal year is 2,576 of the total of 6,233 Navy operating aircraft authorized in this bill. The Navy will have 1,286 of these planes available by the end of the next fiscal year, leaving a deficiency of 1,290 first-line combat aircraft for Regular Navy combat units.

So to keep up our first-line combat units in the Regular Navy, 1,290 aircraft will have to be procured in the next fiscal year.

But what does this bill authorize in combat aircraft? Only 769. That is 521 short of the total required to maintain even the sharply reduced level of Regular Navy combat planes proposed in this bill.

And what are these 521 planes?

They are 379 fighter planes, 123 attack planes, 19 patrol planes. Nine others, including attack transports for the Marine Corps, are also needed for the first-line combat units of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps, giving us a total of 530 planes the Navy is short of its needs—for the Regular Navy combat units alone—under this bill.

And what would they cost?

They would cost $383,289,221.

So I say, at the very least, the Congress must provide the Regular Navy with the aircraft needed to keep its combat air arm from withering on the vine, as this bill would have it do.

That will take an additional $383,289,221 more than the $511,000,000 of new procurement funds authorized for the Navy in this bill. Add to this sum the approximately $123,000,000 that were withheld by Secretary of Defense Johnson from last year's naval aviation budget, which is carried forward in this budget as part of the new procurement fund, and that would give us a total of

$1,071,289,211 in aircraft procurement funds for the Navy—a fund still low in comparison to need, for it still fails to provide a single first-line combat plane for the Naval Air Reserve.

So what I am recommending in total, Mr. Chairman, is supplemental funds in the amount of $583,289,221—$200,000,000 more for the Air Force and $383,289,221 for the Navy—to support and maintain the first-line combat aircraft strength of those services as provided in this budget.

It can be said categorically and factually—and I am sure the Appropriations Committee must agree with me—that this budget is short by that amount and much more in meeting our air-power requirements.

I say that we will be derelict in our responsibilities to the Nation if we fail to remedy these critical flaws in this proposed appropriation.

Even by providing the $583,000,000 additional, our defenses will still be seriously deficient in two respects as regards air power.

That additional sum will not restore the over 2,000-plane reduction already suffered by the Navy in the past 2 years and will not provide a single first-line combat aircraft for the Naval Air Reserve.

That sum will provide no increase above 48 groups in the Air Force, and this air strength is at least 13 groups below the minimum required for the aerial defense of the United States.

No Member of this body questions the fact that we must take calculated risks in our defense program.

And we have to have economy wherever possible.

But we are backsliding into impotency in air power; we are critically jeopardizing our Nation's security; we are again encouraging war through weakness, for the Kremlin responds only to force, and I say to you that the safest road to permanent peace is for this great Nation to maintain modern and powerful armed forces, and especially an adequate air power both in our Navy and Air Force, which this bill does not do.

As General Eisenhower said on March 29 before the Senate Appropriations Committee, "in certain details we've been a bit careless."

I say to this House that the national defense is one place where we cannot afford to be "a bit careless."

While I recognize that this Nation can never achieve an absolute defense—and while, of course, our Nation abhors maintenance of large standing armed strength—we are living in a time of international stress and tension that requires, if we are to err, that we err on the side of preparedness rather than on the side of economy.

Gentlemen, the atomic blitz of tomorrow is a real, a genuine possibility.

We have no alternative but to prepare today for meeting it tomorrow, because tomorrow our preparations may well be far too late.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. The statement the gentleman has made would indicate that it might be possible to effect a saving in the personnel picture at the Pentagon.

Mr. VINSON. I certainly agree with the gentleman. Over all there has been a reduction of 17.4 percent. Here in Washington, where an equivalent reduction should take place, the Department had 29,758 employees and it now has 28,421, a reduction of only 1,337. We ought to have some fair examination here in the departments to see if we cannot bring about a further reduction in the personnel here in Washington. This is where there should be some reductions, not only in the armed services but in the other departments as well. There are just entirely too many people in the city of Washington on the pay roll.

Mr. TABER. I wonder to what extent the practice has gone on of substituting a uniformed WAC for every one of the civilian personnel who have been cut off?

Mr. VINSON. That is not going on very fast. They probably are doing that, but what we want to do is to get some of this enormous number of civilian personnel out of the District of Columbia.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. I wish to compliment the gentleman from Georgia for his very masterly discussion of a momentous problem, and to state that I concur in the views which he has expressed. However, I am deeply concerned about one aspect of the proposal which he says he is going to offer. Having in mind what has happened in the last 2 years with respect to our Defense Establishment, as I see it, the Congress is gradually and rather rapidly losing control of its Military Establishment. I should like to ask the gentleman what reason he has to believe that, assuming his suggestion is adopted by the Congress, it will be carried out by the administration?

Mr. VINSON. In reply to the question of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE], let me say that I am hoping by the time this bill is passed by the House and the Senate the House will have passed a bill pending in the Armed Services Committee today, which will prohibit the Secretary of National Defense from reducing any item in this bill more than 5 percent until he consults with the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]. Of course, I recognize the fact that we may not be able to pass any law to make the President spend the money, but public opinion will make the President do certain things.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has again expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], chairman of the Subcommittee on Armed Services.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I stand here almost defenseless, without manuscript or previous release of my remarks to the press, and I stand here under the further embarrassing situation of following the brilliant address of that legislator and patriot extraordinary, the chairman of the legislative committee on the armed forces, the distinguished gentleman from the State of Georgia [Mr. VINSON]. I appreciate the generous words of tribute which he paid to me and to the members of the subcommittee, and I reciprocate in my esteem for him personally. He has made a tremendous contribution to the cause of good government and national security. These words come straight from the shoulder and right from the heart.

If there is anyone in America who is so naive and ill-advised that he does not want more money for national defense, there is something radically wrong with the information which he has or with his thinking. All of us want more money for national defense. I can think of no more popular issue than to espouse with enthusiasm and vigor the cause of national defense; and I love to wave the flag, and carry it when I can.

The question is, How much national defense do we have? How much can we afford to spend for military purposes? How much in our best interest should we spend on the cause of national defense? If we spend so much, and our enemies hope we will, that we bring on the collapse of the economy of the United States, we will have spent ourselves into defeat. Our air power, great as it is, and our Navy and our Army, great as they are, are not the things that strike terror to the heart of the enemy today and preserve the peace. These things contribute. The thing that makes America the foremost leader of all the world today is America's industrial potential, America's capacity to fight back and continue to fight back until victory has been achieved. That is what the enemy fears, and anything that enters into the body of this America and destroys the pulsing industrial heart of America is something dangerous indeed. No man can claim to be a true and wise advocate of national defense who would espouse the spending of more money for national defense than we can afford. Those who would spend to the extent that our industrial economy and our way of life is destroyed are not friends of national defense. They inadvertently are winning the victory for the enemy from within. That is a cheaper victory than winning from without.

Not long ago with other Members of Congress I journeyed down to the National Gallery of Art, to see the Austrian exhibits. After looking at the pictures here and there I came to a place where I observed a number of coats of armor, belonging to knights of old, standing at attention. They were quite impressive as they stood there—these figures of steel.

I thought then as I think now that I could have walked up to one of these impressive coats of mail and pushed it over. It would have lacked the capacity to rise because it did not have the blood and the sinew; it did not have life within it, a healthy, pulsating, vigorous life. The thing that we must do in this country is to be sure the industrial heart keeps beating, that the circulation con-

tinues to flow, that we are capable of fighting and if pushed aside for a moment to rise and fight again as we did during World War II.

The distinguished gentleman from Georgia almost made me feel as I listened entranced to his rhetoric that we were standing naked, as it were, to the enemies who would destroy us. But I am reminded to say at this point that the United States of America is better prepared to repel immediately an attack from an enemy than it has been on any day or at any hour since hostilities ceased at the close of World War II. We have the most modern weapons we have ever had in the history of our national defense program and our Military Establishment is more in a state of readiness to repel an attack than at any time since the shooting stopped in World War II.

Mr. Chairman, when we speak of national defense we do not speak of $12,800,000,000 in this bill or $13,000,000,000 to use a round figure; we must think of the entire national defense program of this country.

This morning, knowing that the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services would speak, I decided I would like to present to you graphically in these charts a few facts. And I scribbled hastily a few notes as I listened to the eloquent address of the gentleman from Georgia.

The national defense program for the coming fiscal year shapes up about as we see it here on the chart. In the military part of this bill there are $12,800,000,000 in cash. In contract authority—and the only reason it is not cash is because the military people say that they cannot spend it now, they say, "Just give us contract authority, we cannot spend it for 4 or 5 years"—we give them $2,000,000,000, making a total of $14,800,000,000.

In the subcommittee handled by my colleague from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] for the Atomic Energy Commission about $650,000,000 are included.

Is there anyone so lacking in judgment that he doubts that the work we are doing on the atomic bomb and on the hydrogen bomb is not national defense? I think not. And, because the Commission cannot spend the entire billion dollars in one year, it is given $310,000,000 in contract authorization.

Stock piling. Who is there among us who can say that there is anything much more important than the stock piling of critical materials from abroad which might be denied us for a season in the event of hostilities? There is $633,000,000 for stock piling and $100,000,000 for contract authorization.

These letters "NACA" indicate one of the most important agencies in the world today, the National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics, which has been pioneering for many years in the field of national defense to make sure that America leads the parade. Here is $56,000,000 to continue that important work which has made such a tremendous contribution to our security in former years.

Next on the chart is Government and relief in occupied areas, $321,000,000, a part of the defense program around the world.

Voice of America, $34,000,000.

Mutual defense assistance, $650,000,000. That is a very important part of our program. Just recently a number of B-29's set sail on their way across the blue Atlantic in order that they might be over there near the potential enemy and in the hands of friends if trouble comes.

Does anybody say that the hundreds of millions we are spending there is not national defense? It is national defense of the first order. Just this morning I had the opportunity to talk with that able and eminent soldier and statesman, Gen. Omar Bradley, about the conference held in The Hague recently, having as its aim an agreement that might augment the defense of the western democracies against the threat of totalitarianism.

Next on the chart is military public works, $300,000,000 in cash, and I will be glad to support, and I urge the immediate bringing by the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services to the floor, the public works bill, which was delayed last year, and which was sorely needed, and of which we are more in need now, if we are to meet the situation confronting us in military housing.

ECA. I think the average Member of the House voted for ECA not because of any philanthropy—and let us not let philanthropy and the milk of human kindness dry up within our souls—but let it be said in all frankness that we voted this ECA money in the interest of national defense. Those who thought it had no national defense qualities probably voted against it.

So, we have a total of $20,500,000,000 for national defense in the fiscal year 1951. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations I do no come before you as one who has in the past been hesitant to recommend vast appropriations for national defense. I yield to no Member in my desire to achieve the maximum in national security. But we must not spend ourselves into bankruptcy in the name of national defense. Our military leaders, men like General Eisenhower and General Bradley, men like General Collins, Admiral Sherman, and General Vandenberg, members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, are right when they say that it is completely out of the question in peacetime for the Nation to be in a state of absolute and complete readiness for war. It would destroy our economy. It would bring on the police state. It would destroy our liberties. No wise man advocates any such program. Why, it would be very nice, indeed, if the pulsing motors of aircraft were tuned up now at Bolling Field, near Washington, D. C., and if every city and installation were fortified with armaments at every moment to meet every possible emergency. It would be a consoling thing, in a way, if we lived in a state of complete armed readiness. But we lack the resources and the manpower to fortify every portion of our great and spacious country. What we are trying to do is not to become like a synthetic man in armor in a museum, having everything in armament and nothing inside, what we are trying to do is to maintain a healthy condition and have the maximum of defense within our capabilities.

We see on this chart that the estimated national income is $37,000,000,000 and the estimated deficit for 1951 is in round figures $5,000,000,000. Faced with that situation, the committee brought in a bill approximately as had been recommended to us by General Bradley and the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Well may we go slow in buying certain equipment. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL], a member of the committee, is one of the finest patriots I know and one of our best informed men on military matters. He said the other day in a radio broadcast that certain times may be called epoch-making times. We are in one of those periods now, an epoch-making time. It is sort of like the time when gunpowder was discovered, or the steamboat. It is a time of rapid transition in weapons. It would be a serious mistake indeed if we should spend so much money on hardware, weapons of different kinds, that within 2 or 3 years all of that equipment would be out of date and obsolete.

In talking with the Commander in Chief of the Army, Navy, and Air Force a few months ago I was impressed with his urging that the most important money in the military budget is for research and development. In order to keep this expenditure figure for hardware as low as we can, we have tried to spend as much as we dare spend in the field of research and development, in order that we may lead the parade of nations and be prepared for the emergencies that may arise.

I wish you would take a look at that figure for research and development on the chart. Your committee and your Military Establishment have not been asleep. They have been aware for months of the problem confronting us.

We read in childhood that—

The heights by great men reached and kept
Were not attained by sudden flight,
But they, while their companions slept,
Were toiling upward in the night.

America has not slept during this postwar period. But America has been "toiling upward in the night" since 1946, preparing through research and development the finest weapons that have ever been conceived in the history of man. We have made so much progress in the field of research and development that we have outmoded practically every weapon we have. When we have made a little more progress in some more of them, we will be able to get more deeply into the hardware phase—the procurement phase—but do not let us buy too much hardware too soon and have too much obsolete matériel which we will have to consign to the scrap heap.

We are proposing to spend in this budget $143,000,000 for guided-missile warfare. That is just in its infancy. We do not have much money for hardware yet, but that will come later on. The guided missile will revolutionize cer-

tain phases of warfare as we know it. If world war III comes, which God forbid, it will not be like World War I or World War II.

So we are in an epoch-making period. We have come to this epoch-making period by our own plan and design. In research and development we have spent near $3,000,000,000 in the last few years, more than we spent on the atomic bomb, in order that we might go forward in the most important field which will lead to peace and security, if arms can bring peace and security.

The distinguished gentleman from Georgia has talked to us about the woeful inadequacy of the military appropriation bill from the standpoint of aircraft. The Navy has 14,000 aircraft. The United States Air Force has 21,000 aircraft. It would be easy to insist that we thereby have a tremendous reservoir of air power. We do have, but the figures I have given you could be misleading. We must admit there are many trainers included in the aircraft inventory and there are many obsolete planes of many types. Thousands of them are in moth balls and may never be used. We have 6,000 bombers in the United States Air Force, not all modern, not all in use. Yet they certainly would have a very important function to perform if war should come tomorrow. But we are looking forward to the new designs, the jet aircraft, and the electronic devices, many of which have not quite been perfected, but are in the process of perfection. We are looking forward to them. They will outmode other aircraft and devices. We are proceeding cautiously with our aircraft procurement program.

Here is a figure on the chart I would like you to look at carefully—$5,300,000,000. If the House of Representatives and the Senate and the President of the United States approve the military bill which is before you, that much money will be available for expenditure on the morning of July 1, 1950, for aircraft procurement. That is not a trifling sum. "Oh," someone might say, "that is in contract authorization, is it not?" Yes, some of it is in contract authorization. Why is it in contract authorization? Because it takes time to build these airplanes. That money may not all be spent in 3 or 4 or 5 years; we have to proceed slowly. Modern aircraft and weapons are unbelievably complicated in design and construction. But Congress has permitted all the obligational authority to be made available; there is nothing between the military people and the purchase of this material, except the ability of American industry to produce. So look carefully at that figure of $5,300,000,000 before saying that the Subcommittee on Military Appropriations is not somewhat air-minded in its thinking and in its record in previous years in supporting the cause of air power.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. We heard that same argument in 1940 and 1941. I was in Hawaii in 1937, and I pointed out to the military forces that our Air Force there looked like an air force at a country fair. Yet they neglected the air force and we suffered the greatest humiliation ever inflicted on a civilized nation at Pearl Harbor in 1941.

I agree with the gentleman. I am for economy where it is necessary, but if we have another war it is going to be fought with airplanes and atomic bombs. We cannot wait to fire the second shot. We must be ready whenever any enemy threatens us with an attack, as we should have been when Pearl Harbor fell.

Mr. MAHON. We hope that through the processes of unification which to some degree are successful, and the bitter lesson learned by our Navy and Army at Pearl Harbor, that the human error will not be made again, that our military will be ready and able to meet any attack.

Congress can appropriate the money, but Congress of course cannot administer the program.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. SIKES. Although the equipment was limited at the time of Pearl Harbor, had that equipment been used effectively there would have been no catastrophe there. There was radar. There were planes. There were ships in sufficient number to prevent that attack. Had that equipment been used, the disaster would never have occurred. Piling up equipment is not the sole answer to this question.

Mr. MAHON. Piling up equipment is only one of the segments of this picture.

Mr. RANKIN. Putting the equipment at the right place would have prevented the disaster at Pearl Harbor.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. PATTERSON. I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas what his idea of the preparedness program would be. Would it be one along atomic lines, bacteriological warfare, missiles, or just the conventional-type war?

Mr. MAHON. Our idea of warfare must be realistic. Until the guided missile, which within a few years can be fired 5,000 miles and hit the target area, has been perfected, we had better have something else as a substitute. Until the time comes when a ship at sea can proceed within a thousand miles of its target and hit the target with a guided missile we had better be prepared to fight with conventional ships. Until the time ceases to be when an airplane must fly over its target—and the time will come when a bomber will not undertake to fly over the target but will release its missile possibly hundreds of miles away—until that time comes, we must have the B-36 and the B-29, the B-47 and improved types of these conventional weapons. Atomic warfare is not the complete answer to the problem which confronts us. Everybody knew that Russia would eventually have the atomic bomb, and the atomic bomb had already been discounted in military planning and it was not especially significant that it came a year or so earlier than anticipated. It had already been taken into the picture by our defense planners.

Mr. PATTERSON. If you say that, you are agreeing with the eminent chairman of the Armed Services Committee in his proposal.

Mr. MAHON. I usually agree with the eminent chairman of the Armed Services Committee. I do not take serious disagreement with him, generally. I would like to spend far more money than he advocates. I would go him one step farther and double it, if we could afford it.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. Your chart on expenditures for the national defense program, while almost complete, is not entirely complete.

Mr. MAHON. I just thought that up in a hurry yesterday afternoon.

Mr. STEFAN. I notice you omitted approximately $200,000,000 for the Civil Aviation Administration, much of which contains funds for national defense. You also omitted the money appropriated for a new venture in air-navigation development which, when complete, will cost $1,500,000,000. The chart is not entirely complete, in that other appropriations for defense would increase that approximately $2,000,000,000.

Mr. MAHON. Well, I would say the chart is quite conservative. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. For example, these figures for research and development are exclusive of the figures which would pay military personnel who work with the research and development program.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. HARDY. The $5,300,000,000 in funds and authority for the purchase of aircraft is quite an imposing figure. That is true.

Mr. MAHON. That is right.

Mr. HARDY. But does the gentleman take issue with the statement of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] to the effect that under this bill the effective strength of the Air Force will be actually be 42 groups rather than 48 groups? And does the gentleman agree further with the statement of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] that the Navy's effective fighting force will be reduced by 1,500 effective planes, under this legislation?

Mr. MAHON. I would like to comment on that. The position of the committee will be found in the report. The hearings make it very clear, but it is found in the report which points out that at this time we have 46 modern groups. That does not count the Navy and does not count our National Guard. With the program we have this year we will have 48 modern groups in 1952.

In other words, the point of the gentleman's argument is that by 1956—and much of warfare may be revolutionized by that time in many fields—by 1956 we

would have only 42 modern groups if we continued this level of aircraft procurement. That is a matter, as the printed hearings will reveal, which gave the committee much concern. Yet under this bill, in 1952, we shall have 48 modern groups—the strongest we have ever been in modernity, if I may use the word, in our Air Force.

As to the Navy's striking power, it is true that the Navy has fewer planes, but the Navy says, "Qualitatively, we are in the best shape we have ever been."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 15 additional minutes.

Mr. MAHON. The point is that our emphasis is upon compactness—upon streamlining; it is upon efficiency; it is upon research and development; it is with the idea that if war comes we can spring more quickly to full posture, as the military people say, for the defense of our country.

Mr. HARDY. That is, of course, an admirable position, provided we do not bring our effective forces to a point below the irreducible minimum for our safety. The question is, Are we going to determine in the Congress what that position is? Or, are we going to permit the Secretary of Defense, through the administration of the funds which we provide, to use his own discretion, notwithstanding the position which the Congress takes?

Mr. MAHON. I do not know about the Secretary of Defense. The President has impounded money in the so-called Presidential reserve fund. I am told by the Secretary of Defense, and it is supported by the printed record, that it was the action of the Commander in Chief that resulted in the withholding of some of the funds that we appropriated last year. I took, and I take, violent disagreement with the executive branch of the Government for impounding funds which Congress appropriates for defense. If the gentleman will read the report, much of which I wrote with my own hand, he will find the views of the gentleman from Texas with regard to that matter.

Mr. HARDY. I commend the committee for the fine work that it has done. I have just one further question to ask. I have been informed that under this bill there will not be one single first-line plane for use by the Naval Air Reserve. Is that correct?

Mr. MAHON. I could not say offhand. If the gentleman will read the hearings, he will have the figure. I would remind him, however, that we are just coming into the use of jets on a large scale. Perhaps the gentleman noticed in the paper a picture of the first jets landing on a carrier. We are just moving into this field, and our Reserve and our National Guard must proceed very carefully with these fast-moving, intricate, electronic, and expensive first-line planes. We are going as far as we can.

Let me say further with respect to the program of the Navy, that we were careful to continue the ship-building program at the rate of $300,000,000 for 1951. The Navy is not withering on the vine; it continues to be quite vigorous. But it has been reduced sharply in its operations.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. SIKES. I wish to point out that in response to a question by me testimony was given, and it appears in the record, that the naval reservists are flying jet planes. Jets certainly are first-line planes.

Mr. MAHON. One of our Air Force reservists, a Member of Congress, was flying a jet when he lost his life last year. As I say, I sometimes question the wisdom of permitting reservists who are not constantly on the job flying these jets, because disastrous experience sometimes results.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, if my memory serves me correctly, the Navy has in the neighborhood of some two or three hundred submarines. What progress is the Navy now making in converting those submarines to the snorkel type? In other words, are there any funds in this bill to permit the Navy to go ahead and convert and modernize our old submarines?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman has raised certainly one of the most important questions in the national defense picture. We are making, as you know, real developments in the antisubmarine warfare and undersea warfare. We have under construction at this time killer submarines and other types of submarines, and we are converting numerous destroyers, in order that they may do a better job in antisubmarine warfare. The first, No. 1, priority of the Navy today, and rightly so, is antisubmarine warfare and well might that be true because the greatest threat to us on the seas is the Russian fleet of submarines.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, may I compliment Chairman MAHON and his subcommittee. I do not think any subcommittee I have ever served on knows more about this subject than does the gentleman's subcommittee.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is overly generous.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman from Texas stated that in 1952 there would be a modern 48 group.

Mr. MAHON. I believe that is correct.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman will admit, will he not, that in 1952 it goes down?

Mr. MAHON. Yes. We point that out in our report, and this is a very serious matter and something must be done to meet the situation.

Mr. VINSON. Let the House know that in 1952 by the money in this bill there will be a modern 48 group, but for lack of money in this bill from 1952 on you send it down.

Mr. MAHON. I would not make that statement quite that way because the money in this bill or most of it for aircraft procurement will not be spent for 2 or 3 years. We called upon the Secretary of Defense and General Bradley to make sure that in presenting this budget next year they have adequate funds to keep that 48-group figure level. When General Eisenhower was before us on the 24th day of February in an unreported meeting he said: "Gentlemen, you should know before you report this bill what you propose to spend in fiscal 1952, the following year." I agree with him. We went into a huddle with the Joint Chiefs of Staff and with the Secretary of Defense and they said: "Our tentative figure for 1952 is the same, $13,000,000,000. What we want is stability of national defense."

Mr. VINSON. Since the gentleman mentioned the Secretary of Defense, it recalls to my mind that around 1 o'clock at a news conference the Secretary said that "on account of the money in this bill, on account of the arguments that have been stated about the procurement for aviation, both for the Air Force and the Naval Air Force," he is submitting the question to the Joint Chiefs of Staff to see if his recommendations were right.

Mr. MAHON. Well, that was the request we made of the Joint Chiefs and the Secretary of Defense some time ago. This committee will not, if we are supported, let our air power wither on the vine.

It might be pointed out that one of the significant things General Eisenhower said was that we cannot have national defense by hysteria. While he points out that he never saw this bill, or the final budget, he can speak generally and authoritatively in military matters, but not with complete accuracy, not having read the details of the program. Repeating, one of the most important things he said was, "Gentlemen, we cannot have national defense by hysteria." He decried hysteria.

It has been my observation, and I say this in all kindness, that about the time we have our military bill each year on the floor, the flying saucers begin to sail across the western horizon and the unidentified submarines flit to and fro in the Pacific waters and even our friends come out and say in the headlines of the press, and I quote, "Russia is planning a new Pearl Harbor," and things of that nature. I am glad to be warned, and it is true we are faced with a grave peril, Mr. Chairman, but I say to you that Eisenhower was never more everlastingly correct than when he said: "We cannot have legislation by hysteria, that we must not underrate the enemy, neither should we overrate the enemy."

What is the potential threat to Washington, D. C., today? The Russian air power. How many heavy bombers does Russia have? None; not one. How many medium bombers does Russia have? About 300, maybe 400. How many do we have? Hundreds and hundreds and hundreds. Russia has a few of the B–29 type. Of course, a nation with three or four hundred bombers in making an attack is going to get some of them through, and that would be

gravely serious in an atomic war, but if we had, instead of 5,000 bombers 50,000 bombers, an enemy could still penetrate our defenses to some extent. So, while we do not want to underestimate the potential enemy, we do not want to overrate him, either.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Knowing from personal experience some of the tedious tasks of deciphering some of the military budget, I wish to commend the gentleman on the very fine presentation he has made of this difficult subject today.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman. I think you might want me to say something about the radar fence. For the radar fence we appropriated $50,000,000 last year, and that money has not been spent nor obligated. It soon will be. It is a difficult task, and we are going to provide more for the radar fence when it is needed. It is a slow-going proposition. We have provided for industrial mobilization and all those key factors as best we could that would augment and improve our national-defense program.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. Very high in our national-defense program is the National Security Resources Board. That Board, I understand, is charged with the mobilization of our industrial might, our civilian preparedness, the preparedness of our cities against atomic attack or poison-gas attack. Yet, that Board has been without a permanent chairman for more than a year and a half, in fact, until the current program, when Mr. Symington was named to head that Board. Does not the gentleman, in carrying out his responsibility as chairman of this most important committee, consider that fact most unfortunate?

Mr. MAHON. I do, and I breathe much easier now that Stuart Symington, that extraordinary man with remarkable vigor and understanding and capacity is now to be head of the Board. We have provided adequate appropriations, we think, in the bill for the National Security Resources Board. It is a credit to America that we have a man of Symington's caliber in that position. I regret to see him leave the Air Force, and I think he is right when he says we need a 70-group air force. I would even raise that figure if we had the resources to do it. But there are certain limitations which we must keep in mind if we are to preserve our country and not go into a police state program.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. The gentleman is making a very splendid statement and I want to say that I am usually in accord with his views, so I do not want to be misunderstood by this question. The gentleman stated a moment ago that Russia had exactly no heavy bombers. I am just wondering, purely as a layman, with no authority whatever on the subject, what the gentleman's source of information on that question is.

Mr. MAHON. I would not like to give my source of information.

Mr. COLMER. I do not want the gentleman to disclose anything that would be against the interest of this country, but that brings me to the other point.

Mr. MAHON. Let me say this, if I may impose, that according to the press Russia has about 400 of the B–29 type, which we call the medium bomber.

Mr. COLMER. That question was merely preliminary to the one I wanted to ask next, or the observation I am about to make. I realize in a democracy like ours that the situation is entirely different from what it is in a totalitarian state like Russia. As a layman, I have often picked up magazines and newspapers and seen detailed accounts of our latest weapons and our various plans for national defense. I wonder, and I am constrained to wonder by mail I get from my constituents, why we go into all this detail about everything we have in the way of national defense. Would the gentleman care to comment on that?

Mr. MAHON. I would be glad to.

During our hearings each year my blood boils and I see red on frequent occasions because of all these public releases by men in the Department of Defense, and others, which, in my opinion, impair the security of the United States.

The last time the late Secretary Forrestal was before our committee he appeared hastily at our request with the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force. We pounded the table and said there must be an end to all this talking by men in the Military Establishment, giving aid and comfort to the enemy as to the direction of our national defense program. We cast no discredit upon Mr. Forrestal, he was an able and outstanding patriot, we were complaining about the system.

If you will read the hearings this year, you will read again of our insistence that this confidential type of material be kept out of the press. We do our best, but here is what happens. The Navy is a proud and efficient Navy, but partisans of the Navy want the headlines and they strive to get them, and they do get them. The Air Force advocates love publicity and public acclaim. The same is true with the Army. Our service people are proud. They are not dishonest. They are just proud of what they have and they want to grow in the esteem and favor of the American people and the Congress. Nonmilitary people and Members of Congress are also sometimes at fault. It seems almost impossible to prevent these unfortunate and hurtful statements in a democracy such as our own. Of course we do not want to keep the American people in the dark as to the dangers which confront them.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman spoke a while ago about the hysteria of the ones who are clamoring for a strong Air Force.

Mr. MAHON. If the gentleman will permit me to interrupt, the gentleman from Texas did not say that those who were clamoring for a strong Air Force were in a state of hysteria. I think the gentleman from Texas has been perhaps as active on this floor in behalf of the Air Force as anyone in the Chamber.

Mr. RANKIN. I am not criticizing the gentleman from Texas, but I want to call attention to this fact: Many years ago Gen. Billy Mitchell was accused of hysteria because he insisted on an adequate air force, and was prosecuted out of office. Our Air Force was reduced far below the point of safety, and Pearl Harbor was the result.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman was in Congress at the time of the Billy Mitchell affair; I was not.

Mr. RANKIN. I was here and defended General Mitchell on this floor, as did the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REID] on the other side of the aisle. They turned the national defense over to those individuals who were getting rid of Gen. Billy Mitchell, after he had sunk the *Ostfriesland* in 20 minutes in 3 shots, the biggest German battleship captured in the First World War. And as I said, Pearl Harbor was the result.

I am like the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]. I am not willing to capitulate and to turn over to anybody the responsibility of the Congress of the United States for defending this Nation and to defend it promptly at all times.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman from Texas knows no Member of the House who wants to capitulate or turn over the national defense program to anybody else. I say let us have the strongest national defense program that we can afford. Let us be constantly alert to the dangers which confront us from within and without and do our best to preserve our country and prevent war.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time, and thank my committee chairman, Mr. CANNON, very much for the generous amount of time accorded me.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, ordinarily I do not ask the time of the House on the national defense appropriation except to offer, support, or oppose amendments to the bill.

I have felt in the past that the time for general debate should be largely monopolized by the Appropriations Committee members so they could explain fully to the Committee the many details of this very important problem.

I will still defer to the members of that committee for the appropriations details, but we have a collateral problem that also needs our attention today—a problem different from any we have had in the past in regard to national defense.

It is high time we recognized it. And it is of such importance to recognize it that I am taking this time today.

Mr. Chairman, we have, in my opinion, a crisis confronting us as regards the relation of the Congress to the Nation's defense.

More than that, we have a very dangerous situation in another respect. It is a situation unparalleled in my previous service in the Congress. It concerns the veracity of witnesses before the Congress and the freedom of witnesses to voice their convictions before committees of the Congress.

And we have a further problem: that of how to place reasonable restraints on the colossal power of the Secretary of Defense who today wields near dictatorial power over 2,000,000 people, and has at his disposal sums amounting to almost one-third of the Federal budget; sums almost equal to the total Federal budget in 1941, only 9 years ago.

I am gravely disturbed by what has transpired in national defense administration since Secretary Johnson took office.

I am disturbed even more by the portents of the future stemming from his administration to date, disturbing as that has been in so many respects.

Ever since Mr. Louis Johnson took office there has been a rapid-fire sequence of events in the Department of Defense, which, taken together, would indicate to any objective observer that the Secretary has an insatiable ambition—an unquenchable lust for power—a cavalier disregard, strongly colored with contempt for the Congress—an unbridled eagerness for publicity—a dictatorial bent that will brook not only no opposition but no disagreement, whether warranted or not—and no little disdain for honesty, at least before congressional committees.

Mr. Chairman, I am not given to exaggeration. I insist these are not exaggerations. I say that the record of Mr. Johnson's administration supports these statements.

And in the light of that record, I say that every Member of this House should have as much concern over the situation as I have.

It is important to take note of these matters now, if for no other reason than the action of the Appropriations Committee in taking substantially at face value the representations made to them by the Secretary and his minions who presented the budget argument on which the defense items in this bill before us today are based.

Just what has happened in this past year to justify concern over the administration of the Defense Department?

Let us take a look at the record.

The Secretary had not yet gotten his seat warm in the Pentagon—he had been Secretary a month or less—when he administratively threw out the window a project thrice approved by the Congress, the aircraft carrier U. S. S. *United States*.

In this he was not only contemptuous of the Congress but he was guilty of such cavalier disregard of his Secretary of the Navy that the Navy Secretary had no alternative but to leave his office at once under bitter protest.

Mr. Chairman, I know of no recent public event that constituted so direct and flagrant a rebuff of congressional action as this. As one Member of Congress I not only resent the action as constituting a studied insult to the Congress but I am utterly convinced that such a step would not have been taken unless the person responsible, Mr. Johnson, felt—and still feels—within himself that he and his powers supersede the desires of the Congress of the United States.

That, Mr. Chairman, not the aircraft carrier, is the true issue.

That, Mr. Chairman, is why every Member of this House should be as disturbed as many of us on the Armed Services Committee have been by the administration of the Defense Department today.

But that is just one item on the record.

What came next?

About a month after Congress was overruled on the aircraft carrier Washington was flooded with rumors to the effect that Marine Corps aviation was to be absorbed by the Air Force by Secretary Johnson. These rumors became so intense that our distinguished elder statesman of national defense—the gentleman from Georgia—to whom, let me say, the Nation owes far more than it can ever repay for his vision and leadership in national defense in the Congress for over a third of a century—yes; it was the gentleman from Georgia, Chairman VINSON, who finally found it necessary to visit the Secretary to ask his intentions as regard the Marine Corps.

From this visit came a letter from the Secretary. That letter flatly disavowed that it was or had at any time been planned to alter the status of Marine Corps aviation. The Secretary asserted in his letter that no studies had been initiated at any time in the Pentagon on the subject.

Mr. Chairman, the Armed Services Committee and the Congress accepted that letter at face value and dropped the subject.

But it is widely known—and I must mention it to point up further our need for concern today—that the Secretary personally told members of the press in New York, off the record, of course, directly the opposite, and I happen to know that the Secretary had personally directed initiation of comparative cost studies in the Pentagon which had as their purpose justifying the transfer of the Marine air arm to the Air Force, his disclaimers to the contrary notwithstanding.

So now the picture begins to take form.

Not only is contempt for Congress evident in the Secretary's conduct, but now the problem of veracity is added.

There was a flurry of incidents of this sort last spring, Mr. Chairman. For example, in testimony last spring on amendments to the Unification Act, the Secretary flatly denied before the Armed Services Committee having attempted at any time to discipline any members of the press for criticising him.

But present at that very hearing were members of the press who were prepared to sign affidavits certifying, under oath, directly to the contrary.

Another example at the same time, Mr. Chairman.

The Secretary also testified to the committee that at no time while he was Assistant Secretary of War did he go over the head of, or around, the Secretary of War, then Secretary Harry Woodring, to the President or the Congress, and he asserted that he was working under direct congressional authority which itself bypassed the Secretary of War.

As to his conduct while Assistant Secretary of War, I need not labor the point. Surely there are enough Members still here who were on the old Military Affairs Committee to give the answer to that, regardless of Mr. Johnson's testimony.

But as to the congressional authority under which Mr. Johnson functioned as Assistant Secretary of War, I may say that the Secretary deliberately misled the committee, for the authority he asserted was his was specifically subject to the "direction of the Secretary of War."

But all of this happened last spring, Mr. Chairman.

I am inclined to think that we on the Armed Services Committee should have a sense of guilt ourselves for what has happened since. For having had these warnings, I think we would perhaps have been well advised then to call a halt to the increase in the power of a man who so evidently was contemptuous of the Congress and had displayed a convenient disregard for fact.

The record, members of the committee, speaks more loudly the more recent it gets.

Since last spring, what has happened?

We have seen an arbitrary cut-back of appropriated funds—a completely unilateral abrogation of congressional defense policy, again contemptuous of the role of Congress in national defense.

We have seen sharp reductions of the armed forces directed by the Secretary without consultation with the services, despite testimony, let me say again, directly to the contrary—reductions, I must also say, that were modified only as a result of the vigorous and timely hearings by the Armed Services Committee last October which placed a damper on the Secretary's unilateral actions.

And what else?

We have seen a witness, Admiral Denfeld, the Chief of Naval Operations, fired from his position of high professional responsibility for no reason other than his failure to toe the party line in his testimony before the Armed Services Committee last October.

Yes; he was fired directly in the face of promises that such an act would not be taken—promises made by the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Navy, and by the committee itself.

This perfidious act was excused by Secretary Johnson on grounds that the admiral was unfit for his position. But what were the facts? The admiral had served for 40 years in the United States Navy. He had just completed a 2-year tour of duty as Chief of Naval Operations. He has just been reappointed, with Secretary Johnson's approval, for

another 2-year tour as Chief of Naval Operations.

To me the most remarkable aspect of this event is not its evidence of vindictiveness and intolerance and disregard for promises on the record. We had seen that evidenced before.

What was remarkable was the extent of the contempt evidenced for the Congress in the belief that the Armed Services Committee and the Congress could be cajoled into believing that the removal of the admiral from his position as Chief of Naval Operations had no relation to his testimony before the Armed Services Committee.

But the record goes on, Mr. Chairman.

The next thing we knew was that the name of Capt. Arleigh S. Burke, a distinguished naval officer, had been removed, contrary to law, from a Navy selection list for promotion to the grade of rear admiral.

And why was this done?

It was done because Captain Burke had appeared before the Armed Services Committee in October 1949 to present the Navy views on the aircraft carrier U. S. S. *United States*.

But this finally aroused the public. Somewhere in the administration reason prevailed. It was not, I realize, on a basis of responding to justice nor in recognition of the rights of witnesses before congressional committees. Not at all. The injustice was remedied and the captain's name placed on the list, which list, by the way, included a bunch of the palace guard, because the situation was getting unsavory in a political vein.

The vindictiveness was still there, the intolerance, the desire to inflict punishment for testifying frankly before the Congress.

But at last it had become impolitic to carry out the punishment.

But, Mr. Chairman, the record goes on.

Next we found that every top-ranking officer in the Navy had been set aside in the selection of the officer to succeed the Chief of Naval Operations who had just been fired for speaking frankly to the Congress.

And why were they set aside?

Because they, too, had had the courage, as had Admiral Denfeld, to express themselves frankly before the Congress on national defense policies.

Because their views were not 100 percent in accord with the course of national defense planning under Secretary Johnson, they had become unfit to take the professional leadership of the United States Navy.

As the Navy Secretary told the United States Senate a few days later, he had no objection to a naval officer speaking his mind freely before the Congress, but that officer must be prepared to take the consequences thereafter.

This amazing story can go on and on, Mr. Chairman.

Take, for example, this incident:

A naval officer sought to write a series of articles in answer to General Arnold's series on air power, in which series the general treated the testimony taken by the Armed Services Committee in October before which this naval officer had appeared.

The naval officer was officially requested not to publish the series of articles. General Arnold was permitted to proceed with his series without restraint.

And why?

Because, of course, General Arnold was expounding the accepted, the official view of the Department of Defense.

Take another example:

The Naval Institute planned to publish in its December issue the testimony of naval officers before the Armed Services Committee on the questions of unification and grand strategy. The official request was made of the Institute that the testimony not be published. The request was complied with.

But, at the same time, and without restraint, the Air University was publishing an article contending that the position of naval leaders on strategy and unification was wholly erroneous. No effort was made to censor that article.

And why not?

Because the Air Force article supported the party line.

And take another matter, Mr. Chairman.

In the amendments to the unification act it was unequivocably stated that there shall be no single chief of staff over the armed forces. The law also stated clearly that the Joint Chiefs of Staff shall consist of four men—the chairman, and the three chiefs of services. All four of the chiefs of services were made the advisers to the President, the National Security Council, and the Secretary of Defense.

But what is happening?

The chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff alone usually represents the Joint Chiefs of Staff in the highest Government councils. This is understandable. Not only are the Nation's civilian leaders trained in Army organization and hence predisposed to a Chief of Staff system, but Secretary Johnson recently, in a speech, went so far as to characterize the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff as the "quarterback" for national defense.

So what are we getting, despite the law? We are getting the equivalent in power, in prestige, and in duties a single chief of staff, regardless of the prohibitions of law.

And take the weird propaganda that America is getting stronger daily while the Secretary is sharply reducing the armed forces—the mass publicity on economy in the armed forces while sidestepping the question of injury done to the defense of the Nation through those reductions—the assertion that General Eisenhower is responsible for and approves this budget whereas he tells the Nation that the budget compels cuts below safe levels.

Add the beat-the-hell-out-of-Joe-Stalin speech of Secretary Johnson several weeks ago, at a time when our Nation has suffered a terrible defeat in China and is outweighed in almost every branch of the armed forces by Russia, as stated publicly, contrary to Mr. Johnson, by the Secretary of the Air Force. Then mix in the Secretary's charge that the Joint Chiefs of Staff have approved the budget as sufficient unto the hour, despite his own statement that the Joint Chiefs of Staff believe many billions more should be added.

And now the picture is adequately complete, although I could go on.

Members of the committee, that record is enough to warrant concern on the part of the House of Representatives.

That record is enough to make every Member of this body seek some restraint on the power of the Secretary of Defense.

That record is enough to cause the Committee on Appropriations to act without hesitation to plug the many holes in this defense budget which, I am convinced, exist simply to keep the budget low enough to make the economy record of the Secretary of Defense look politically defensible.

For my part, Mr. Chairman, for the integrity of the Congress, for a sound national-defense program, and for the future of our Nation, I hope that the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee will take the initiative and see that steps are taken to bring reason and mature judgment to the Pentagon; and, if that is impossible, that he will initiate legislative action to circumscribe the authority of the Secretary of Defense so as to keep the Congress, and the will of the American people, from being flouted at the caprice of any one man in the Department of Defense.

(Mr. STEFAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point.)

THE FEDERAL-AID PROGRAM

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, provision of funds for continuation of the Federal-aid highway program is not a new matter to Members of Congress. This program was initiated in 1916 at a time when the country had almost no improved roads. It caused a marked acceleration in road improvement following the First World War and has been a major factor in creating the great system of highways that now reaches to every part of the country. This system is far from adequate for our present need, but, even with its many deficiencies, it is the greatest highway system in the world.

The policy of Federal aid to the States was adopted with the support of all political parties. It has produced great benefits in every section of the country and to every segment of the population. No Federal improvement activity is more general in its benefits or more firmly established by demonstrated value. In considering the provision of funds for continuing the work it is appropriate that we review what has been accomplished and examine the extent of the benefits.

When the Federal-aid plan was adopted there were few surfaced rural roads. Travel between cities by highway was rare and few people traveled more than 5 or 10 miles from their homes by highway. In 1921 Congress authorized the designation of a Federal-aid highway system and required that Federal-aid funds be concentrated on that system. It established the objective of connecting the population centers of the country

with a system of two-lane roads which would also serve as the main arteries of a more extensive system reaching all productive areas.

At that time, it appeared to many that the country was embarking upon a task so large and costly as to be far beyond its means. Federal funds furnished an incentive toward the construction of highways that resulted in the purchase of more motor vehicles. Soon these vehicles were producing large amounts of revenue in registration fees and gasoline taxes. These funds were used to build still more roads. Through the twenties and thirties the process of more Federal aid, more roads, more motor vehicles, and more funds for still more roads continued. Highway transportation became an important factor in practically every phase of our social and economic life.

Prior to the war the 233,000-mile Federal-aid system had been improved in some degree throughout almost its entire length, largely with two-lane surfaces. The goal set in 1921 had been reached.

Highway use had become essential in the daily life of almost every citizen. Highways were used to transport farm products to market, children to school, products of mines and forests to places of use, by industry, and for the daily movement of millions of people to and from work.

Our tremendous effort in war production, one that far surpassed anything our enemies expected, was made possible only by a network of highways reaching all parts of the country. Highways were essential in building war plants and homes for workers, in the movement of workers to and from the plants, in feeding the workers, in delivering materials to the plants, in the interchange of parts and partly processed material between plants, and in the rapid delivery of completed material. Throughout the war our main highways that make up the Federal-aid system teemed with war traffic. We hope that they will not be needed again for such traffic, but readiness in this respect is just as necessary as any other phase of national defense.

In the years before the war it became increasingly evident that there was need for much more highway improvement, according to standards greatly advanced beyond those used in the twenties and early thirties. Grades, curves, and surface widths designed for the early motor vehicle traffic were not suitable for the swiftly moving masses of modern vehicles.

The serious highway deficiencies became more conspicuous during the war period. Great service was rendered by highway transport, but it fell far short of being the best, most rapid, and cheapest service possible. Congestion, delays, and accidents on main routes, particularly in and near cities greatly hampered war traffic.

Influenced by knowedge of prewar highway inadequencies and experiences with war transport, Congress enacted the Federal-aid Highway Act of 1944 authorizing a broad program of improvement. The legislation was based on detailed surveys and studies made before the war, and was designed to meet highway needs of all kinds.

This and supplementary legislation authorized a total of over $1,000,000,000 for primary Federal-aid highways, $720,000,000 for secondary or farm-to-market roads, and $600,000,000 for urban sections of the Federal-aid system.

The program was slow in getting under way at the close of the war. Disruptions caused by the war, high prices, and shortages of many kinds greatly delayed progress. These troubles gradually disappeared and during the past 2 years excellent progress has been made.

Statistics showing the accomplishment with postwar funds are impressive. Completed work includes 57,576 miles of road, 7,619 bridges, 232 grade crossings eliminated; 60 grade-crossing elimination structures reconstructed, and 464 grade crossings protected by warning devices. This work cost $1,900,000,000, the Federal contribution amounting to $960,000,000.

Although the 1950 construction season is not yet under way in most of the country, there are nearly 10,000 miles of Federal-aid highway classified as under construction—much of it inactive because of the season of the year—and over 4,000 miles have been approved for construction and should be placed under construction soon.

Summarizing these classes of work shows that the Federal postwar program has provided or will soon provide nearly 72,000 miles of road, 10,503 bridges, 405 grade-crossing eliminations, and 105 grade-crossing elimination structures as replacements at a total cost of $2,900,000,000 with the Federal Government contributing close to $1,500,000,000.

PRIMARY FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS

Let us examine the parts of this program and the character of work being done. The work of greatest general interest and service is that on the primary Federal-aid system, consisting of 233,000 miles of main highways. These are the main highways interconnecting cities of all sizes.

For the greater portion of the system two-lane highways will be adequate for a number of years to come. However, conditioning these two-lane roads for safe and expeditious movement of modern vehicles presents one of the major problems to be solved. A portion of the mileage needs widening to four lanes.

Because of the large accumulation of worn-out surfaces that cannot be maintained at reasonable cost, it is not surprising to find most of the State highway departments assigning Federal-aid funds to obtain the maximum of resurfacing and widening.

The problem of replacing surfaces on the primary Federal-aid system as they wear out and can be kept in use only through very high expenditures for maintenance is a serious one. For rural portions of the system the average age and the percentage expected to wear out in the next 10 years are as follows:

Average age in years:	
Low-type surfaces	10.6
Intermediate-type surfaces	8.2
High-type surfaces	13.5
Total	10.7
Percentage of mileage that will wear out in next 10 years:	
Low-type surfaces	93.5
Intermediate-type surfaces	74.0
High-type surfaces	44.0
Total	64.4

Large expenditures on these highways are inevitable, either for maintenance when it would be more economic to reconstruct, or for reconstruction. There is danger that lack of funds will create too much tendency toward resurfacing alone when correction of grades and curvature is necessary for complete modernization. In many States Federal aid furnishes the margin that makes possible full modernization on work that is done.

The $1,080,000,000 in Federal funds provided since the war for primary Federal-aid highways has permitted the improvement of many highways that were difficult and dangerous to travel. Improvements have been completed on 18,357 miles of highway, 3,041 bridges, 182 grade-crossing eliminations, and 44 grade-crossing elimination structure replacements. This work cost nearly $1,000,000,000, the Federal Government supplying approximately half. If we include projects now under construction and those approved for construction there results a total of 23,038 miles of highway, 4,214 bridges, 182 grade-crossing eliminations, and 67 replacements of obsolete grade-crossing elimination structures.

URBAN HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENTS

No phase of the Federal-aid program meets a more pressing need than that of improving the main routes in and near cities. In past years State and Federal highway funds have been concentrated mainly on the rural roads. The improvements made have generated great streams of traffic that encounter narrow, congested roads and streets as they approach our cities. There they must pass over routes laid out and built to accommodate the horse-drawn traffic of a city of the size that existed long ago. Narrow widths, parked vehicles, and conflicts with cross traffic cause intolerable delays and many accidents. Modern improvements at great cost are needed. For the largest cities the only possible solution is the construction of express highways.

The Federal Government has authorized $600,000,000 in postwar funds for use on urban sections of Federal-aid highways. Availability of the funds has greatly stimulated action by States and cities in the planning of projects and in obtaining necessary funds. Every city wants all the improvements possible and wants them now. There is considerable pressure upon State authorities to spread available funds too thin in too many places rather than to make the necessary concentration of funds for permanent solution where congestion is worst.

The Bureau of Public Roads has emphasized the importance of applying Federal-aid urban funds to projects that will give a permanent solution where congestion and accidents are worst.

In and near Washington are some excellent examples of the kind of work being done or planned for practically every large city. A four-lane bridge across the Potomac nearing completion will eliminate the long columns of vehicles that back up every morning and afternoon on the approaches to the present bridge. The new Whitehurst elevated expressway leading to Key Bridge serves a free flowing traffic that once fought its way in a bumper-to-bumper column along M Street in a succession of starts and stops.

In my own State, Nebraska, there are two large urban projects that will greatly relieve congestion. In Grand Island a subway with a 48-foot pavement on one of the most heavily traveled routes is nearing completion. In Omaha, work will soon begin on the Q Street bridge, a magnificent and urgently needed structure that will cost close to $1,000,000.

In the Federal postwar urban program 571 miles of highway, 398 bridges, 79 grade-crossing eliminations, and 8 replacements of obsolete grade-crossing elimination structures have been completed. This work cost $275,000,000, the Federal Government contributing $63,000,000. Work under construction or approved for construction will bring the totals to 852 miles of highway, 762 bridges, 174 grade-crossing eliminations, and 16 replacements of obsolete grade-crossing elimination structures.

Statistics of this kind are inadequate to describe the real value of the improvements being made. One has to spend an hour or more fighting his way through the congestion of a city with obsolete main arteries and then breeze through another city on an expressway at 35 to 40 miles an hour to appreciate what expressways mean. Their cost is great, often $2,000,000 or $3,000,000 or more per mile but the highway cost per mile of vehicle travel is almost always less than similar costs on less heavily traveled highways.

THE NATIONAL SYSTEM OF INTERSTATE HIGHWAYS

The Federal-aid Highway Act of 1944 authorized the designation of a national system of interstate highways not exceeding 40,000 miles in extent. This system has been selected by joint action of the State highway departments and the Bureau of Public Roads. It is composed of the most important routes of the Federal-aid primary system. No special Federal funds have been provided for this system but since it is a part of the Federal-aid primary system it is being improved with funds provided for that system.

The action taken has had the desirable effect of centering attention on the most important routes of the Nation, both their rural and urban sections. The Bureau of Public Roads has cooperated with the American Association of State Highway Officials in the formulation of high standards for the system. A large portion of the notable projects in the Federal-aid program are on this system. They include many sections of divided four-lane highways, urban expressways, large bridges, and elimination of railroad grade crossings.

In my own State the most heavily traveled highway is included. This is the transcontinental route that passes through Chicago, Omaha, North Platte, Cheyenne, Salt Lake City, and on to San Francisco. Beyond North Platte there is a branch to Denver. The route is the main artery of east-west traffic across Nebraska and there is every reason for improving it to meet modern conditions at the earliest possible date.

A recent report by the Bureau of Public Roads, prepared with the assistance of the State highway departments, shows the large amount of work needed on the interstate system. To make the system adequate for present traffic and that expected in the immediate future will require the expenditure of $11,300,000,000.

Nebraska estimates that 454 miles of the system in rural areas and 6.4 miles in urban areas require further improvement at a total cost of $48,000,000.

SECONDARY ROADS

The provision of $720,000,000 in the postwar program for secondary roads has resulfited in a more businesslike attack on the secondary road problem than ever before. Secondary roads are being better planned, better built, and constructed in greater quantity. The program has extended engineering aid and cooperation by the State highway departments into 2,990 counties or about 97 percent of the 3,070 counties.

A Federal-aid secondary system of 393,000 miles has been designated through cooperation of county, State, and Federal agencies. Scientific methods were used in the selection of routes, thus assuring improvement of roads most needed and of widest benefit. Benefits of the Federal funds have been widely distributed. Improvements have been or will soon be made in over 2,800 of the 3,070 counties in the United States.

Work already completed includes 38,600 miles of road, 4,180 bridges, 37 grade-crossing eliminations, and replacement of 8 obsolete grade-crossing elimination structures. The Federal Government paid approximately half of the total cost of $640,000,000.

The totals of work completed, under construction and approved for construction are 48,000 miles of highway, 5,527 bridges, 49 grade-crossing eliminations and 22 replacements of obsolete grade-crossing elimination structures.

Reports from all parts of the country show the great value of the improvements being made and the advantages of State technical assistance in planning and directing the work. The program has included a surprising number of roads serving highly productive agricultural areas that were of more than average cost because of natural obstacles. In past years many such roads have been badly needed but could not be built because of lack of funds. Examples are roads across swamps, on causeways across lakes, and through mountainous areas.

One of the best examples of benefits derived is found in my own State. Cherry County in Nebraska is in the sand-hill country where the native grasses produce sleek cattle and the sand produces terrible travel conditions. Sand-hill trails to the ranches, even when partly stabilized with straw or topsoil, limit average speed to 10 or 15 miles per hour. When snow falls practically all travel ceases. In recent years State and Federal secondary road funds have been used to convert a sand trail across the county to an all-weather highway. As one rancher puts it, "improved roads remove much of the fear of being unable to secure help, supplies, or medical attention because of transportation barriers." The road across Cherry County was of great value in the severe winter of 1948–49. It was quickly cleared of snow by State forces and used as a main artery in movement of snow-removal equipment and supplies to the areas east and west. Where cattle were formerly driven long distances from the ranch on the way to market they are now picked up by trucks from corrals along the road.

IMPORTANCE OF FEDERAL AID TO NEBRASKA

To fully understand the benefits of the Federal-aid program it is necessary to go into some particular State and study the highway needs and the importance of Federal aid in meeting these needs. Nebraska is an excellent example for such study. Highways are of the greatest importance to the people of the State in making use of its resources. It is important to the people of other States that Nebraska have good highways since the meat and other foods that it produces feed many people beyond its borders and streams of traffic from east and west flow across the State.

Delivery of livestock to the big markets at Omaha and Sioux City, Iowa, is necessary for a large portion of Nebraska producers. Well-fattened stock must be transported from ranch and farm without suffering from hunger, thirst or other discomfort that will cause them to lose weight and the producer to lose profit. It is a decided advantage for the producer to make delivery on short notice and sell on a favorable market. These factors have led to a continual growth in the proportion of livestock delivered by highway. The accompanying table shows this marked trend and also the remarkable growth in the total deliveries:

Livestock receipts and percent of "drive-in" [1] receipts at Omaha, Nebr., and Sioux City, Iowa

OMAHA

Year	Cattle and calves	Percent drive-in	Hogs	Percent drive-in
1937	1,459,375	56.0	1,109,682	75.9
1940	1,326,163	72.2	2,061,508	68.5
1945	1,970,037	74.7	1,802,257	62.2
1948	1,628,146	74.1	2,331,447	84.6

SIOUX CITY

1937	700,443	70.2	827,170	91.4
1940	797,074	77.9	1,709,589	83.2
1945	1,528,504	70.5	1,355,357	82.7
1948	1,205,115	75.1	1,812,302	95.8

[1] The term "drive-in" designates livestock received other than by rail.

Source: U. S. Department of Agriculture.

Deliveries by highway in 1948 were about double what they were in 1946. The livestock trucks must have good road surfaces on which to operate. The existing surfaces have been a big factor in raising production to its present level.

Nebraska has 105,000 miles of highways of all kinds, including city streets. Of this mileage, 71,800 miles or nearly 70 percent is still unsurfaced and the condition of the surfaced roads is by no means adequate for present traffic. A comprehensive study of Nebraska road and street needs was made in 1948 by Nebraska State authorities. The cost of meeting the needs on the three major road systems was found to be as follows:

State highways	$259,000,000
County roads	120,000,000
City and village streets	86,000,000
Total	465,000,000

In addition to these construction requirements the people of the State must continue to maintain the existing highways.

The urgency of the needs and their great cost present a perplexing problem to the people of the State. Since there are only 13 people to each mile of highway it is not an easy matter to obtain the needed revenue. Yet, since the State depends mainly on agriculture and stock raising for its prosperity, it must have good highways for these operations.

The Nebraska Department of Roads and Irrigation reports that during the 16-year prewar period 1926–41 inclusive the State spent on an average of $7,500,000 annually for State highway improvements. Due to increased costs and improved design made necessary by increased traffic and heavier loads, a mile of road today costs at least double what it did during the 16-year period.

Almost everything purchased in building a highway costs double what it did before the war. Our State engineer tells me that the highway department purchased 2,600,000 gallons of gasoline in 1937 which cost 6.83 cents per gallon, exclusive of tax. In 1949 2,700,000 gallons were purchased at 12.05 cents per gallon, exclusive of tax. Gasoline is costing 76 percent more than it did before the war.

If progress on highways is to be kept at the prewar level at least $15,000,000 must be provided for highways. Action by the State legislature increased the gasoline tax from 5 to 6 cents, effective in May 1949. The additional highway revenue and continuation of Federal aid will permit the State to just about equal the prewar progress. This will be far below a satisfactory rate, but we can take some satisfaction in the recovery of lost ground.

Without Federal aid the situation would have been far worse. Nebraska has been apportioned nearly $40,000,000 in Federal postwar funds. This substantial sum and the necessity of matching have furnished the incentive toward providing more State revenues and increasing the size of the road program. Many major improvements are being made in our highways to serve the ever-increasing number of motor vehicles and intensity of use by the heavier vehicles. Postwar Federal-aid funds have been used to complete over 1,400 miles of highway. Additional projects programmed with available funds or in a more advanced stage will bring the total to nearly 2,500 miles. This is a substantial achievement.

Compared with total needs the progress is not yet satisfactory but it does represent a marked improvement. Federal aid is a necessity to the State if it is to go forward rather than backward.

COORDINATION AND RESEARCH RESULTING FROM FEDERAL AID

The policy of Federal aid to the States has resulted in marked benefits other than the actual construction of many miles of highway. It has brought together the highway officials of all of the States and the Bureau of Public Roads to discuss common interests and problems. The degree of uniformity that exists on our highways is largely attributable to this factor. The Nation has benefited through the common effort in the designation of all of our major highway systems and in the production of reports on the condition of these systems that have been used as a basis in the determination of national highway policy.

A large part of the Nation-wide cooperative effort is through the American Association of State Highway Officials, organized in 1914 to foster adoption of Federal aid and to discuss and plan operations. This cooperation has resulted in the adoption of high standards for the various highway systems, specifications for materials, methods of testing, methods of construction, and numerous manuals for use in design. These products have become the standards for American highway practice and are widely used throughout the world.

As a guide in administering the Federal-aid program and also for use in developing standards of the Association of State Highway Officials, the Bureau of Public Roads has conducted extensive physical research. It has continuously studied the characteristics of various materials and their most effective use in construction, the effect of vehicles and weather on highway surfaces, and the behavior in service of various types of construction. Work is done at the research station at Arlington, Va., in field tests at selected locations, and in cooperation with the States on Federal-aid projects. The kind of soil on which a highway is constructed has great influence on the life of the surface. Good soils permit economies in construction. Poor soils such as clay require more substantial surfaces. The Bureau has developed scientific methods of surveying soils, testing them, and applying the information in design and construction. This work has been of particular importance in the construction of low-type roads with local materials.

Many different types of road surface are now constructed with tar and asphalt with far greater success than was attained 20 or 30 years ago. Results from laboratory studies and field experiments have been applied to improve the qualities of high-type pavements and to make possible the construction of low-type roads with materials close at hand.

As a result of many discoveries concerning the characteristics of cement and other materials that go into concrete, the strength and durability of concrete roads and bridges have been greatly increased.

In various sections of the country there have been road failures because of the chemical content or other characteristics of materials. Sometimes the cause is a combination of material characteristics and climatic effects. The trained specialists of the bureau study such failures, make laboratory tests to determine the cause and devise methods of avoiding failures.

One of the most important investigations has been to determine the forces that the wheels of motor vehicles apply to road surfaces and bridges, and the effect of these forces on the surface or structure. The information derived has been essential in the enactment of laws regulating the weights of vehicles to avoid excessive damage to highways and in the design of road surfaces and bridges to withstand legal loads.

No one knows with any accuracy the return that has been made from expenditures for physical highway research but, with each State spending many millions of dollars annually for highways, it is certain that the small Federal expenditure has produced a big return in better highways.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Appropriations of the House has given its answer to millions of people throughout the length and breadth of this land of ours who are crying for reduced taxes and for reduced living costs. The answer, Mr. Chairman, seems to be to "let 'em cry."

Against the enormous expenditure of $42,400,000,000 recommended by the President of the United States, of which $24,400,000,000 is contemplated in the requests passed upon in connection with this bill, the committee has effected a reduction in expenditure amounting to $204,000,000.

That is less than 1 percent of the overall total recommended. It amounts to $1.35 per person in the United States.

The average American today is paying more than one-quarter of his income to the tax collector. The average American is squeezed between inflated prices, on the one hand, and sky-high taxes, on the other hand. The Nation is being driven down the road, by taxes and constantly increasing debt, to bankruptcy and dictatorial government.

The answer suggested by your committee in this bill is a reduction in spending of $1.35 per person.

Mr. Chairman, the committee has taken credit for a reduction in expenditure of $979,000,000. Upon analysis, however, this claimed reduction largely disappears. It is a mirage—now you see it, now you do not.

If we examine this claimed reduction closely, we find in the first place—and this is not an inclusive figure—that at least $380,000,000 of the total claimed reduction is of a character which cannot be counted upon. I say this because

the items involved depend for their size, in the last analysis, not upon committee decisions but upon the law.

I have in mind such apparent reductions as are included with respect to veterans' pensions, with respect to veterans' readjustment benefits with respect to the Railroad Retirement Board, with respect to the Civil Service Retirement Fund, and with respect to hospital-construction grants.

There may be further items, but there are at least $380,000,000 of claimed reductions which cannot be counted upon.

In addition to that, Mr. Chairman, the committee seems to have claimed an increase in income of $395,000,000 at one point and of $125,000,000 at another point, both because of anticipated increase in postal rates.

The total increase anticipated by the President was $395,000,000, and, as a practical matter, the only step in that direction up to date is favorable action by the House on a bill contemplating an increase of $125,000,000. The maximum that can be claimed therefore in this connection is $125,000,000 instead of $520,000,000.

If we take the $380,000,000 of claimed reduction that canont be counted upon, and allow $125,000,000 increase for postal revenues, but take off the other $395,000,000, we have a total of $575,000,000 which, deducted from the over-all claim of $779,000,000 leaves us as a maximum reduction in expenditure that can be counted on $204,000,000.

That, as I have already indicated, is equivalent to a reduction of $1.35 per person in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, the Congress must do what the committee has failed to do. The Congress must eliminate waste and extravagance in the reckless requests for expenditure which have been submitted to the Congress by the President. The Congress must heed the cries of the people for less spending, for lower taxes, for lower living costs, and for the preservation of what is left of the dollar.

America must remain strong in this time of world crisis, and to remain strong America must remain solvent. We cannot possibly measure up to our tremendous obligations at home and abroad while floundering in a sea of red ink.

Mr. Chairman, we are confronted by an unparalleled national debt. The direct debt which we usually refer to approaches $256,000,000,000. That means a debt of about $6,400 for every family of four in America. If we include contingent obligations, obligations in respect to which the Federal Government has a secondary liability, the over-all debt approaches $430,000,000,000, or $10,750 for every family of four in America.

We are confronted also with a further deficit some 3 months hence of between five and six billions of dollars.

We are confronted with a tax burden of between five and six times the tax burden prior to Pearl Harbor.

We are confronted by the fact, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] has pointed out, that the maximum revenues in sight for fiscal 1951 amount to only $37,300,000,000.

That is the important figure to be kept in mind throughout the consideration of this bill, Mr. Chairman. It is in order to consider appropriations against that over-all figure that the omnibus appropriation bill has been adopted this year for the first time.

Against this background, Mr. Chairman, against these revenues of $37,300,000,000, the President has submitted to the Congress the largest peacetime appropriation request in the peacetime history of the country, carrying with it, as I have said, an anticipated over-all expenditure of $42,400,000,000.

If that expenditure is made, it means a further deficit in fiscal 1951 of $5,100,000,000, and a further increase in our direct national debt up to somewhere around $266,000,000,000.

You will find the over-all expenditure to which I have referred included in three separate items in the committee report. First, there are the items of expenditure specifically included in this bill amounting to $23,423,000,000. Second, there are the items of expenditure which are to be met out of prior-year appropriations and revolving funds amounting to $7,079,000,000. Third, there are the items of expenditure not considered at all in this bill, such as requirements for the Senate, permanent appropriations, expenditures out of nonappropriated funds, expenditures for various items of foreign aid, and expenditures involved in new legislation that is proposed, amounting to $10,955,000,000. The over-all total is $41,459,000,000.

You will find the first two items in a table on page 6 of the committee hearings. The third item is in a table on page 7 of the committee hearings. A further break-down of item 3 is in another table that has been presented to the committee in this connection. I shall insert all three tables, under leave to extend my remarks, at this point in the RECORD:

Analysis of estimated expenditures for the fiscal year 1951

Organization unit	Budget estimates		Recommended in bill		Bill compared with budget estimate	
	Appropriations in this bill	Expenditures in 1951 from appropriations in this bill	Appropriations	Revised estimate of expenditures in 1951 from appropriations in this bill	Appropriations	Expenditures
Legislative branch (excluding the Senate)	$65, 296, 396	$53, 549, 003	$56, 822, 450	$46, 015, 553	−$8, 473, 946	−$7, 533, 450
The judiciary	24, 113, 700	24, 956, 526	23, 560, 165	24, 376, 526	−553, 535	−580, 000
Executive Office of the President	10, 492, 553	9, 712, 053	9, 947, 553	9, 252, 053	−545, 000	−460, 000
Independent offices	8, 149, 421, 777	7, 801, 784, 288	7, 629, 304, 944	7, 532, 261, 888	−520, 116, 833	−269, 522, 400
Federal Security Agency	1, 635, 083, 600	1, 459, 548, 159	1, 591, 784, 590	1, 418, 438, 159	−43, 299, 010	−41, 110, 000
General Services Administration	861, 883, 194	749, 471, 696	836, 126, 434	724, 009, 696	−25, 756, 760	−25, 462, 000
Housing and Home Finance Agency	47, 000, 000	46, 009, 632	23, 400, 000	22, 629, 632	−23, 600, 000	−23, 380, 000
Department of Agriculture	806, 278, 446	701, 354, 465	764, 032, 701	664, 470, 655	−42, 245, 745	−36, 883, 810
Loan authorizations	(610, 000, 000)	185, 130, 000	(520, 350, 000)	168, 130, 000	−(89, 650, 000)	−17, 000, 000
Department of Commerce	782, 419, 000	759, 059, 847	725, 429, 000	703, 803, 847	−56, 990, 000	−55, 256, 000
Department of Defense:						
Military functions	13, 025, 000, 000	9, 957, 043, 330	12, 822, 182, 300	9, 815, 503, 330	−202, 817, 700	−141, 540, 000
Civil functions	834, 867, 500	564, 382, 500	632, 620, 000	429, 644, 500	−202, 247, 500	−134, 738, 000
Department of Interior	669, 251, 505	524, 532, 029	621, 634, 130	488, 605, 629	−47, 617, 375	−35, 926, 400
Department of Justice	147, 425, 800	137, 603, 660	144, 230, 000	134, 645, 160	−3, 195, 800	−2, 958, 500
Department of Labor	220, 014, 700	175, 938, 771	208, 573, 100	173, 270, 771	−11, 441, 600	−2, 668, 000
Post Office Department (payable from general fund of Treasury)	554, 607, 000	554, 607, 000	401, 500, 000	401, 500, 000	−153, 107, 000	−153, 107, 000
Department of State	230, 077, 397	167, 321, 355	217, 651, 297	161, 166, 455	−12, 426, 100	−6, 154, 900
Treasury Department	576, 548, 600	519, 317, 664	545, 605, 000	494, 109, 064	−30, 943, 600	−25, 208, 600
District of Columbia	12, 000, 000	12, 000, 000	12, 000, 000	12, 000, 000		
Bill total	28, 651, 781, 168	24, 403, 321, 978	27, 266, 403, 664	23, 423, 832, 918	−1, 385, 377, 504	−979, 489, 060
Estimates of 1951 expenditures out of prior year appropriations, working, transferred, and revolving funds		7, 079, 776, 516		7, 079, 776, 516		
Items not considered in this bill [1]	11, 592, 751, 053	10, 955, 658, 912	11, 592, 751, 053	10, 955, 658, 912		
Budget total	40, 244, 532, 221	42, 438, 757, 406	38, 859, 154, 717	41, 459, 268, 346	−1, 385, 377, 504	−979, 489, 060

[1] Represents budget estimates of anticipated appropriations and expenditures for the Senate, foreign aid, permanents and indefinites, proposed legislation, nonappropriated funds, etc.

The amounts shown at the foot of the foregoing table as "not considered in this bill" are enumerated as follows:

	1951 appropriations	1951 expenditures
Proposed legislation (1950)		$78,500,000
Proposed legislation (1951)	$4,452,316,000	2,356,696,400
Nonappropriated funds		2,086,949,973
U. S. Senate	12,486,891	12,334,155
Expenses, occupied countries	350,000,000	196,000,000
Mutual defense assistance (liquidation of present contract authority)	500,000,000	100,000,000
Reserve for contingencies	211,969,631	170,800,000
Permanent and indefinite appropriations	5,949,018,531	5,842,953,384
1951 supplementals under existing legislation	116,960,000	111,425,000
Total	11,592,751,053	10,955,658,912

Items not considered in this bill—Proposed legislation fiscal year 1950

	1951 appropriations	1951 estimated expenditures
Funds appropriated to the President:		
Assistance to the Republic of Korea		$55,000,000
Relief of Palestine refugees		20,000,000
Department of Commerce:		
Civil Aeronautics Administration, construction of public airports, Alaska		3,500,000
Total	0	78,500,000

Items not considered in this bill—Proposed legislation fiscal year 1951

	1951 appropriations	1951 estimated expenditure
Funds appropriated to the President:		
Assistance to economically underdeveloped areas (point 4)	$35,000,000	$25,000,000
Assistance to the Republic of Korea	115,000,000	55,000,000
Disaster relief	5,000,000	5,000,000
Economic cooperation: Foreign assistance and other foreign aid	3,100,000,000	1,700,000,000
Mutual defense assistance	647,500,000	200,000,000
Independent offices:		
Expanded displaced persons program (Displaced Persons Commission)	2,640,000	2,430,000
Extension of rent control (Office of Housing Expediter)	16,000,000	15,000,000
Fair Employment Practice Commission	700,000	600,000
National Science Foundation	500,000	400,000
Selective service program (Selective Service System)	4,226,000	3,923,000
Federal Security Agency:		
Education of children on Federal properties and emergency areas	7,000,000	7,000,000
General aid for operating expenses, elementary and secondary schools	300,250,000	290,240,000
General assistance to college students	1,000,000	900,000
Expansion of vocational rehabilitation program	4,300,000	4,279,000
Surveys and emergency construction, elementary and secondary schools	45,200,000	22,190,000
Public Health:		
Aid to medical education	45,000,000	30,000,000
Increased aid to local public health services	5,000,000	4,500,000
Health services for school children	35,000,000	25,000,000
Extension of public assistance programs	250,300,000	200,280,000
Increased grants to States for maternal and child welfare	9,500,000	6,930,000
Housing and Home Finance: Cooperative housing for middle-income families	$35,000,000	$35,000,000
Agriculture: Administration, Commodity Exchange Act	780,000	700,000
Commerce:		
Civil Aeronautics Administration: Construction of public airports, Territory of Alaska		
Bureau of Public Roads: Forest highways, Alaska	2,888,000	2,888,000
Inland Waterways Corporation	3,000,000	3,000,000
Defense:		
Department of Defense: Military functions	131,722,000	70,000,000
Department of the Army: Civil functions, Corps of Engineers, St. Lawrence seaway and power project	6,000,000	4,000,000
Interior:		
General investigations, research, and utilization of salt water, Bureau of Reclamation	500,000	500,000
Baltimore-Washington Parkway (National Park Service)	3,000,000	2,000,000
Post Office: Proposed postal rate increase	−395,000,000	−395,000,000
Justice: Civil rights program	800,000	740,000
Labor:		
Expansion of unemployment insurance program:		
Administration and reinsurance	12,525,000	12,373,400
Unemployment compensation payments to Federal workers	13,500,000	13,365,000
Industrial safety program	6,000,000	5,973,000
State: Contribution to international organizations	2,485,000	2,485,000
Total	4,452,316,000	2,356,696,400

Items not considered in this bill—1951 estimated expenditures from nonappropriated funds

	1951 appropriations	1951 estimated expenditures
Independent offices:		
Export-Import Bank of Washington		$47,800,000
Reconstruction Finance Corporation		1,128,466,241
Tennessee Valley Authority		[1] 8,936,000
Housing and Home Finance Agency		35,327,411
Department of Agriculture		912,875,421
Department of Defense		[1] 29,000,000
Department of the Interior		26,400
Department of State		390,500
Total		2,086,949,973

[1] Excess of receipts over expenditures.

Items not considered in this bill—foreign aid fiscal year 1951

	1951 appropriations	1951 estimated expenditures
Funds appropriated to the President: Mutual defense assistance	$500,000,000	$100,000,000
Department of Defense: Government and relief in occupied areas	320,000,000	178,000,000
Department of State: Government in occupied area of Germany	30,000,000	18,000,000
Total	850,000,000	296,000,000

Items not considered in this bill—Reserve for contingencies

	1951 appropriations	1951 estimated expenditures
Total as per budget estimate	$200,000,000	$175,000,000
Budget amendments:		
Legislative	−73,375	
Department of Agriculture	−1,600,000	−1,900,000
Department of Interior	+245,600	
Department of Commerce		+600,000
Department of State	−2,902,594	−2,900,000
Atomic Energy Commission	+16,300,000	
Revised total	211,969,631	170,800,000

Items not considered in this bill—Permanent and indefinite appropriations fiscal year 1951

	1951 appropriations	1951 estimated expenditures
Total carried in table	$5,949,018,531	$5,842,953,384
Major items are—		
Interest on the public debt	5,625,000,000	5,625,000,000
Refunds and draw-backs (customs)	16,000,000	16,000,000
Alaska Railroad special fund	14,100,000	12,100,000
Payments to States under Mineral Leasing Act	13,500,000	13,500,000
Exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities	110,000,000	54,047,000
Other (miscellaneous)	96,314,531	48,402,384
Interest on refunds of internal revenue receipts	74,104,000	73,904,000

Items not considered in this bill—1951 supplementals under existing legislation

	1951 appropriation	1951 estimated expenditures
Agriculture:		
Eradication of foot-and-mouth and other contagious diseases of animals and poultry	$19,550,000	$16,500,000
Research facilities, animal industry, Agricultural Research Administration	4,500,000	3,500,000
International wheat agreement (reimbursement to Commodity Credit Corporation)	82,385,000	82,385,000
Commerce: Civil Aeronautics Administration: Claims, Airport Act	1,000,000	600,000
Defense: Panama Canal: Maintenance and operation	4,000,000	3,500,000
Interior:		
Management of lands and resources, Bureau of Land Management	50,000	40,000
Management and protection, National Park Service	250,000	200,000
Indian resources management, Bureau of Indian Affairs	125,000	100,000
State: Consolidation of building space in New York	5,100,000	4,600,000
Total	116,960,000	111,425,000

The over-all total of $41,459,000,000, of course, includes the claimed reduction of $979,000,000.

The third table, Mr. Chairman, is particularly interesting, because it includes the items proposed for foreign aid and for new legislation, amounting to some $2,400,000,000.

Further savings are, of course, possible in this field. It is obvious, however, that further and substantial reductions must be effected in the bill

before us if we are even to approach a balanced Federal budget.

I have here, Mr. Chairman, a rather interesting table in respect to Federal receipts and expenditures over a 40-year period. The table shows that during the period from 1910 to 1949 there was a Republican administration in Washington for 15 years and a Democratic administration for 25 years. It shows the Republicans had control of the House 15 years and the Senate 19 years and that the Democrats had control of the House for 25 years and the Senate for 21 years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, under the Democratic administration there were deficits in 18 out of the 25 years, and of course, there are further deficits anticipated of between five and six billion dollars this year and between four and five billion dollars in the next year.

If we eliminate the eight war years, 1917 to 1919 and 1942 to 1946 the result is 10 deficit years out of 17 years controlled by a Democratic administration, with two more deficits estimated, in comparison with 15 years of control by a Republican administration with only three deficit years.

A comparison of results of fiscal operations during years of control of the House by each party shows a similarly striking picture. Twenty-five years of control by the Democrats resulted in 19 deficit years with the nineteenth, a twentieth, and twenty-first deficit a practical certainty in the current and succeeding fiscal years. Eliminating the war years results in a Democratic House showing of 11 deficit years out of 17 with 2 more to follow. On the other hand, the 15 years of Republican control of the House produced only two deficit years.

Twelve successive years of Republican control, 1919 through 1930, resulted in 11 successive reductions in the national debt as a result of annual surpluses. The per capita debt was steadily reduced from $242.54 in 1919 to $131.51 in 1930. The next 11 years of control of the House by the Democrats, 1931 to 1941, produced annual deficits and a constant increase in the per capita debt from $135.45 in 1931 to $367.57 in 1941.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I shall include the table at this point in the RECORD:

Fiscal year	Majority party [1] [2]			Millions of dollars				Per capita debt
	House	Senate	Administration	Receipts	Expenditures	Surplus or deficit (—)	Public debt	
1910	Republican	Republican	Republican	676	694	−18	1,147	$12.41
1911	Democrat	do	do	702	691	11	1,154	12.29
1912	do	do	do	693	690	3	1,194	12.52
1913	do	Democrat	Democrat	724	724		1,193	12.27
1914	do	do	do	735	735		1,188	11.99
1915	do	do	do	698	761	−63	1,191	11.85
1916	do	do	do	782	734	48	1,225	12.02
1917	do	do	do	1,124	1,978	−854	2,976	28.77
1918	do	do	do	3,665	12,697	−9,032	12,244	117.11
1919	Republican	Republican	do	5,152	18,515	−13,363	25,482	242.54
1920	do	do	do	6,694	6,403	291	24,299	228.23
1921	do	do	Republican	5,625	5,116	509	23,977	220.91
1922	do	do	do	4,109	3,373	736	22,963	208.65
1923	do	do	do	4,007	3,295	712	22,350	199.64
1924	do	do	do	4,012	3,049	963	21,251	186.23
1925	do	do	do	3,780	3,063	717	20,516	177.12
1926	do	do	do	3,963	3,098	865	19,643	167.32
1927	do	do	do	4,129	2,974	1,155	18,512	155.51
1928	do	do	do	4,042	3,103	939	17,604	146.09
1929	do	do	do	4,033	3,299	734	16,931	139.04
1930	do	do	do	4,178	3,440	738	16,185	131.51
1931	Democrat	Republican	Republican	3,190	3,652	−462	16,801	$135.45
1932	do	do	do	2,006	4,741	−2,735	19,487	156.10
1933	do	Democrat	Democrat	2,080	4,681	−2,601	22,539	179.48
1934	do	do	do	3,116	6,745	−3,629	27,053	214.07
1935	do	do	do	3,800	6,591	−2,791	28,701	225.55
1936	do	do	do	4,116	8,540	−4,424	33,779	263.79
1937	do	do	do	5,029	7,806	−2,777	36,425	282.75
1938	do	do	do	5,855	7,031	−1,176	37,165	286.27
1939	do	do	do	5,165	9,027	−3,862	40,440	308.98
1940	do	do	do	5,387	9,305	−3,918	42,968	325.59
1941	do	do	do	7,607	13,766	−6,159	48,961	367.57
1942	do	do	do	12,799	34,289	−21,490	72,422	537.80
1943	do	do	do	22,282	79,702	−57,420	136,696	1,001.46
1944	do	do	do	44,149	95,572	−51,423	201,003	1,455.67
1945	do	do	do	46,456	100,397	−53,941	258,682	1,853.21
1946	do	do	do	43,038	63,714	−20,676	269,422	1,907.62
1947	Republican	Republican	do	43,259	42,505	754	258,286	1,793.23
1948	do	do	do	42,210	33,791	8,419	252,292	1,721.29
1949	Democrat	Democrat	do	38,246	40,057	−1,811	252,770	(?)
1950 [3]	do	do	do	37,763	43,297	−5,534	(?)	(?)
1951 [3]	do	do	do	37,306	42,439	−5,133	(?)	(?)

[1] Calendar year.

[2] Inasmuch as the Congress and administration in a given calendar year are largely responsible for the fiscal condition of the ensuing fiscal year, it is logical to charge the results of fiscal operations accordingly.

[3] Estimate.

Source: Financial statistics, 1910 through 1947, Annual Report of the Secretary of the Treasury, June 30, 1948; 1948 and 1949, the Treasury daily statement, June 30, 1949.

Mr. Chairman, in considering the overall situation which confronts us the experience of the Canadian Government immediately to the north of us in the postwar years is striking and interesting.

In each postwar year the Canadian Government has succeeded in effecting tax reductions so that the total tax reduction in the five postwar years today amounts to almost $1,300,000,000, equivalent in American terms to $17,400,000,000.

It is also interesting to note that in spite of these five annual tax reductions, the annual tax receipts have varied very little.

The greatly increased economic activity resulting from additional purchasing power in the hands of consumers provided an enlarged tax base in addition to providing consumers with goods and services they could not have had without tax reductions.

Here is how the tax-reduction programs have affected revenues:

In the year 1945–46, with a tax reduction of $300,000,000, the revenue dropped $100,000,000.

In the year 1946–47, with a tax reduction of $266,000,000, there was a revenue increase of $183,000,000.

In the year 1947–48, with a tax reduction of $265,000,000, there was a revenue drop of only $5,800,000.

In the year 1948–49, with a tax reduction of $92,000,000 there was a revenue drop of only $10,500,000.

The year 1949–50, with a tax reduction of $376,000,000, there is an estimated revenue drop of $148,000,000.

Thus, after five successive tax reductions totaling $1,300,000,000 per year at the present time, the estimated 1949–1950 revenues are only $81,000,000 less than in the last war year of 1944–45.

If this country had kept pace with Canada in tax reduction, such reductions would total $17,400,000,000 annually by now. Actually they total about $11,000,000,000. In other words, we need a further cut of about $6,500,000,000 to catch up with Canada.

This is not all, Mr. Chairman. The Canadian Government has not only reduced taxes in every year. It has also reduced its national debt each year, beginning with the first full peacetime fiscal year 1946–47. At the end of 1949–50 the net national debt will have been reduced $1,700,000,000, or 12.9 percent.

Had our Government done equally well since the end of fiscal 1946 our national debt would be reduced by $34,700,000,000 by the end of fiscal year 1950, and at that time would be around $234,000,000,000 instead of around $256,000,000,000, with the trend down instead of up.

On the basis of current population estimates of 13,500,000 for Canada and 150,000,000 for the United States, the per capita debt at the end of fiscal 1950 will be $866 in Canada and $1,723 in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I am advised that the Canadian budget has been, is, and is expected to be in the next fiscal year, in balance with surpluses in each instance.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that Uncle Sam can afford to take a lesson in the fiscal field from our neighbor to the north.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to repeat in passing, that the rate of expenditure at the present time has reached an all time peacetime high. During 8 years under President Woodrow Wilson the

average annual expenditure was $5,800,000,000. During the first 8 years under President Roosevelt, before World War II, the average annual expenditure was $8,400,000,000. The average expenditure under President Truman during his first 4¼ years in office amounted to $45,000,000,000.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, I want to point out that the over-all expenditure which the President recommends in the coming fiscal year of $42,400,000,000 amounts to more than $8,000,000,000 in excess of expenditure during the fiscal year 1948, which ended only 21 months ago.

Of that increase of more than $8,000,000,000, $5,300,000,000 is in respect to domestic expenditure. It is expenditure recommended outside of foreign aid, outside of national defense, outside of veterans' programs, outside of servicing the national debt.

That increase of $5,300,000,000, Mr. Chairman, amounts to almost a 100 percent increase over expenditure for the same purposes in the fiscal year 1948 and it exceeds by some $200,000,000 the anticipated deficit under the President's recommendations for the fiscal year 1951.

Mr. Chairman, it is impossible to blame the contemplated unbalanced budget for fiscal 1951 solely on the cold war.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. I wonder if the gentleman has the figures to show how much of that increase is due to the salary increases for Federal employees that have been voted by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I do not have the exact figure in mind. Of course, the main difficulty in all this expenditure increase comes from authorizations which are voted on the floor of the Congress.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I think the figure for which the gentleman from Virginia asks would be interesting, but I think it would not be accurate unless there were added to it a statement of what reductions in unnecessary employment forces and duplications could have been made in order to absorb the additional salaries, which I think was in the mind of the Congress when they made the additions. It was so stated on the floor, that these additions could be made if the agencies themselves would absorb them without adding to the budget. I find that very few of the agencies made very much effort to do that, so much so that in the subcommittee on which I serve they have pretty well been instructed to do it, if they will not do it of their own volition.

Mr. GARY. I have here the figures for the pay acts that were adopted last year alone. It cost $700,000,000. Of course, it was not my purpose to enter into a discussion at this time as to the propriety of those increases, because Congress debated that question last year and decided it. But I do want to call attention to the fact that the Congress cannot continue to vote for increased costs, and expect the budget to remain the same. In addition to this $700,000,000, we authorized last year approximately $1,000,000,000 a year for low-cost housing. We have authorized various other items. If the Congress continues to vote expenditures of that nature, we must expect the budget to rise.

The total, I understand, is $2,350,000,000.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. What was that figure?

Mr. GARY. The total cost of the new legislation enacted at the last session of Congress.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. But the cost of the salary increase was $700,000,000?

Mr. GARY. Yes.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I think that is a very interesting figure, because just a rough calculation in my mind would indicate that if the agencies of the Government had let their lapses stand without filling them, they would have absorbed that figure almost to the dollar without any additions.

On the other hand, I think the gentleman should give us the figures of further additions to the bureaucracy, the additions to Government employment over and above what the agencies had a year ago or 2 years ago which I think you will find very interesting; and further his own distinguished Senator from Virginia can give him the figures and tell him how we could have saved more than that money.

Mr. GARY. The facts are we have increased the compensation of postal employees alone $740,000,000 since 1945. I think it should be said in all fairness that there had been no increases whatever for a number of years prior to 1945. Those employees had to pay the additional cost of living just as everyone else, and we had to take that into consideration. What I am interested in bringing out is that we should not get up on the floor of the House and vote for these mandatory increases and then when the budget comes before us, talk about how much the President of the United States has increased the budget, or how much any other agency of the Government has increased the budget, because such increases have largely been through the action of the Congress itself in legislating that these increases shall be made.

When the increases are made, necessarily they must be reflected in the budget which is presented to the Congress.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I still insist that there should be some statement made regarding the necessity or advisability of the increases in employment during the same year which, in my mind, is the explanation for the increased budget rather than the increase in salary.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

(Mr. ANDERSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD immediately following the statement by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON.])

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman from Virginia should remember, too, that plan No. 18, which has been sent to us means another increase in compensation of Federal employees. Do not forget that one, and that came down to us from the President. It did not originate here.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. GARY. That came to us from the White House, but it is my understanding it originally was the recommendation of the Hoover Commission.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I know, but you have taken that label and pasted it on all the quack remedies.

Mr. GARY. I personally do not think the Hoover Commission report is a quack report. I think it is a very excellent report. I do not think it is altogether perfect. I do think it is a very excellent report, however.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I do not say it was a quack report. I said that you had taken the Hoover label or the President has, and pasted it on a lot of quack and cracked remedies. That is what I said.

Mr. GARY. The recommendation that the gentleman just mentioned—was not that a recommendation of the Hoover Commission?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Oh, it is just like a lot of other things. Like the one I have in my hand here, to do away with the office of the general counsel and to do away with the wages and hours Administrator and putting it in the Department of Labor. Those things are not in the Hoover Report.

Mr. GARY. The one the gentleman referred to at first is in the report. The transfer of the employees from the postal department to the Central Services was recommended by the Hoover Commission.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes, but there is nothing said there about increasing their pay, that is, letting the postal employees take their schedule of pay over to the general services and also grab off additional days of leave.

Mr. GARY. That automatically follows the transfer, does it not?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, why do we have this tremendous request before us at this time? Why it it so difficult to eliminate waste and extravagance?

There are many reasons. I want to stress two of them which are important, to my mind, at this time.

In the first place, Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, the necessary leadership by the President of the United States is lacking.

We shall never put this Government on the efficient and economical basis, to which the people of this country are entitled, until the President of the United States, whoever he may be and whatever party he may represent, concludes that

this result is vital in the national interest, and puts his back into securing it.

We shall never put this Government on a proper basis as long as the Harry Hopkins' creed of spending and taxing controls Executive thinking.

We all know by experience, Mr. Chairman, the difficulty of effecting economy in the face of opposition by the executive branch of this Government, particularly in the light of the enormous propaganda set-up which it has at its command at this time, a set-up which, as many will recall, the Bureau of the Budget testified only a few years ago amounted to some 46,000 persons, either part time or full time, working at the expense of the people of this country.

We all know equally well how readily substantial economy could be effected if the President of the United States really desired economy.

The so-called Hoover Commission has pointed the road to savings estimated at between three and four billion dollars.

Mere directives to the heads of departments and agencies by the President could effect very substantial economies.

The President, of course, plays a major part in respect to new legislation that is submitted to the Congress, and its cost.

The President could readily control the size of the Federal pay roll.

We have today over 2,000,000 people on that pay roll. All impartial opinion seems to be agreed that the pay roll is grossly overstaffed. The Hoover Commission has pointed out that there is a turn-over in that pay roll of about 25 percent in each and every year. In other words, some 500,000 people on the pay roll in any given year leave their positions for one reason or another.

All that is necessary is to let nature take its course and to rigorously control reappointments when vacancies occur. If that policy were pursued, if vacancies were filled only when absolutely necessary, it would not be long before the swollen pay roll would be down to the size that it ought to be, in terms of efficiency and economy, and no one would be removed against his will from the pay roll.

These are but examples. The Nation is entitled to the leadership and cooperation of the President in the interest of efficiency and economy at this crucial time.

In the second place, Mr. Chairman, the hands of the Eighty-first Congress were tied when the Democratic leadership of the House allowed the expert bipartisan staff of investigators of the Appropriations Committee to be thrown out of the window at the first meeting of the committee in 1949.

No Appropriations Committee under present conditions can function properly without a skilled staff of investigators.

I sat for a time this year as a member of the Armed Forces Subcommittee. I sat there as a substitute because one member of that subcommittee was compelled to be away from Washington.

There were five Members of this House entrusted with the enormous responsibility of passing upon some $15,000,000,000 worth of requests in terms of appropriations or contract authorizations, or more than one-third of the entire budget.

No expert staff of investigators was available. It was possible only to interrogate the officers in charge of the several divisions of the armed services and to draw the best possible conclusions.

I did not attend the executive session at the end of the hearing to mark up the bill, but I think I can picture the subcommittee, confronted by the all-important question of national defense; confronted by the realization that in the event of trouble they would be responsible for any unjustified cuts; arriving at the conclusion that it was impossible to make any cuts unless justified beyond any shadow of doubt; and finally recommending a reduction of $141,000,000, or less than 1 percent of the total request.

Mr. Chairman, I am not reflecting upon this subcommittee or anyone of its members. They are all personal friends of mine. They are all able Members of this House, desiring economy where economy is possible. The point I make is that no subcommittee can possibly do the job properly in respect to this enormous request for funds, and make intelligent cuts, unless it has the facts.

Personally, I am for every cent that is necessary for national defense. I never want to go through again the experiences some of us went through in 1940 and 1941, when we knew from figures confidentially presented which could not be made available to the public, that this country was lamentably unprepared for World War II.

The situation was so bad that General Marshall subsequently in an official report stated, if I recall correctly, that aside from plans we were in worse condition prior to World War II than we were in 1917 prior to World War I.

This country accomplished miracles between 1940 and 1945. We were lucky to have 5 years. We will not have 5 years next time.

It may be that some adjustment is necessary in certain respects in reference to national defense appropriations. General Eisenhower's views are certainly entitled to every consideration.

Personally, I think that aid for our major ship construction yards in the near future is vital.

The situation in these yards today is deplorable. Employment is deteriorating rapidly. There is little or no naval construction in view, and commercial construction is practically ending. There are only eight commercial ships under construction in our major yards on the Atlantic coast in the calendar year 1950. Only one will be under construction in the calendar year 1951, and I am advised that two of these yards will have to close in the near future unless something is done to help the situation.

This is not a matter for consideration in connection with this bill. There is a bill, however, which has been pending before the Committee on Rules for months. It was introduced with a view to meeting this situation. A long-range program of construction must be encouraged if we are to take care of our skilled staffs of workers at essential shipyards, which have proved themselves to be vitally essential from the standpoint of national defense.

There is another item in this bill which I think is important in this connection. I refer to the proviso in the independent offices chapter of the bill which states:

Provided further, That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be available for, nor any obligation made for, the payment of an operating-differential subsidy for any number of ships in excess of the number of ships receiving such subsidy as of January 1, 1950.

Mr. Chairman, those concerned maintain that the present wording of this proviso would in effect cancel all operating subsidies provided in the 1936 Merchant Marine Act, designed to assure an adequate merchant marine equipped to serve as auxiliary in time of war.

They point out also that the proviso is unnecessary inasmuch as adequate control over the situation is maintained through the annual appropriation of funds for operating subsidies.

I believe this proviso should be deleted or so amended as to meet the objections that have been made to it.

The fact remains, however, Mr. Chairman, that the over-all request for national defense, whether you consider it $15,000,000,000 or $20,000,000,000, is an enormous sum of money.

The fact also remains, Mr. Chairman, that over the years our armed services have been notoriously wasteful in the handling of funds.

Generally speaking, it is fair to say I think that our military and naval officers are not trained to assess cost. On the contrary, and probably rightly so, they are trained to obtain results regardless of cost.

I am confident that an expert bipartisan group of investigators, such as was available in the Eightieth Congress, could have found ample opportunity for very substantial savings without in any way impairing the national defense within the over-all figure of $15,000,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, under present conditions, the Bureau of the Budget is responsible primarily to the President of the United States. What the President desires the Bureau of the Budget supports. What he does not desire the Bureau of the Budget opposes.

It has been made responsible to the Chief Executive on the theory that it is the executive branch which does the spending of money, and that, therefore, it should have the assistance of the Bureau of the Budget in determining its recommendations for spending.

To me it has always seemed that the purse strings of the Federal Government were deliberately placed in the hands of the Congress; that the executive branch spends only what the Congress authorizes; and that, therefore, the Bureau of the Budget or some equivalent organization should be available and responsible to the Congress in its determination of what sums it will authorize to be expended.

In any event, Mr. Chairman, in the absence of the Bureau of the Budget an

investigating staff for the Appropriations Committee of this House becomes vitally necessary.

This need was recognized for years by Members on both sides of the aisle and after many years authority to appoint such a staff was finally obtained in the Reorganization Act of 1946.

In the succeeding year a start was made in setting up such an organization.

We had, as the members of the committee well recall, a staff of some 10 permanent investigators with FBI and and General Accounting background. We had in addition some 25 part-time members on the staff, including outstanding leaders in the accounting profession, and in the research profession throughout the length and breadth of this country, men drawn from both major parties who willingly gave of their time because of their desire to contribute to the maintenance of the solvency of the Nation.

Those investigators, going directly into departments and agencies, were able not only to make exhaustive reports of the greatest value, but to bring back to the various subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations figures which could be relied upon.

As the result, as the Members will recall, the budget was balanced both in fiscal 1947 and in fiscal 1948, for the first time since President Roosevelt entered the White House in 1933. Rescissions or reductions were effected to the extent of $9,800,000,000, debt reduction was made possible to the extent of $7,000,000,000, and tax reduction was afforded to the extent of $4,800,000,000, one-half of the tax relief going to those with incomes of less than $5,000; 7,500,000 people with low incomes being taken off the tax rolls entirely.

That, Mr. Chairman, was a major accomplishment for the investigating staff, it was a major accomplishment for the Committee on Appropriations of the House, it was a major accomplishment for the Congress as a whole.

Nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, despite this record at the very first meeting of the Committee on Appropriations in January of 1949, after control of the Congress had passed from the Republicans to the Democrats, this staff was completely abolished.

It was no mere change of personnel. The whole principle behind the staff was discarded and we were advised that we were to return to the former policy of investigation when necessary, by one executive agency of another executive agency.

That method, Mr. Chairman, had been tried and found wanting. It will always be found wanting, in my judgment, as long a human nature is what it is.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman will recall that that action was taken in the full committee of the Committee on Appropriations with no opportunity to debate whatsoever and with no defense on the majority side of the action taken. I am referring to the then majority side, which was a year ago last January. To me the action in doing away with that trained investigating staff has cost and will cost the taxpayers of America a good many hundreds of millions of dollars. If the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] would care to do so, I would like to hear him defend that action on the floor.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I do want to make it plain that I am not accusing the gentleman from Virginia of fomenting that particular action, but it did come from the majority side of the full committee and took away from our full Committee on Appropriations the eyes that we need to cut this budget.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. Does the gentleman know that this committee at the present time is using the staff of the FBI for that purpose, which staff is recognized as one of the best investigating staffs in the entire world?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman from Virginia that any staff that has been used—and I have personally seen no results that have amounted to anything in the last 2 years—has been of a temporary character, employed from time to time as may be required, under the authority given the chairman at the meeting to which I referred.

That is a very different proposition from having a staff that is primarily responsible to the committee and to the Congress, such as we had before, and, in my opinion, will never produce the desired results.

As the gentleman from Minnesota has pointed out, the action was taken under the leadership of the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], by the unanimous vote of the Democratic members at that meetings over the unanimous opposition of the Republican members, and without permitting a word of debate or a single question by any Republican Member present.

I predicted at the time that the action would cost the people of this country billions of dollars, and I think that prediction has already been fulfilled.

The action, in my judgment, killed the one best hope of an intelligently balanced budget.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, I submit that essential economy is difficult, if not impossible, first, because of the lack of necessary leadership by the President of the United States, and second, because this Congress rendered itself largely impotent by the denial of essential staff.

Sometime ago, Mr. Chairman, a distinguished American made the following statement:

> We are going down the road to statism. Where we will wind up no one can tell. But if some of the new programs seriously proposed should be adopted, there is danger that the individual, whether farmer, worker, manufacturer, lawyer, or doctor, will soon be an economic slave, pulling an oar of the galley of state.

These are not the words of any Republican.

They are the words of a lifelong Democrat who has rendered distinguished service under the New Deal as a Member of Congress, as United States Senator, as a member of the Supreme Court, as wartime Director of Economic Stabilization, and as Secretary of State.

They are the words of an old friend and colleague known well to many of us here, Mr. Justice Byrnes.

Mr. Chairman, the elimination of waste and extravagance is vital if America is to avoid national bankruptcy, dictatorial government, and the loss of precious liberties.

A strong and solvent America is vital at this time in the world's history, not only in the interest of America itself but in the interest of the entire civilized world.

We should not forget, Mr. Chairman, the words of the great Communist leader, Lenin, when he said, "Some day we will compel the United States of America to spend itself into destruction."

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SADLAK. I desire to commend the gentleman on his able, factual, and documented presentation. It occurs to me, after listening to the gentleman's expressions, which indicate great research and familiarity with his subject, that there are many items in this appropriation measure which, because of the fact that they are fixed item, cannot in any way be tampered with in this appropriation. However, after listening intently to the gentleman, it seems to me we have only one alternative in proceeding on this appropriation measure, namely, to endeavor to make as many small cuts as are possible; and, by a number of small cuts pyramided, attain a goal where the small cuts will then in effect become substantial cuts.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I hope as we go along with the consideration of this bill it will be possible not only to effect small cuts but to effect large cuts.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. The gentleman referred a few moments ago to the superior staff of experts for investigation that was available to the Eightieth Congress.

I would like to ask the gentleman if he does not know that during the second session of the Eightieth Congress there were five references in committee reports to investigations made by the experts. Whereas, during the second session of the Eighty-first Congress there were six references to such investigations in the committee reports.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I will say to the gentleman from Virginia I do not have the list with me now. On a previous occasion, however, I inserted in the RECORD a compilation of the more important investigations made by the ex-

perts during the Eightieth Congress. I think if the gentleman will refer to that list he will be very much surprised, not only by the number, but by the far-reaching importance and thoroughness of the investigations made at that time.

Mr. GARY. I have a list of committee references to investigations conducted by the committee's staff.

There were five references to these investigations in the committee reports of the Eightieth Congress, second session. One, the supplemental independent offices report. That was on the Veterans' Administration and Army and Navy pensions.

Another reference was in the Interior report. That referred to the accounting systems in the departments.

Another was in the State, Justice, Commerce and Judiciary report which related to Department services. Another reference was to the Weather Bureau.

In the Treasury Department there were references to the Bureau of Internal Revenue and typewriter purchases.

In the Eighty-first Congress, second session, the references were as follows: In the Commerce report to the CAA investigation, to the CAB investigation, and to the Bureau of Standards.

In the Agriculture report, to the investigation on entomology.

In the Interior report, to the Road Commission's claims.

In the Eighty-first Congress, to the Civil Service Commission.

The Eighty-first Congress, the Federal Communications Commission.

The Eighty-first Congress, the Atomic Energy Commission.

It would appear from this list that the Committee on Appropriations has been more zealous in referring to and making its investigations in the Eighty-first Congress than in the Eightieth Congress.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. In order that the gentleman from Virginia, who is usually so well informed, may be better informed on this matter, I shall insert at this point in the RECORD a copy of my previous remarks listing the principal investigations made during the Eightieth Congress:

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—STAFF AND ORGANIZATION

I have been a member of the committee for many years, I have long considered it the most important committee in the House of Representatives. Because of present conditions in the world both at home and abroad I consider it has a tremendous responsibility.

Over the years, Mr. Chairman, it has been the opinion of Members on both sides of the aisle belonging to this great committee that that committee could only do its work properly, in a manner worthy of the confidence of the House and of the country, if by some means or other it could obtain a competent, expert, permanent staff, a staff equipped to make investigations and analyses when the occasion demands.

As I stand here and look back over the years I can hear Member after Member standing in the well of this House, Members from both sides of the aisle, making an appeal for that kind of staff.

We finally got the necessary authority for that staff, Mr. Chairman. It came in the so-called reorganization bill approved August 2, 1946.

That bill provides that "Each standing committee of the House and Senate, other than the Committee on Appropriations, is authorized to appoint by majority vote not more than four professional staff members * * * on a permanent basis, without regard to political affiliation and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of the office."

That bill goes further, Mr. Chairman. It provides that the Committee on Appropriations in the House and in the Senate is authorized to appoint such staff as each committee by majority vote shall determine to be necessary and to conduct such studies and examinations of the organization and operation of any executive agency as it may deem needed.

In other words, each Appropriations Committee was authorized to have an unlimited staff, subject only to the judgment of the committee, and essential appropriations.

In my judgment this was one of the most important and most helpful features of the entire Reorganization Act.

What happened, Mr. Chairman? Not long after the Reorganization Act a beginning was made on a real staff for this great committee. Some 8 or 10 permanent employees were appointed, with contemplated expansion. The regular staff was augmented by a group of consultants from private enterprise, who gave generously of their time in the interest of economy. A small allowance for expenses was permitted, and the time and transportation of these individuals was a donation to the cause of good government.

In this manner, skills far beyond the ability of the Government to provide were made available to the committee.

Numbered among these men were 10 of the country's outstanding accountants, picked as a special committee by the American Institute of Accountants. All of these men were, of course, certified public accountants of national standing, and one is currently president of the New York State Certified Public Accountants Society.

The remaining men were business executives and research assistants of considerable standing, many of whom were, and are continuing to be, used as consultants by various Government agencies which have learned to value their counsel and assistance.

There was no partisanship in the activity, as the group was very representative of both political parties, although all were united on behalf of Government economy.

In addition to the day-to-day work of the staff, the major studies completed were as follows:

First. An exhaustive study of the then Federal Public Housing Administration, extending into nine States. The study exposed many vicious illegal practices and was the basis of corrective legislation. As a result, the agency undertook a real reorganization, eliminating frills, waste, and extravagance.

Second. A review of the Department of Agriculture budget for 1948, including all the bureaus and agencies of that Department, resulting in many recommendations of benefit to the Department. This review also encompassed a particular inquiry into the Rural Electrification Administration.

Third. A study of the Maritime Commission for both 1948 and 1949, which resulted in corrective legislation recovering for the Government hundreds of millions of dollars.

Fourth. Studies of the Veterans' Administration's requirements for both 1948 and 1949, which information has been the basis of a great deal of organizational correction. This study likewise went into the Federal hospital picture in great detail and has formed the basis of continued study by the Hoover Commission as well as the Veterans' Administration themselves.

Fifth. A study of the War Assets Administration for 1948.

Sixth. Continuing studies of the Department of the Interior for 1948 and 1949, including such technical subjects as an anlysis of existing Federal power policy and including spot checks of the accounting systems in the various field installations, which were made available to the Department of the Interior and are currently the basis of accounting reorganizations.

Seventh. Detailed analyses of the operations of the United States Employment Service and the Bureau of Employment Compensation which materially assisted in the reorganizations of those agencies and will no doubt be very helpful in the 1950 hearings. This particular investigation required a great deal of field study and resulted in the exposé of especially flagrant violations of the Hatch Act in the State of Tennessee. This information has been forwarded to the Department of Justice and to the United States Civil Service Commission who are currently investigating the matter, with a view to dealing with the offenders.

Eighth. A detailed analysis of the operations of the Bureau of Internal Revenue which resulted in the location of widespread abuses and inefficiency. The report has been made available to the Secretary of the Treasury, and studies are now being made and many improvements instituted that were recommended in this report. As a corollary to this investigation, particularly flagrant violations of the Hatch Act in Massachusetts were uncovered. This information was likewise turned over to the Civil Service Commission and to the Department of Justice for their investigation.

The Civil Service Commission has cited for removal some twenty-odd employees in one Massachusetts office of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. I understand the Department of Justice still has the matter under consideration.

Ninth. An exhaustive investigation of the Department of State which likewise located many flagrant abuses of good administration, and also located a list of undesirable individuals with subversive connections who were then employed by the State Department. Subsequent to the exposé, some 30 to 40 of these individuals were separated from the service. It is also interesting to note that many of the individuals mentioned in the original list were later questioned by the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Tenth. A study of the Treasury Department budget for 1948 and 1949.

Eleventh. A study of the Army and Air Force budgets for 1948 and 1949, which formed a basis for rescissions approximating $5,000,000,000 returned to the taxpayers by this committee.

Twelfth. A study of the budget of the Navy for the fiscal years 1948 and 1949, which likewise formed a basis for substantial monetary rescissions and appropriations reductions.

Thirteenth. An executive study on operations of the Government in the Territory of Alaska. It touches upon the activities of almost every Federal agency operating in Alaska and should be of great value to the committee in the 1950 deliberations.

Fourteenth. A report on the study of the subsistence procurement of Army for use in the 1950 hearings. The report indicates that corrected procedures can save tremendous sums of money.

These are only a few of the more important studies undertaken by the group. In addition, scores of comparatively minor studies were made of specific units of the Government.

The over-all result was that the committee was able to effect savings on rescissions detailed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of some $9,800,000,000 in 2 years, making

possible a balanced budget for the first time in 16 years, making possible a reduction in our national debt of some $7,000,000,000, making possible a reduction in our tax burden of $4,800,000,000, 71 percent of which went to those with incomes of less than $5,000, some 7,000,000 persons being removed from tax rolls entirely.

It was a fine start, and I agree with the sentiment of a close friend of mine now on the majority side of this great committee, who said to me shortly after our return to Washington in January, that in his opinion the Republicans of the last Congress had made a fine start with this staff, and that his only criticism was that the staff had not been large enough.

Now, Mr. Chairman, you may be surprised, in view of this record, to know that this staff has been completely abolished. It has been abolished, despite the experience of years, despite the intent of the Reorganization Act, despite the splendid record that it made.

The staff has not only been abolished, it is not only a question of relieving those who served on the staff, the whole theory of a staff responsible only to the Appropriations Committee has been, for the time being, abandoned, and we have gone back to the old idea of asking one executive agency to please investigate the actions of another executive agency, whenever an investigation seems necessary.

Mr. Chairman, that plan has been tried. It is better than nothing. But as long as human nature remains what it is, it will never, in my opinion, get fundamental results. In fact it may tend at times to conceal rather than to disclose.

Real results depend on a permanent, nonpolitical skilled staff, responsible to the Appropriations Committee and to that committee alone.

I want to pay my tribute, Mr. Chairman, to the work done by the staff of the Committee on Appropriations during the last 2 years. They made a splendid contribution to the Nation in terms of lower prices, in terms of lower taxes, in terms of a stable economy.

I want also to record for the RECORD, Mr. Chairman, my opinion that the action taken in abolishing the staff and certain other action taken in connection with the organization of the committee for this Congress is most unfortunate.

That action was taken contrary to the views of the minority members of the committee. In fact, it was taken without allowing any minority member of the committee the opportunity to question, to debate, or to offer to amend any one of a half dozen resolutions that were adopted in the full committee.

I regret the manner in which the action was taken. In my judgment, it was unworthy of the traditions of the great Committee on Appropriations.

I regret the action taken, because, in my judgment, it is likely to cost the people of this Nation literally billions of dollars.

I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the Eightieth Congress had investigations into every single department and almost every agency of the Government. As a result of this we were able to cut the appropriation bills which were reported to the House $2,774,000,000 as against the proposed cut here of $1,385,000,000.

Mr. GARY. Practically all of that was restored through supplemental and deficiency appropriations.

Mr. TABER. That is not correct.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 hour to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, since we are discussing the greatest peacetime budget in history, I feel we should have a quorum present instead of the apparent 50 or so Members on the floor.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. RABAUT and Mr. TABER.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 14, noes 56.

So the motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas has made the point of order that a quorum is not present. The Chair will count.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

(Mr. STEFAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

WHAT IS NEW IN WEATHER

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, every now and then someone tells us the climate is changing. Not many years ago a professional climatologist probably would have answered such a remark by saying there is no indication that significant changes are taking place in our climate now. Climatologists have always recognized the occurrence of variations in average weather conditions from year to year—warm winters, cool summers, and periods with below-normal rainfall. Unusually dry years led to the disastrous Dust Bowl conditions of the mid-1930's. Until recently most scientists in this field believed these fluctuations from year to year were averaged out in the long run, leaving little or no permanent change in climatic conditions in recent times. But now more comprehensive studies of temperature trends and recession of glaciers and the polar ice cap have led to a conclusion that perhaps the climate which contributes so much to our national economy and prosperity may not be the changeless and everlasting natural resource we have taken for granted. This is a subject of great concern to the public and it is reassuring to know that research workers in the fields of weather science and climate are devoting more attention to investigation of the stability of climate. Even small changes of a few degrees in temperature or a few inches a year in rainfall would seriously modify the agricultural and business activities of many flourishing communities situated in marginal climatic regions. It is necessary to know as far in advance as possible about the long-term trends in weather and climate so that suitable readjustments may be planned. Even now there are localities in the relatively dry parts of the Middle West where wheat farming is being exploited beyond the natural water resources of the area and in dry years that are sure to come sooner or later, we shall doubtless witness another Dust Bowl problem.

Even in the East where rainfall is usually adequate, we hear much about the water shortage in New York City and we find that serious consideration is being given to the possibility of supplementing natural rainfall by artificial rain making. I am informed that these possibilities have been exaggerated in many of the claims by so-called rain makers quoted in the newspapers. Although the United States Weather Bureau is very much interested in seeing a full investigation of the possibilities of increasing the rainfall by artificial means and although success in these efforts would be of inestimable value to the people in many parts of our country, it appears that such methods are likely to be rather limited in practical application and economic value. The trouble is you cannot produce rain economically by artificial methods unless there is adequate moisture in the atmosphere and in most cases when the conditions of moisture and clouds are favorable, nature itself provides the mechanism by which rain is formed. I understand there are occasionally special circumstances, such as the cases where clouds persist more or less continuously over the crests of mountains in winter time and the instances where shower-type clouds are on the verge of precipitation but upper air conditions are not quite right for their full development, and in such cases it would sometimes be possible to start precipitation by use of Dry Ice or other condensation nucleii. But these favorable instances are relatively infrequent and there is no reason to believe at present that artificial methods will provide a solution for water shortages in time of widespread drought. This shows why it is so important for our meteorologists to learn more about the fundamental natural controls of weather and climate.

During the recent war we heard much about research and development in meteorology and improvements in weather-forecasting services. Almost 5 years have passed since cessation of hostilities and I have again inquired into the activities and progress of the Weather Bureau. The war made the American people more weather-conscious than ever and the needs of agriculture and commerce have greatly increased demands for weather reports and forecasts. Moreover, the weather-reporting system on which our weather forecasts in the United States are based has taken on a world-wide aspect. It depends upon daily weather reports from stations in the Arctic and from weather-patrol vessels at sea, as well as from a vast network of land stations closely related by international cooperation. The reports from domestic and overseas stations contain not only

comprehensive data of weather conditions measured on the ground or near the surface of the sea but also the conditionOs of air temperature, pressure, humidity, and wind at each successive altitude up to 40,000 or 50,000 feet and in some cases higher. All of this information is essential for diagnosis of the ever-changing structure of the atmosphere and its accompanying influence on the weather and climate we experience on the ground.

Our citizens should know more about this extensive system of international weather reporting which is the basis for the weather reports and forecasts we see each day in the newspapers or hear over the radio. The collecting center of the Weather Bureau in Washington now receives more than 25,000 reports of surface and upper air meteorological conditions by radio or wire every day. They come from all parts of the Northern Hemisphere and from some of the Southern Hemisphere. Many more are received by mail from countries in the Southern Hemisphere, the delay in transmission by this channel being no handicap for most climatological purposes. Since the weather south of the Equator does not immediately affect our weather in the United States the reports are not required by radio or cable for daily weather forecasting as is the case with conditions in the Northern Hemisphere where the interrelationships of weather are more direct. In the course of a year it requires more than 15,000,000 different weather observations and reports to serve the needs of agriculture, aviation, business, and industry in the United States, and weather conditions differ so much from place to place and from day to day that about 300,000 different forecasts are needed each year to describe the different local eather conditions. During 1949 an additional 4,300 forecasts of flood conditions in various river valleys of the United States were issued by the Weather Bureau to enable the populace to take precautions against damage and loss of life by floodwaters. This flood warning service has been improved and extended during recent years and is the best developed and one of the most interesting and valuable services of its kind anywhere. I shall say more about it a little later.

A handicap of the weather forecaster before the war was the lack of weather reports from the Arctic where cold waves that grip the United States in wintertime usually originate. Reports were very sparse also from many ocean areas where moist air masses which bring rain to this country have their source. The forecaster had to guess the nature of changing conditions in the Arctic and over the oceans in order to estimate the effects of air masses from these regions when they reached the United States. To some extent deficiencies in reports from these areas have now been corrected.

Through international cooperation with Canada and Denmark and with the assistance of the Air Force and Navy, the Weather Bureau now participates in the operation of joint weather stations in six widely separated localities in the far north. One of the stations is within 500 miles of the North Pole. Their reports of surface and upper air conditions transmitted daily by radio have contributed much to improvement in forecasts of cold waves, blizzards, and other severe weather conditions in our Middle West.

The meteorological station network over the oceans has also been improved as result of international cooperation. In the Atlantic the bordering maritime nations have joined together to support 10 weather patrol vessels. These ships also serve as navigational aids and for search and rescue missions for aircraft and ships in distress. Four of the stations are manned by the United States, two by Great Britain, one by France, one by Norway, and the other two jointly by Canada, Netherlands, and this country. The apportionment is based upon the relative volume of air traffic of the respective countries. In the Pacific where there is still a great expanse of water where weather observations are rarely, if ever, made, our weather maps are comparatively incomplete and the forecasting of weather, therefore less accurate. At present there are three station weather ships in the Pacific, all in the eastern half, maintained by the United States primarily as aids to aerial navigation.

Much of the progress in meteorology during the war was in the development of apparatus and instruments. The radar has been adapted for use in detecting formation of destructive thunderstorms. It has been used also to locate and track hurricanes at distances of a hundred miles or more and it is being tested experimentally as a means of recognizing tornadoes before they come within a range of the regular weather observer's eye. Radar installations have been placed at three stations in the Middle West to serve as outposts for tornado warnings. In effect, they extend the "visual" range to distances of 75 miles or more with respect to heavy rainstorms. The three installations are at Wichita, Kans., Wichita Falls, Tex., and Norfolk, Nebr. Another interesting wartime development in meteorology is the use of seismographs to detect hurricanes while they are far at sea beyond the observation of vessels in regular ocean lanes. The microseisms produced by hurricanes and typhoons are not yet well understood and they do not occur every time hurricanes are present but frequently they are the only sign of a hurricane in some remote part of the ocean. Present evidence indicates that whenever microseisms of a particular type are recorded they point infallibly to existence of a hurricane.

Still another important device in modern weather analysis and forecasts is the rawinsonde perfected by the military services during the war. By means of a small radio set which transmits meteorological measurements and is tracked by a special type of radio compass, this instrument as it ascends with a sounding balloon gives for the first time a practical means for measuring the wind direction and velocity above the clouds by use of recording equipment installed on the ground. Because measurements of the upper winds are most important during periods of overcast sky and storminess the rawinsonde has added much to the accuracy of forecasting under certain conditions. This has reference in particular to prediction of the rate of movement of storms and preparation of maps of winds aloft for aircraft operations.

In 1941 the Weather Bureau established a new system of flood-warning service in northeastern Nebraska. This organization makes use of immediate reports from cooperative observers who serve without pay and go into action whenever rainfall passes a certain critical figure. The system is designed to furnish warnings in river valleys where heavy showers cause flash floods. Although this method has its limitations, it is the best means so far developed for providing a warning service for flash floods, and its success as the first of its kind has led to organization of similar cooperative networks in 20 other localities, one of which is the Potomac River Basin.

Flood-control projects of the Corps of Engineers and irrigation works of the Bureau of Reclamation call for extensive studies of meteorological situations which give rise to flood conditions. The weather conditions determine to a large extent the location, type, and magnitude of flood-control dams and reservoirs for conservation of water. As one of the steps in its advancement of the flood-forecasting services for the country, the Weather Bureau during the past 2 years has been supported by Congress in establishment of six river forecast centers and one seasonal water supply forecast station. As an example of the responsibility of these centers, the Weather Bureau office at Portland, Oreg., issues river forecasts for about 100 localities in the area. During 1949 estimates for the country as a whole indicated that precautions against damage by flood as a result of timely and accurate forecasts prevented losses amounting to $180,000,000 or more. The total losses by flood during the year were of course in excess of this, but they would have been greater by this amount if flood forecasts had not been available.

Naturally, the public is interested in the cost of maintaining the Weather Bureau. During the past 10 years appropriations to the Bureau have increased from about $5,000,000 to almost $25,000,000 per year. Perhaps half of this increase is the result of increased operating costs for salaries, communications, expendable sounding balloons, and similar items. The other half represents expansion of the Bureau due to the greatly increased uses of weather information in business and industry and especially the new requirements for accurate forecasts in agriculture and air commerce. The present cost is equivalent to about 18 cents per capita. Although it is impossible to place a dollar value on the lives saved as result of warnings issued by the Weather Bureau in advance of hurricanes, blizzards, and so forth, estimated at a minimum of several hundred lives each year, it has been shown by surveys that practical use of weather reports and forecasts in the agricultural and commercial activities of the country are worth more than a billion dollars

each year. This represents a value in excess of $7 per capita, a very good return on the investment.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, the one-package appropriation bill now before the House is supposed to give the Members of Congress and to the American people an opportunity to consider at one time the relationship between appropriations, expenditures, and revenues. If it will accomplish that purpose, it will obviously be a step in the right direction. However, from present indications and knowledge which I have obtained up to date I have serious doubts in my mind as to whether it will in reality accomplish the objectives that its sponsors had in mind.

I desire at this time to refer to a statement made by the President in his recent annual message to the Congress on the state of the Union. The President among other things stated:

> Largely because of the ill-considered tax reductions of the Eightieth Congress the Government is not now receiving enough revenue to meet its expenditures.

You all heard that statement, and you heard the President make that statement time and time again, and you have heard it again on this floor and out on the political stump by those who adhere to the philosophy of the present occupant of the White House. You have heard them make that statement repeatedly, and you have heard the President and those who aid him in making that statement seek to place responsibility for his continuing budget deficits on the Eightieth Congress.

When we are faced with facts that are so clear, facts that anyone can get if they simply take the time to read the President's budget and the explanatory material that goes along with it, and when we are faced with a fiscal situation so dangerous, why not tell the people of America the truth? Why stand in the well of this House and repeat something that cannot be substantiated on the facts?

Now, let us get the facts. It will be recalled that in fiscal 1947 which began July 1, 1946, and ended June 30, 1947, the Treasury showed a surplus of $800,000,000. In fiscal year 1948, which began July 1, 1947, and ended June 30, 1948, the Treasury showed a surplus of $8,400,000,000. A Republican Congress was in charge of appropriation bills, and through the medium of reductions in appropriations and rescissions of appropriations previously made, the Eightieth Congress not only balanced the budget but has enabled the Treasury to show the surpluses to which I have just referred in fiscal 1949, which began July 1, 1948, and ended June 30, 1949. In the first year of the Democratic control of the Congress a deficit of $1,700,000,000 was incurred. The projected deficit in the revised estimates of the President for fiscal 1950, the year in which we are presently operating, indicates a deficit of $5,700,000,000 and in view of the recent drop in tax receipts indicated in reports that have recently come from the Treasury Department it is certain that the President will have to revise his estimates again and it may be that the deficit for 1950 instead of being $5,700,000,000 may perhaps be six or seven billion dollars.

Now, the tax law has been vigorously assailed and condemned by the President and by the majority leader and by the distinguished orator from Missouri [Mr. CHRISTOPHER] who has repeatedly referred to it, and by numerous others, including the Vice President and many others I have heard speak on this subject. And, by the way, you Fair Dealers have been in control now of the first session of the Eightieth Congress, you have been in control since January 1950 of this session of Congress and despite your condemnation of the action of the Eightieth Congress in passing a tax-reduction bill not one of you has dared to offer a bill and bring it to the Congress proposing to repeal that action of the Eightieth Congress. Why do you not do that? You have complete control of the House Ways and Means Committee, you can bring in a bill here in 10 minutes if you want to. If that law is so bad, if it is as bad as it has been pictured, if that action of the Eightieth Congress is responsible for your budget deficits, why have you not brought a bill in here to repeal it? Why do you continue to kid the American people? You are going to find out that they will not be kidded much longer because they have access to the facts.

What are they? That tax law of the Eightieth Congress became effective on April 2, 1948, and was made retroactive to January 1, 1948. The revised rates of withholding went into effect on May 1, 1948.

Fiscal 1948, which includes 6 months of calendar 1948, during which the new law was effective, shows that personal income tax collections—by the way it should be noted right here that the Republican tax reduction law only related to personal income taxes—were $20,997,780,699. In fiscal 1949 personal income tax collections were $18,725,152,438. Thus showing and indicating a net drop in personal income tax collections of $2,272,628,261.

You recall that when that bill was brought before the Congress it was contended that if tax reductions were given to the people, and they had the right to spend some of their money themselves instead of letting the Government take it from them and direct how it should be spent, that there would be an upturn of business and the corporation income taxes would show a tremendous increase. That was the contention. What has happened?

Let us examine the corporate income taxes for the same period. Corporate income taxes for the fiscal year 1948 were $10,174,409,834, and for 1949, after the passage of this infamous income tax reduction, as it has been called by my Fair Deal friends, who ought to know better, corporate income taxes rose to $11,553,669,234, or an increase on the corporate income side of $1,375,259,400.

Now, my friends, let us not talk in half-truths in this very eventful and fateful hour. Let us tell the truth, and I defy anyone in or out of Congress to dispute the figures which I have quoted. Thus, it will be seen that in spite of the recession which was getting under way when this income tax law was passed—and everyone knows that—which the Revenue Act of 1948 unquestionably halted, corporate income tax receipts increased in the amount just referred to exactly as was contended by the advocates of that tax-reduction law in the Eightieth Congress. Thus it can be seen that the tax-reduction bill passed in the Eightieth Congress placed additional money in the hands of the people of America to spend themselves and relieved thousands of little-income people from paying any tax at all, and the result is that it stimulated American business so that the net loss of income tax receipts, both corporate and individual, was only $893,368,861, yet the deficit in that year was $1,700,000,000.

Now Mr. Truman, now Mr. Majority Leader, now Mr. Christopher from Missouri, now all of you people who have been making such rash statements as you have been making, placing the responsibility for your budget difficulties upon that tax reduction bill, why not tell the truth? We will admit that there was some reduction in the over-all tax picture, but in no sense can it be said that that tax-reduction bill is responsible for the budget difficulties.

What about the deficit you face today? The President in his annual budget message to this Congress specifically stated that income-tax payments were maintaining a constant level, and yet we are faced in fiscal 1950 with a budget deficit of over $5,700,000,000.

There can be just one answer to this whole situation. There is just one reason why we are going in the red, and that is because we are spending just too much money. We do not have the courage to put first things first and apply the reason you would apply to your own business and your own life and your own family and seek to make reductions where they are possible without interference with the general services of the Government, and try as near as possbile to bring this budget into balance.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. JACOBS. I do not know whether or not I understood the gentleman correctly a moment ago, but is it correct that the tax bill passed by the Eightieth Congress did not increase or affect corporate income-tax rates? Did I understand the gentleman correctly?

Mr. KEEFE. Yes; I so stated.

Mr. JACOBS. Then if you collected a billion and a third more dollars in corporate income taxes after that went into effect, that meant the corporations made a whole lot more money.

Mr. KEEFE. Exactly as was contended. It was the contention here in this Congress, and it was contended in Canada and by all other people that have given any thought to this tax question, that if you will put some money in the hands of the people and let them spend it for the purposes for which they want to spend it, business will be stimulated. As the result, the Government

will not lose revenue, but will gain on the corporate side.

Mr. JACOBS. It looks as if the corporations gained, too.

Mr. KEEFE. I have no doubt they did. I am not questioning that. So what? That is the very argument—that corporate income will go up and business will be better if you give the people an opportunity to spend some of their money, instead of having a lot of bureaucrats and Government agencies take it away from them, and take away from them a large clip for their own expenses before it gets out into circulation. It is the velocity of spending, as everybody knows, that creates business and determines whether or not profits will be up or down.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Is not the whole enterprise system of America based on the proposition that profits must be made and income must flow before we gather any revenue whatsoever?

Mr. KEEFE. If we are to maintain the capitalistic system of America—let us call it by its right name. We use the term "democracy" in its widest sense, but the thing that has given this country the position it has is the capitalistic system. Inexorably interwoven with that system is the profit motive. Whenever you take the profit motive away, you are approaching socialism, or its first cousin, communism, make no mistake about that.

If I had the time, I would like to point out, and I shall take just a moment to point out that every person I know of in your party and in the other party that is seriously considering the picture that faces the country today realizes that if we continue down the path we are going, 25 years from now, 30 years from now, 40 years from now, or sooner, perhaps, we will have completely changed our concept of government, and, in fact, have realized a socialistic system in America.

It took them a half a century in England to do exactly the same thing as we are doing here. They did not realize many of the steps they were taking when put together in the total mosaic would spell socialism. After 50 years of effort they have a socialistic government in Great Britain. We are taking that same course here and traveling at a very rapid rate as every intelligent and sensible and nonpartisan thinker on that subject in America is willing to concede.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. Is it not true, history shows each and every time personal income taxes have been reduced, revenue to the Government has increased and that happened not only as a result of the tax reduction bill of the Eightieth Congress, but as a result of every tax reduction bill?

Mr. KEEFE. That was true after the last war. The distinguished gentleman who now occupies the chair, and who is a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and my distinguished friend, the chairman sitting in the Chamber well know, that when they advocated tax reduction they did so on the theory that it would stimulate business—and it did. I am certain, may I say to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, if you will report a bill which will eliminate some of these nuisance taxes which are a stumbling block to business, and which are keeping people from buying furs and jewelry and other items, you will not have to be talking about what you are going to do up in New England to take care of the industry in Connecticut or Rhode Island.

Business will revive and, in fact, you will not lose any real revenue.

Mr. Chairman, I want to devote myself in the balance of the time I have remaining to a subject which is very near and dear to me, and the one on which I spent most of the years of my legislative experience. That subject is the field of public health. May I say to you I have had a hundred Members of Congress come to see me personally and call me on the telephone and ask the question, "What have you done to the public-health program?" They have stated that they have received letters from governors, from this party and that party, and from this organization and from that organization, demanding that they be told what the Committee on Appropriations has done to the public-health activities of this Nation.

I want to answer some of these questions so that you will be able, intelligently, to answer those same questions.

At the outset, I want to emphasize good health is the greatest asset any individual can possess. Is there anyone here who will deny that statement? Good physical health in the people of America is the greatest asset we have. A vigorous, alert, healthy citizenry is the greatest asset of any nation, and we in the United States can be justly proud of the remarkable advances that have been made in the field of public health. As a result of the constant painstaking efforts of thousands of men and women engaged in scientific research and the application of approved principles we have seen a steady decline in the mortality rate as a result of the incidence of infectious and contagious diseases, such as smallpox, diphtheria, yellow fever, typhoid, malaria, and many other diseases. We have seen a gradual accumulation of scientific knowledge resulting in the constant discovery of new and better means of controlling diseases which formerly resulted in high mortality rates.

Scientists and researchers working in the field of sanitation, nutrition, and hospital and medical services, have seemingly performed miracles in extending the average expectancy of life here in the United States. The Biblical expectancy of life of 70 years has practically been reached by the female population of America today and the male population is only 2.3 percentage points behind that. Think of it. The normal expectancy of life in the time of Andrew Jackson and Alexander Hamilton was only 28 years. This year in America a baby born tomorrow has a normal life expectancy of over 67 years, if it is male, and nearly 70 years if it is female.

Think of that, my friends. Take it home with you to the doubting Thomases who say that money expended for research, hospital facilities, and sanitation is money thrown down the drain.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. TACKETT. The gentleman mentioned the other day about a cut in the appropriation for hospital construction.

Mr. KEEFE. I am coming to that right now. I am going to discuss it.

As a result of the constant increase in the age groups over 60 years of age, special attention is now being given to those diseases that take a terriffc toll of human suffering and life. I refer especially to cancer, diseases of the heart, and circulation. I also refer to the amazing, outstanding increase in the number of people afflicted with mental illness. These diseases, together with infantile paralysis, rheumatic heart, multiple sclerosis, peptic ulcers, and a number of other diseases affecting sight and hearing are now being attacked on a wide front in order that our rapidly growing aged population may end their days in peace and comfort, and to contribute to the general welfare and life and normal expectancy of life from these terrible scourges.

The work of the National Cancer Society, the American Heart Association, the National Mental Hygiene Association, the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, the Damon Runyon Cancer Fund, and many other public and private philanthropies and organizations working throughout the country have turned the thinking of the American people to ways and means that must be found to ultimately eliminate these great destroyers and cripplers of human beings in the future.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations, dealing with public-health questions—and I have been a member of that committee now for more than 10 years—I have been pleased to devote the major part of my time, as most of you know, to knowing and understanding those problems.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I want to say that having sat next to the gentlemen from Wisconsin upon that subcommittee for 6 years, it is my firm conviction that no man in America, at least in the Congress of the United States, has done as much for public health in its various branches, through his interest in such things as trying to do away with cancer and heart disease, and such, as has the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. I am very thankful to the gentleman for those more than kind remarks.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. I can go even further than the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] and say that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE]

has gone right into my home to help me in a personal situation, and I shall never forget him for all that he has done for me and mine.

Mr. KEEFE. I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I believe always in the back of the gentleman's mind is the desire to help people who are ill. He deserves an enormous amount of appreciation.

Mr. KEEFE. I may say to my friends in the House that the thing that has kept me in the Congress has been the interest which I have had in this field of public health. Were it not for the fact that there is a tremendous amount of work to be done, a tremendous amount of work to be done in the face of opposition from people who do not know and understand the problem, I am frank to confess that I would not be attracted to service in this House much longer. But I say to you that this matter of public health and the part that the Congress of the United States can play in fostering those great programs that we now have in operation promise such astounding and unheard of results that if I get no other compensation in this life at all, it will be enough compensation for me to have played a small part in attempting to make the services that are now available to a few available to all the people of America.

If I have my way and Congress supports the attitude of the chairman of this subcommittee and my own attitude we will see to it that this program we have developed over the last 10 years is not destroyed capriciously, but that it will be maintained at a level that will permit it to continue to function in the direction that Congress has indicated that it wants it to function and not be curtailed and limited, if you please, because some one man does not believe that research is worthwhile.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. Will the gentleman explain to us just exactly what this bill does to this program?

Mr. KEEFE. I am going to get to it right at this moment.

There is a demand in certain parts of the country and in some quarters for the establishment of some sort of system of public health insurance, and it is directly associated to and made attractive to the public through the promise that if such a program is established it will be able to more effectively bring to all the people the benefits of advanced scientific knowledge and improved hospital and medical service. It is this natural allurement that is being overplayed, in my judgment, by those who advocate compulsory national health insurance. I think we can agree that the ultimate objective of any program whether it be compulsory or voluntary, is to achieve a wider distribution of hospital and medical services and to bring to a greater number of our people the prospects of better health. In considering this ultimate objective I have long felt that we should not merely denounce the proposal of Mr. Oscar Ewing and those associated with him, those who clamor for compulsory national-health insurance without being able to suggest a solution for an admitted problem by tendering a better program more in keeping with the American system of liberty and freedom, and free from the withering and destructive influence of bureaucratic or socialistic control. To suggest an alternative proposal it is not necessary to present a detailed and utterly new concept of medicine and hospital care. In my judgment, the answer to the Ewing proposal is to be found in the over-all progress that is being made in the hospital construction program, in the expanded research program, in the development of State and local and public-health services, in sanitation, in pollution-control development, in aids to develop better medical schools, clinics, laboratories, and facilities; in the development of more and better doctors and researchers, and in the constant education of the public so that they will avail themselves of these facilities before it is too late.

Oh, how often we see the case of an individual believing himself to be in good health, with no previous notice, toppling over in his chair. We have seen that repeatedly manifested in this Congress. A visit to a properly trained doctor or technician might have put that person under care and possibly have avoided the calamitous situation resulting from his sudden and unexpected passing. It is a human experience that each and every one of us sees every day of our life; and I, for one, intend to try to do something about it. You are going to have a chance to vote to do something about it before this bill finally is passed.

Mr. Chairman, we have before us today the proposed 1951 budget of the Public Health Service. At this time, we must subject every proposed expenditure to the closest scrutiny to ensure ourselves that the funds must be spent and that they will contribute amply to the health, well-being, and economy of the Nation. We have a corresponding obligation to protect standards of health and to avoid being "penny-wise and pound-foolish."

I wish to apply these principles specifically to the construction program of the Public Health Service. This program falls into two interlocking parts which at first glance seem unrelated. All medical research—fundamental and applied—is worth undertaking and deserves support from public funds only because it will—sooner or later—relieve human suffering. Research findings are valuable to human beings not in the laboratory, but when they are applied to the prevention of illness or to the cure of illnesses in doctors' offices, clinics, and hospitals. The major gap in our medical care facilities is the Nation's hospital facilities. Unless they are expanded, research findings must remain in large part sterile. Moreover, we must have an adequate hospital system—particularly in rural areas—if preventive medicine is to be practiced on the scale required both to save lives and to avoid the heavy costs that arise from postponing adequate medical attention.

The second element of the program is aid to hospitals, medical schools, and universities for the construction of research facilities. Just as hospitals are necessary if research is to be fruitful, research is critically important if the Nation is to avoid a constantly rising bill for the cost of medical care. The Hoover Commission, after noting what research has done over the last 50 years to reduce the incidence of what used to be the major communicable diseases of children—smallpox, diptheria, and so forth—and of adults—as witness the treatment of pneumonia and venereal diseases with antibiotics—warned that we must step up the pace of medical research if the cost of medical care is to be kept within bounds. If we can substantially reduce the incidence of such major scourges as heart disease, cancer, and mental disorders, the savings to the Federal Government in provision of medical care to veterans alone will repay the cost of the research many times over. At this time, the shortage of space for research is—as I shall point out in detail in a few minutes—reducing the productivity of research expenditures and forcing the postponement of urgently needed work.

I am convinced not only that measures such as these wil save Federal, State, and local expenditures in years to come. I am also convinced that adequate hospital facilities and adequate research facilities are a means of raising health standards to levels that the people of the Nation should enjoy and that will cut the ground from under extreme and impractical proposals in the field of medical care.

II. HOSPITAL FACILITIES

I should now like to discuss specifically the item concerned with the construction of community hospitals and health centers under the Hospital Survey and Construction Act.

I doubt that there is a single Member of Congress who is not familiar with this great program, who has not had one or more hospitals built in his district which would not otherwise have been possible except for the assistance under the Hospital Survey and Construction Act.

We all know that the program has been successful. Those of us who have taken an active role in the hearings preceding passage of the Hospital Survey and Construction Act of 1946 and in subsequent congressional action relating to this legislation know that this success is not attributable to accident. I want to explain precisely why it has been successful, and why the arbitrary action of the Committee on Appropriations in cutting the 1951 appropriation for this act is an affront to both Houses of Congress, a breach of faith with States and communities, and a threat to the standards of health of the peaple of the Nation, particularly those in rural areas.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I agree with the statement of the gentleman, and at the proper time in the consideration of the bill I

expect to offer an amendment to restore the cut back to the budget item.

Mr. KEEFE. I thank the gentleman. I have such a proposal already prepared.

To begin with, I know of no legislation—and I say this advisedly—that was more carefully planned and that was based upon more careful consideration of needs and of alternative ways of meeting them.

A commission on hospital care established under the auspices of the American Hospital Association with the full support and backing of the American Medical Association began its studies of a careful long-range plan for hospital construction in 1944, 2 years before passage of the act. It found that the hospital resources of the Nation were truly in a critical condition, that there was not only an acute shortage of hospital beds but that many were grossly obsolete and inadequate to carry on modern medical care. They found that the hospitals then in existence were poorly distributed leaving large areas of the country with virtually no hospital beds of any kind. They found that doctors were rapidly disappearing from the rural areas primarily because there were too few hospitals in which to practice their highly technical professions. In large part, these deficiencies stemmed from the virtual cessation of hospital construction during the depression. They could not be remedied during the war, when stopgap measures centered around the needs of defense areas had to suffice.

This commission reached the conclusion that there was no possibility of constructing the needed hospital beds without Federal aid. But they did not stop there. They said that these Federal funds should not be provided to any State until that State had carefully surveyed its needs and arrived at a comprehensive long-range plan for construction, giving first consideration to the most needy areas. Finally, they stressed the point that any Federal program that might be adopted should have a large element of State and local control.

The Hospital Survey and Construction Act, embodying these principles, became law in August 1946 after hearings that began in January 1945. In hearings before both Houses of Congress, representatives of medicine, hospitals, labor, industry, farm groups, education, and many others not only stressed the need for hospitals but expressed their support of the principles laid down by the commission.

I recount these developments not as an exercise in historical exposition, but to make clear the fact that the statute was not hurriedly drawn, that it had and has now a broad base of support—labor and management, Republican and Democratic, urban and farm, medical and lay, that it permits no expenditure of Federal funds until a sound, detailed State plan is established, and that it draws the States and localities fully into planning and operation of the act. This is no bureaucratically engendered Federal hand-out. It is a model of cooperative planning to meet human needs.

Now, how has the act worked out?

The beginning was slow. I say this not apologetically but with pride. The actual start on construction was slow because the required surveys had to be made, and plans based on the surveys developed. By the end of the fiscal year 1947, all of the States and Territories had completed their surveys and had their long-range master plans approved by the Surgeon General. They showed a total need for more than 900,000 new hospital beds, the long-run goal of the program. Under these long-range State plans, the needs of each and every community have been carefully evaluated. The needs of each one have been objectively considered and rated in relation to the needs of all the others. Each community, therefore, knows in advance its relative position and approximately when it might expect to receive financial aid.

I stress this planning for two reasons. First, the plans are a remarkable instance of measuring needs and ranking them in order of priority. More important, their usefulness rests upon the reasonable assumption that the Congress of the United States will observe its commitments. These plans are not dreamed up. They are produced by the hard labor of thousands of interested people—doctors, hospital administrators, and lay groups and individuals—in all States and in hundreds of communities. They are linked to plans for bond issues. They involve municipal finance plans. They are the base for fund-raising drives in cities, towns, and counties. The Committee on Appropriations has, as I shall point out, proposed action that will throw these efforts into complete chaos.

The act has produced more than plans, and has done more than stimulate cooperation—desirable as these are. It has gotten hospitals built, particularly in rural areas. Of the 1,019 projects approved since the beginning of the program, up to December 31, 1949, 797 are general hospitals; 71 percent of these are in communities of less than 5,000 population, and 87 percent are in communities of less than 10,000 population. It is obvious therefore that the general hospitals are going into rural communities, most of which have never before had the advantage of hospital care. Hospitals for tuberculosis, mental, and chronic diseases are for the most part of necessity located in larger population centers since this is where the necessary specialists are found.

The financing of the act has been upon a conservative basis. I had some part in insuring that this would be the case. Let me cite a pertinent example. The original provided for an annual cash appropriation of $75,000,000 with which to pay one-third the cost of hospital construction. Since it was difficult to estimate accurately the cash demands of the program, the Appropriations Committee substituted for the fiscal year 1948 a contractual authority for the $75,000,000 in cash appropriations. This permitted the Congress to make the cash appropriations later and in such amounts as were required to meet these contractual obligations. Some said that this was a device to hold back the program and delay its execution. It was in reality a common sense method of financing that has characterized the total operation of the program, and has proved to be entirely satisfactory.

The success of the act led the first session of the Eighty-first Congress to extend the time of operation of the act from 1951—the original expiration date—to 1955. Moreover, the original annual allotment of $75,000,000 was raised to $150,000,000 in the light of experience gained as construction actually got under way. It is to this level of appropriations that the planning of State and local bodies has become firmly and justifiably linked for the next 5 years.

The original act was not perfect. It was not, for example, flexible enough to permit adjustment of the Federal share of hospital costs to the financial ability of the States, nor to permit reasonable adjustments to meet the needs of richer and poorer areas within the States. This has been rectified.

A second deficiency of the original act was that it did not lay sufficient emphasis on means of making hospitals more effective as medical care institutions. This Congress dealt with this problem by authorizing the Surgeon General to make studies and demonstrations directed toward the improvement in hospital practices and regional integration of hospitals, and to make grants to hospitals, universities, States, and other appropriate professional bodies for these purposes.

These cooperative studies are badly needed because most of the hospitals of the country are small and isolated. The small rural hospital can be fully effective only if it is associated with a larger medical center so that it can call upon specialized personnel and facilities in order to provide a complete service. The fact that the large majority of the hospitals being built under the Hospital Survey and Construction Act are quite small increases the necessity for doing something to insure the quality of the care to be given. The practicability of such a regional organization of a group of small hospitals around a medical center has already been amply demonstrated in a few places with the financial support of a number of philanthropic foundations.

The necessity for these studies and demonstrations has been stressed in testimony before Congress by State departments of health, the American Hospital Association, and the American Medical Association. I share the views of these leaders that the Hospital Survey and Construction Act will fall short of its goal if in aiding hospital construction, it fails to insure that the quality of hospital care in rural areas is as good as that given in metropolitan centers.

I have reviewed this program with some care to make a number of things clear. First, the program has been thought out with extreme care. Second, the States and localities have been brought fully into the planning and operation of the program. Third, the program is working out as was intended. Fourth, the rate of construction—even

with the liberalizing amendments enacted by the Eighty-first Congress—is moderate in relation to the needs for hospitals, particularly in rural areas. Fifth, attention is being given not only to building hospitals but to working out arrangements that will provide better medical care—again, particularly in rural areas—at minimum cost. Sixth, the success of the whole undertaking and the good faith of the Congress in dealing with States and localities, which must plan far in advance, rest upon a reasonably stable level of appropriations for the act.

For these reasons, I protest the action of the Committee on Appropriations in reducing the cash appropriation for this act in 1951 from $125,000,000 to $100,000,000, in cutting contract authority from $150,000,000 to $75,000,000 in eliminating entirely the funds proposed for study of means of making the services provided by hosiptals more effective and in cutting the appropriation for administration of the law.

Look first at what the committee proposes to do with contract authority. Both Houses of Congress have, after extensive hearings, enacted a statute to extend for a 5-year period and committed the Federal Government to provision of $150,000,000 in contract authority for each of these years. The committee presumptiously proposes to nullify the express will of Congress. This House cannot deal in an off-hand cavalier fashion with its commitments to States and localities. State planning groups, local citizen groups interested in hospital construction, local governmental authorities, and State legislatures are making commitments, laying plans, negotiating bond issues, and expending funds for blueprints on the assumption that the Congress of the United States can be relied upon.

I propose that the $150,000,000 contract authority for this act be allowed in accordance with the commitment in the basic legislation.

Look now at what the reduction of the cash appropriation from $125,000,000 to $100,000,000 will do. These funds, bear in mind, are to liquidate obligations already incurred. Figures from the States already indicate that at least $108,000,000 must be available during the fiscal year to cover these prior obligations. The figure of $125,000,000 is the probable level of cash needed to liquidate these and other obligations already incurred on the basis of contract authority authorized by Congress. There is no point in cutting back this cash appropriation, as the committee proposes. If this is done, there will simply be a request for a deficiency appropriation, and the request must be honored.

Elimination of $1,377,094 for the studies which I have described—$1,000,000 for grants to States, hospitals, and other qualified bodies and $377,094 for investigations by the Public Health Service—is equally short-sighted. We have embarked, I am glad to say, on a long-overdue hospital-construction program. But we are ultimately concerned with medical care and not with bricks and mortar. I propose that this item be restored so that the Federal and State Governments and the hospitals and medical schools can jointly work out means—adjusted to local needs—that will make the hospitals most effective in helping sick people.

Finally, I propose that there be appropriated $1,429,906 to administer this act. The committee proposed to reduce administrative funds on the assumption that its other proposed reductions would be agreed to by the House. The reasonable sums thus far devoted to administration account in substantial part for the success of the act. An increase in the scope of the program accompanied by a cut in the level of appropriations found necessary for effective operation would court inefficiency and deterioration of the fine Federal, State, and local relationships established over the last 4 years.

III. CONSTRUCTION OF MEDICAL RESEARCH FACILITIES

I now wish to lay before you the purpose, status, and prospects for extension of the Nation's medical research facilities.

The construction of medical research facilities must, as I have explained, be considered as part of a total program for establishment of adequate public health facilities. The sums are far less than those involved in construction of hospitals, but they are equally important.

I have followed the development of medical research in this country during and after World War II with a great deal of care.

Before the end of the war, I was impressed by the fact that cessation of wartime programs would result in a catastrophic slump in medical research in our medical schools and universities unless the Federal Government took an active role in financing investigations during the postwar period.

I did all that I could both to establish the necessary legislative base and to set appropriations at a level which would permit medical research to go forward. The research-grant program of the Public Health Service is now a going concern. It has played a major part in forestalling the sharp curtailment of medical research that appeared imminent in 1945.

As I have watched this program in operation and from talks with medical investigators and deans of universities and medical schools, it has become clear to me that research grants alone are not sufficient in themselves to establish a well rounded medical research program for the Nation. The research grants help to buy equipment, and supplies and to pay salaries. But they cannot be used to construct research facilities.

We have reached the point where further development of medical research depends heavily upon expansion of the space available in universities and medical schools. This is particularly true in the fields of cancer, heart, and mental health.

Now let me explain what has been done and what ought to be done in each of these fields.

(a) Heart research facilities: Last year, recognizing the urgent need for additional space if vital research in heart diseases were to be undertaken, Congress appropriated $6,059,000 for construction of heart-research facilities.

This was a start. The appropriated funds have been made available to 25 institutions in 16 States. I am submitting for the RECORD a list of these grants—see appendix A.

The Committee on Appropriations has proposed that this program be brought to an abrupt and total halt.

I want to explain as clearly as I can what the consequences of this action would be.

First, the funds provided last year forced an arbitrary selection among equally needy institutions. Dr. Paul White of Boston, a member of the National Advisory Heart Council and one of the foremost experts in the Nation in the field of cardiovascular research, has said this:

> It was with the greatest difficulty that we established even a remotely passable priority list among all the institutions throughout the country whom we knew had complete justification for expecting construction aid from us in order not to delay seriously or to bog down important research in heart disease in progress or in prospect.

Dr. Stafford Warren, of Los Angeles, another distinguished investigator in the cardiovascular field, has this to report on needs for heart research facilities:

> Meritorious requests have exceeded the Federal funds available, and the minimum needs have not been met. More widely distributed centers for cardiovascular research are needed. In the West and Southwest, for example, the research potential cannot be adequately realized without additional assistance, carefully extended, for construction of research facilities.

Dr. T. Duckett Jones, a third outstanding scientist and member of the National Advisory Heart Council, has this comment on the need for construction:

> Members of the National Advisory Heart Council have visited some 59 institutions in need of better laboratory facilities to conduct cardiovascular research. The findings have been rather consistent in most parts of the country. Most medical schools, teaching and research hospitals, and other research institutions are in great and often dire need for laboratory space. The present able investigators and personnel are seriously hampered by this lack of space.

I have at hand, and will submit for the RECORD, a list of requests for aid in constructing heart research facilities—see appendix B. These requests are from 45 institutions in 21 States and the District of Columbia. They total $28,000,000. Seventeen additional institutions in 11 States have expressed an intention to apply for this aid.

In my opinion, it would be unwise to appropriate a sum of this magnitude in 1 year for construction of heart research facilities.

On the other hand, I firmly believe that the Committee on Appropriations has irresponsibly turned its back on a program essential to the furtherance of medical research. I urged the committee to insert in the budget an item to

provide funds for a moderate continuation of the heart research construction program. The committee saw fit to ignore my proposal.

In my judgment $4,000,000 in contract authority—two-thirds of the appropriation for this purpose in 1950 and one-seventh of the firm, justified, and screened requests now in hand—is the absolute minimum required for this program. I offer an amendment to this effect.

(b) Cancer research facilities: I turn now from the field of heart to the field of cancer research.

Cancer research is more extensive than that in heart. The Nation-wide mobilization of men and money for cancer research undertaken with the aid of both private and governmental agencies has proceeded to the point where there is an extensive network of laboratories and scientists at work on the problem. Since the cancer research program is a few years ahead of the heart program, the problem of research facilities was encountered earlier.

The first funds for Federal aid in construction of cancer research facilities were provided by Congress in the appropriation for fiscal year 1948. Subsequent appropriations for fiscal years 1949 and 1950 have enabled 44 institutions in 26 States and the District of Columbia to expand both their clinical and laboratory cancer research facilities. In total, $16,303,000 has been provided for this purpose by the Congress—see appendix B. I shall submit for the record a list of these grants.

This program has been in operation long enough so that its value can be assessed.

The funds have been used to expand existing cancer research centers, as well as to help establish facilities needed for the creation of new research programs. In most cases, the Federal funds have supplemented funds from local sources. We can confidently predict that all research construction funds will stimulate and supplement local efforts to raise funds, rather than tc replace these efforts.

It is clear that the construction grant procedures enlarge rather than limit the freedom of hospitals and schools to conduct cancer research.

Each individual application has been studied in order to determine how best to provide the working space which will facilitate the development of well-balanced programs of fundamental and clinical research. In some cases, laboratories were adequate and additional clinical facilities were needed to complement these laboratories. In other cases, good clinical facilities were available but laboratories were needed to make more effective the work that is being carried on in the clinical programs. In some instances, needed space for both clinical and laboratory research has been provided through the grant. This same realistic adjustment of facilities to needs can be expected under all the construction grant programs.

Finally, the construction grants have been an important factor in resolving another key problem—the shortage of trained cancer investigators.

Although none of the funds has been allocated to provide facilities for training, the training programs of the grantee institutions have benefited by the improved research facilities. They have enabled research institutions to train medical and graduate students, internes, resident physicians, and additional personnel in research. They have resulted in an improvement in the teaching of cancer as well as related scientific fields. Because of the additional facilities for research, these institutions have been able to attract and keep better qualified personnel for both research and for teaching. The same valuable byproducts will come from research construction grants in other fields if they are not arbitrarily stopped.

As in the case of heart research construction grants, the Committee on Appropriations saw fit to ignore my request that the program continue. There is not a dime in the Public Health Service budget for construction of additional cancer research facilities.

This refusal was in the face of requests for funds from 23 institutions in 15 States and the District of Columbia. The requests total almost $12,000,000—see appendix E.

As is true in the case of heart research construction, I do not believe that Congress should appropriate funds for fiscal year 1951 sufficient to meet all these requests. In view of the sums already expended, the state of the Federal budget, and in view of the progress already made, I think that the program should be less extensive in fiscal year 1951 than in fiscal year 1950.

In fiscal year 1950, $4,175,000 was appropriated in cash and $6,000,000 was provided in contract authority.

But the complete cessation of aid for construction of cancer research facilities proposed by the Committee on Appropriations reflects little credit upon either the vision or the understanding of that group.

I therefore urge that the 1951 appropriation to the Public Health Service be amended to provide $3,000,000 in contract authority for aid in construction of cancer research facilities. This would cover less than a third of the requests on hand, and is less than a third of the cash appropriation and contract authority allowed for fiscal year 1950.

(c) Mental health research facilities: Finally, I wish to discuss the need for research facilities in the field of mental disorders. The care of those hospitalized in Federal, State, and private institutions by mental illness costs the people of this country about $400,000,000 per year—over $1,000,000 every day. The loss in production, income taxes, and other less tangible factors is easily twice the direct burden of hospital costs.

There is only one way of reducing this burden in the future without depressing still further the deplorable standards that exist in most of the Nation's mental hospitals.

Only a well-balanced mental-health program which places proper emphasis on research into the cause, prevention, and cure of mental illness can relieve taxpayers of an appreciable part of this economic burden and reduce the wretched misery and suffering that are now the lot of mental patients and their immediate families.

We have the machinery for an expanded research program in the National Institute of Mental Health. Appropriations, modest in terms of the certain gains that would come from a heavier investment, have been made.

But, as is true in cancer and heart disease, facilities are lacking. We need more research centers not only to work toward the findings that will enable us to conquer mental illness, but also to serve as training centers. The shortage of trained people in this field cannot be relieved until the research centers in which they must pursue advanced work are made more adequate.

These centers should concentrate upon various aspects of psychiatry and neurology, but they must be closely linked with other medical specialties, such as pediatrics and internal medicine, and with basic medical departments, such as physiology and pathology.

New centers should be established in areas where none now exists. The pressures and strains that lead to mental illness vary throughout the country, and problems peculiar to different localities should be studied by people fully familiar with the communities in which they work. Moreover, we should avoid concentration in a few centers that will have a tendency to forestall the free development of ideas essential in an area where most problems are as yet unsolved.

It is a shocking fact that there are fewer than 20 such research and teaching centers in the field of mental disorders. Almost all of our money is going into the care of those already afflicted. A pittance is being devoted to the expansion of research that alone can prevent the burden of care from becoming steadily more onerous as the years go by.

In my opinion, the country would be well served by a 10-year program designed to double the number of research centers for mental health, and to strengthen the existing centers. Carefully thought out plans have reached the stage where $2,500,000 could be profitably committed during 1951 as a start on this program.

I attempted to persuade the Committee on Appropriations that failure to adopt a program of this nature is inviting—in fact, making certain—the imposition of hospital costs many times $2,500,000 per year for the indefinite future. I had no success.

I, therefore, propose that the 1951 budget of the Public Health Service be increased by $2,500,000 to permit aid in construction of these mental-health research facilities.

Mr. Chairman, I tell you it is about time we begin to think of the people here in America and their needs instead of planning to build hospitals and furnish unemployment relief and sanitation projects and septic pools and so on all over the world. I am not one who is going to sit idly by and see the known needs of millions of Americans denied, frustrated, and destroyed, and at the same time vote billions of dollars to provide facilities even in the countries that

are occupied and controlled by those who were our former enemies.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. The gentleman from Wisconsin has brought to bear in his discussion of this bill a rich store of knowledge and rich experience, and his great ability. I wish to commend him on the magnificent manner in which he has acquitted himself.

Mr. KEEFE. I thank my good friend for his fine statement.

What did the committee do? We had witness after witness come before that committee giving us the benefit of their advice and their experience from all over America. The chairman of the Appropriations Committee was not there at a single hearing when this matter was discussed, yet he came before the subcommittee when the bill was marked up and insisted on cutting this program right square in two and putting it back to the $75,000,000, after this Congress had sent the word out to the people of America that they could depend upon the Congress of the United States to assist them to the extent of $150,000,000 in hospital construction.

I have the facts and figures here. I shall not attempt to read them now, but if anybody attempts to challenge them they will be in the RECORD.

There are hundreds of communities in the United States that have issued bonds for the building of hospitals, depending upon the allocation of funds that was set up under this amendment of last August raising the amount to $150,000,000. There are hundreds of communities in this Nation in which public-spirited citizens have put on drives and the people have literally contributed their own money to provide the sponsor's share to build hospitals in various communities throughout the Nation.

If the action of the subcommittee of this Congress and the full Appropriations Committee—and I may say we did not raise any question about it in the full committee. The gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] and I were so humiliated to think that the program we had spent our time developing and supporting by proofs and testimony could be so recklessly and wantonly slashed and knocked out under the guise that they were saving money for the people, only to vote a few days later to spend $2,700,000,000 on foreign aid, and take it out of the hides and the welfare of the people of the United States of America. As far as I am concerned, I did not and I will not do it. You will have an opportunity to express yourselves on this question when it comes up. The chairman of the subcommittee is here on the floor, and I am certain he will agree with and substantiate every statement I have made here this afternoon.

Something very unusual has happened in this Congress on this question. I was advised by members of the committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce that after the action of the Committee on Appropriations became known to them they called a meeting of their committee and by unanimous vote of that great committee sponsoring this legislation they agreed to stand behind the action of the gentleman who is now addressing you and the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], seeking the restoration of these funds. I asked the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST]: Is that not the fact?

Mr. PRIEST. That is the position taken by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at a special meeting.

Mr. KEEFE. They have given study to this program the same as we have. They know the implications involved. You cannot arbitrarily, in a moment of emotional attitude in a committee, without any knowledge of the facts and without any hearing of the evidence just ruthlessly slash a program which is so vital to the welfare and interest of the people of America.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. TACKETT. Is it not further a fact that the people of this country relying upon the Congress have gone so far as to have blueprints drawn up and engineering work carried on for the purpose of building hospitals and now they find that partially completed hospitals are going to be lost as a result of the action of the committee which in one breath has told the American people it does not make any difference about serving humanity in America, and then in the next breath giving $2,700,000,000 to be used in any way that is seen fit on foreign soil to be sure that those people are cared for better than our own people?

Mr. KEEFE. I was a Member of the Eightieth Congress. I supported the Marshall plan and I supported aid to Greece and Turkey. I supported the GARIOA program. I supported every one of those programs until this year when they tacked on titles II and III to the bill which I felt had no place in the bill. I will be accountable to the people I represent for my action in voting against that bill. But regardless of that I cannot sit here and in good conscience as a Member of this great body, see the things which I know are needed cast aside when witness after witness from California to Massachusetts in this great field of public health—not bureaucrats, not public-health people employed by the Government, but men of the character of Dr. Paul White, the world's greatest authority on cardiovascular diseases and men of that type—like Dr. Rhodes, head of the Sloan-Kettering Clinic, the greatest cancer research specialist in this country, in my opinion—man after man of that type from Missouri, from California, from Minnesota, from Ohio, from all over the country, came before the committee and testified. It is a liberal education to read that hearing. We have the national advisory councils in the heart program and in the cancer program, and the mental health program, composed of the finest businessmen in America who are giving their time and attention and money to this problem.

Under the inspiration of the chairman of the full committee that has been completely wiped out. The construction of clinical facilities which we started, and which is so vital if we are to carry on the fight against these dread diseases, the killers and cripplers of mankind, has been completely stopped.

I will tell you more about it when we get into the bill. I will offer some amendments to put some of these funds back to carry on that program.

The chairman of the subcommittee knows as well as I do that we are not seeking to override the budget. We have not overridden the budget. We made very substantial cuts in the appropriations. We did so with a distinct understanding between the chairman and myself that in the mark-up of that bill of the money which we cut from the public health bill for certain purposes, amounting to some $26,000,000, eight or nine million dollars could be taken to carry on the clinical hospital construction program which is growing throughout the country and which offers the greatest hope we have for the solution of these diseases, such as cancer, heart disease, and many other diseases.

Mr. REGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. Just let me finish this thought. After we had made those cuts, we not only lost those items but we were unable to transfer those funds into the activities that we wanted them to be transferred to. Again, the chairman of the committee, without hearing a single witness in the hearings, was able, by his force and drive, to do that. It is small wonder that his own subcommittee chairman refused to go along with him, and will take the floor at the proper time in complete support of the position which I am presenting to you this afternoon. I take my hat off to JOHN FOGARTY, who has some vision, who has some courage to stand up and fight for the things he knows are right and not be driven into a position of trying to stimulate false economy by taking it out of the hides of the American people.

I now yield to the gentleman.

Mr. REGAN. I have been impressed with the gentleman's remarks. I am sorry I did not hear all that he had to say, but would not this cut have the effect of discouraging those communities who have drawn plans and prepared their sites for these hospitals and have them under construction? Would it not be a move toward pushing on to us socialized medicine, if this program were not completed?

Mr. KEEFE. My friends, if you are interested in socialization of medicine, if that is what you want to see come, you follow the attitude of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and you will get it. That is what will bring it about. But if you carry on the program that the chairman of the subcommittee and the gentleman from Wisconsin, who is now addressing you, have tried to put into force over the last number of years—I have been a member of that committee for 10 years, working for this objective. To do what? To get more hospitals, get

more doctors, get more nurses, get more research, and get more applied research into the hands of more people in America, and do it under the American plan. That is the only way it can be done. It is the only way it can be done, and it is being done with a very small expenditure of money. If I had the time to show you the economical aspects of this situation, I could demonstrate to you where every dollar you are spending on this program will ultimately save many, many dollars to the people of America as a result of the application of the research that is going on. If you only knew how hard we had to fight to get into this bill some money to carry on the research of acth and compound E, that promises to completely revolutionize the medical practice throughout the world, and will be the greatest boon to humanity since the discovery made by Pasteur, and perhaps much greater. The stories that were told to us by these leading scientists throughout the country are what we might look forward to when a complete synthesis of these drugs is made known, and when the sources of cortisone can be discovered, so as to make it available, as penicillin is now made available, the amount of money we are asking—and we had to beg and plead to get that amount of money in this bill—my God, have you ever taken penicillin? Think of the millions of people whose lives have been saved and whose productivity has been saved in the use of that remarkable drug. My friends, the work of the National Institute of Health alone in developing the type of serum that was used during this last war saved more in money and lives than all the money the Federal Government has ever spent in the field of research.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has consumed an hour. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be allowed to proceed for five additional minutes, and yield him five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I went over the country impressed with the need for the development and stimulation of the cancer program, the heart-research program, the poliomyelitis program, and many others. I talked to researcher after researcher in institution after institution throughout the country. I asked: "What is the bottleneck?" They said: "It is clinical facilities. We have to rely on rats, guinea pigs, monkeys, or chimpanzees. The latter are tremendously expensive, but we have not the human material available to whom we can give the very best of medical science and the best of care and treatment, whose progress we can observe and record in connection with the research programs that are going on throughout the country."

We came back to this Congress and we asked you to relieve that bottleneck. You did so practically unanimously. What is the result? This great clinical hospital that is being built out here at Bethesda, which is hooked up with all other clinical hospitals that are being built throughout this country and with the centers of research throughout the country. You did it; the Congress did it almost without opposition of any kind. Thus, there has been a correlation of all this research; all of the research is being correlated and funneled into this central research institution out here where the research findings will be evaluated and will in turn be transferred to other centers of research to avert duplication. It has been accepted by the great research scientists of this country as one of the greatest forward steps that has ever been taken in the field of research. If the attitude of the committee is maintained, that program is stopped far short of its goal. I, for one, do not propose to see it die if I can help it by the expenditure of a few measly dollars, seven or eight millions; and I shall offer amendments at the proper time to take care of it. I will demonstrate to the Congress where we can effectuate savings and where we have effectuated savings that will offset this budget increase suggested, two and a half times.

This one activity means something to me. Oh, it does not mean anything to me politically. Very few of the people in my district know anything about the work that I have done here; but I tell you it means something to human beings, and I have had experiences in my own family that impressed upon me its importance. Because of my position in this field, I was able to bring to my little grandson the best that there was in America to cure him of devastating rheumatic fever. I tell you that so far as I am concerned I am going to make those same services available, if it is possible, to every kid in America that is struck down with that dread disease. You ask me why I am interested in it? Because I have seen what these people have done in the field of cancer, in the field of rheumatism, in the field of arthritis, in the field of heart disease; I know what great accomplishments the future has in store for us. I want to make those facilities and those research findings availble to all the people of America. How any man who professes to have his heart beat in sympathy with the common people of this country can think otherwise is beyond my wildest imagination.

APPENDIX A

Approved heart research construction grants (alphabetical by States, as of Oct. 29, 1949)

State and institution	Grant number	Amount requested	Amount recommended	Amount awarded
California: University of Southern California	HC-504	$1,000,000	$500,000	$485,000
Colorado: University of Colorado	HC-285	254,540	254,000	246,380
Georgia:				
University of Georgia	HC-535	58,000	58,000	58,000
Grady Memorial Hospital	HC-7010	15,000		15,000
Illinois:				
University of Chicago	HC-265	750,000	500,000	485,000
Michael Reese Hospital	HC-7007	10,000	10,000	10,000
Northwestern University	HC-264	50,000	50,000	50,000
Kansas: University of Kansas	HC-270	100,000	100,000	100,000
Louisiana: Tulane University	HC-533	1,010,500	500,000	485,000
Maryland: Johns Hopkins University	HC-255	1,266,928	500,000	485,000
Massachusetts:				
Beth Israel Hospital	HC-573	190,000	190,000	184,300
Harvard School of Public Health	HC-7001	82,500	82,500	82,500
House of Good Samaritan [1]	HC-7006	235,000	175,000	169,750
Massachusetts—Continued				
Massachusetts General Hospital	HC-267	$1,120,000	$500,000	$485,000
Peter Bent Brigham Hospital	HC-298	250,000	250,000	242,500
Minnesota: University of Minnesota	HC-259	1,659,000	500,000	485,000
Mississippi: University of Mississippi	HC-536	4,435	4,435	4,435
New York:				
New York University	HC-268R	1,625,500	500,000	485,000
Syracuse University	HC-7004	1,145,000	145,000	140,650
Oklahoma: Oklahoma Medical Research Foundation	HC-246	325,000	325,000	100,000
Pennsylvania:				
Children's Hospital, Philadelphia	HC-291	385,000	385,000	373,450
University of Pennsylvania	HC-254	500,000	330,000	320,100
Tennessee: Meharry Medical College	HC-503	177,660	177,000	172,330
Utah: University of Utah	HC-251	60,000	60,000	60,000
Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin	HC-225	300,000	300,000	291,000
Total		12,574,063	6,395,935	6,015,395

[1] Informal application.
Total of 25 grants in 25 institutions, representing 16 States.

APPENDIX B

Pending requests for cardiovascular research construction grants (Jan. 13, 1950)

State and institution	Grant number	Amount of pending request
Alabama: Medical College of Alabama.	HC-540	$416,931
California:		
University of California Medical School.	HC-548	1,250,000
University of California Medical School, Los Angeles.	HC-252	884,736
University of Southern California.	HC-504	[1] 515,000
District of Columbia: Georgetown University.	HC-525	909,960
Georgia: Emory University	HC-541	500,000
Illinois:		
University of Chicago	HC-265	[1] 265,000
University of Illinois	HC-299	2,350,000
Loyola University	HC-349	116,000
Michael Reese Hospital	HC-258	2,647,950
Kentucky: University of Louisville.	(HC-7003)	[2] 285,000
Louisiana: Tulane University.	HC-533	[1] 525,500
Maryland: Johns Hopkins University.	HC-255	781,928
Massachusetts:		
Children's Medical Center, Boston.	HC-7009	450,000
House of the Good Samaritan.[3]	HC-7006	[1] 175,000
Massachusetts—Continued		
Massachusetts General Hospital.	HC-267	[1] $635,000
New England Center Hospital.	HC-7000	220,000
Michigan: Wayne University.	HC-571	377,226
Minnesota: University of Minnesota.	HC-259	[1] 1,174,000
Missouri: Washington University School of Medicine.	HC-7002	200,000
New York:		
Bellevue Hospital (New York City).[3]		150,000
University of Buffalo	HC-295	335,000
Columbia University College of Physicians and Surgeons.	HC-224 (R)	1,000,000
Cornell University	HC-346	200,000
Montefiore Hospital (New York).	HC-527	418,700
Mount Sinai Hospital	HC-7005	300,000
New York Hospital	HC-345	800,000
New York University	HC-268 (R)	[1] 1,140,590
University of Rochester	HC-350	414,368
Syracuse University	HC-7004	[1] 1,004,350
North Carolina:		
Bowman Gray School of Medicine of Wake Forest College.	HC-343	848,900
Duke University	HC-256	1,347,000
University of North Carolina.	HC-263	516,800
Ohio: Western Reserve University.[3]		$275,000
Oklahoma: Oklahoma Medical Research Foundation.	HC-246	[1] 225,000
Oregon: University of Oregon.	HC-272	230,000
Pennsylvania:		
Jefferson Medical College (Philadelphia).	HC-598	1,000,000
University of Pittsburgh	HC-7008	400,000
University of Pennsylvania.	HC-254	179,900
Temple University Hospital and Medical School.	HC-342	900,000
Woman's Medical College of Pennsylvania.	HC-248	169,645
Tennessee: University of Tennessee.	HC-223	468,000
Texas: Southwestern Medical college (Dallas).[3]		500,000
Washington: University of Washington (Seattle).	HC-301	500,000
West Virginia: University of West Virginia.	HC-289	5,860
Total		28,008,854

Footnotes at end of table.

[1] Requested over and above present active grant.
[2] Application HC-7003 withdrawn. New application to come.
[3] Informal application.

Total 45 institutions.
Representing 21 States and the District of Columbia.

APPENDIX C

Expressed intent to apply for heart research facilities construction grants (as of Feb. 10, 1950)

State and institution	Estimated request (if given)	Individual contacted
California:		
University of California (Donner Laboratory), Berkeley	No estimate	John H. Lawrence.
Has pending: HC-548, Medical School, San Francisco, $1,250,000		Francis S. Smyth, dean.
Has pending: HC-252, Medical School, Los Angeles, $884,736		Stafford L. Warren, dean.
District of Columbia: George Washington University Hospital	No estimate	Brian Blades.
Indiana: Indiana University School of Dentistry, Indianapolis	do	Maynard K. Hine, dean.
Massachusetts: HC-7015, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge	$250,000	J. R. Killian, Jr., president.
New York:		
Helen Hay Whitney Foundation, New York City	No estimate	T. Duckett Jones, medical director.
Albany Medical College (Union University), Albany	do	Harold C. Wiggers.
Ohio:		
Division of City Hospitals, Department of Public Health and Welfare, Cleveland	do	Mr. Stanley A. Fergus, commissioner-superintendent.
South Carolina: Medical College of the State of South Carolina, Charleston	do	John A. Boone.
Tennessee: University of Tennessee, Knoxville (has pending: HC-223, $468,600 for Medical School at Memphis)	do	C. E. Brehm, president. O. W. Hyman.
Texas: Baylor University College of Medicine, Houston	do	Warren T. Brown, associate dean.
Vermont: University of Vermont, Burlington	$200,000	W. E. Brown, dean.
Virginia:		
Medical College of Virginia, Richmond	No estimate	W. T. Sanger, president.
University of Virginia, Charlottesville	do	J. Edwin Wood, Jr.
Canada: Montreal General Hospital, Montreal	do	E. A. Stewart Reid.
	$450,000	

Total: 11 States, District of Columbia, and Canada—17 institutions. 15 institutions in 10 States, District of Columbia, and Canada have given no estimate. 2 institutions in 2 States have given an estimate of $450,000.

APPENDIX D

Active cancer research construction grants by State (as of Oct. 29, 1949)

State and institution	Number of grants	Institution total	State total
Alabama: Medical College of Alabama and the Jefferson County Health Department	1	$47,280	$47,280
California:			
University of California Medical School, San Francisco	1	1,000,000	
University of California, Los Angeles	1	700,000	
Los Angeles County Hospital	1	35,255	2,035,255
University of Southern California	1	200,000	
Stanford University	1	100,000	
Colorado: University of Colorado	1	400,000	400,000
Connecticut: Yale University	1	250,000	250,000
District of Columbia:			
George Washington University	1	200,000	
Do	1	50,000	398,500
Georgetown University Medical School	1	148,500	
Georgia: Emory University	1	500,000	500,000
Illinois:			
University of Chicago	1	450,000	
Do	1	240,000	890,000
Loyola University: Stritch School of Medicine	1	200,000	
Kansas: University of Kansas	1	200,000	200,000
Maine:			
Jackson Memorial Laboratory	1	250,000	
Do	1	100,000	350,000
Maryland: Johns Hopkins University	1	$750,000	$750,000
Massachusetts:			
Boston University School of Medicine	1	49,900	
Massachusetts General Hospital	1	700,000	
New England Deaconess Hospital	1	400,000	1,368,422
Do	1	85,000	
Tufts College Medical School	1	133,522	
Michigan: Wayne University College of Medicine, Detroit Institute of Cancer Research	1	150,000	150,000
Minnesota:			
University of Minnesota	1	543,550	
Do	1	135,888	879,438
Do	1	200,000	
Missouri:			
Washington University	1	450,000	
Do	1	250,000	1,325,000
St. Louis University	1	625,000	
New York:			
Columbia University College of Physicians and Surgeons	1	1,000,000	
Memorial Center for Cancer and Allied Diseases	1	250,000	2,259,368
New York University-Bellevue Hospital	1	575,000	
University of Rochester	1	434,368	
North Carolina: Duke University	1	200,000	200,000

APPENDIX D—Continued

State and institution	Number of grants	Institution total	State total
Ohio:			
Ohio State University	1	$300,000	$600,000
University hospitals of Cleveland, Western Reserve University	1	300,000	
Oklahoma: Oklahoma Medical Research Foundation	1	125,000	125,000
Oregon: University of Oregon Medical School	1	10,000	10,000
Pennsylvania:			
Institute for Cancer Research	1	149,000	654,676
Do	1	49,468	
University of Pennsylvania	1	56,208	
Do	1	200,000	
University of Pittsburgh	1	200,000	
South Carolina: Medical College of the State of South Carolina	1	16,000	16,000
Tennessee:			
Meharry Medical College [1]	1	$20,000	$541,969
Do	1	30,385	
University of Tennessee	1	491,584	
Texas:			
University of Texas	1	200,000	300,000
Do	1	100,000	
Utah: University of Utah School of Medicine	1	416,404	416,404
Virginia:			
Medical College of Virginia [1]	1	10,588	85,588
University of Virginia School of Medicine	1	75,000	
Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Medical School	1	975,000	975,000
Total (56)			15,727,900

[1] Construction has been completed.

Total of 55 grants in 44 institutions.
Representing 25 States and the District of Columbia.

NATIONAL CANCER INSTITUTE,
GRANTS AND FELLOWSHIPS BRANCH,
February 17, 1950.

Approved research construction grants, National Advisory Cancer Council meeting of February 16 and 17, 1950

CC–979: University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, Dr. W. R. Berryhill—construction of a cancer research division, university hospital and medical school ---------- $200,000

CC–1022 (R): Beth Israel Hospital, Boston, Mass., Dr. C. F. Wilinsky construction of animal farm, cancer research ---------- 50,000

CC–1033 (S): Wayne University College of Medicine and Detroit Institute of Cancer Research, Detroit, Dr. William L. Simpson, Dr. G. H. Scott—construction grants-in-aid ---------- $100,000

CC–7015 (S): Boston University School of Medicine, Dr. James M. Faulkner—construction of facilities for care of animals required in cancer research at Boston University School of Medicine ---------- 12,850

CC–7017 (R): Medical College of the State of South Carolina, Charleston, S. C., Dr. Kenneth M. Lynch—building construction to provide facilities for cancer research, including clinical investigation ---------- $100,000

CC–7021: State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Dr. Titus C. Evans—modification of laboratory facilities for research on cancer using radioisotopes (for cancer research facilities) ---------- 12,250

CC–7024: The Children's Medical Center, Boston, Dr. Sidney Farber—permanent equipment for the new research building about to be erected by the Children's Cancer Research Foundation at the Children's Medical Center ---------- 100,000

Total approved (7) ---------- 575,100

APPENDIX E

List of pending construction grant applications (as of Mar. 15, 1950)

State and institution	CC grant No.	Amount of pending request	Individual contact
California:			
University of Southern California	7011 (S)	$550,000	Dr. B. O. Raulston.
Stanford University	772 (RS)	400,000	L. R. Chandler.
Connecticut: Yale University		750,000	Dr. George B. Darling.
District of Columbia: George Washington University.	7016 (S)	400,000	Dr. Walter A. Bloedorn.
Florida: Dade County Cancer Society.		75,000	J. Gerald Lewis, president.
Illinois:			
Loyola University (Stritch)	7008 (S)	255,000	Dr. John F. Sheehan.
Michael Reese Hospital	7022	542,000	Dr. Albert Tannenbaum.
Indiana: Indiana University Medical Center.	7018	485,920	Dr. Edwin A. Lawrence.
Massachusetts:			
Harvard University		300,000	Dr. James S. Simmons.
Jewish Memorial Hospital	7020	182,500	Dr. F. Homburger.
North Carolina: Duke University	840 (S)	1,100,000	Dr. Wilburt C. Davison.
New York:			
Mount Sinai Hospital	7002	300,000	Dr. George Baehr.
Montefiore Hospital	7004	418,700	Dr. Daniel Laszlo.
Do	7005	373,700	Dr. H. M. Zimmerman.
Ohio:			
Ohio State University	851 (S)	$1,200,000	Dr. Charles A. Doan.
Western Reserve University	7010 (S)	350,000	Dr. J. T. Wearn.
Oregon: University of Oregon Medical School.	7013 [1]	900,000	Dr. Frank B. Queen.
Pennsylvania: University of Pittsburgh.	7006 (S)	200,000	Dr. Wm. S. McEllroy.
South Dakota: University of South Dakota School of Medicine.	7019	120,000	Dr. Donald Slaughter.
Tennessee:			
Baroness Erlanger Hospital		250,000	Dr. S. S. Marchbanks.
Vanderbilt University	7023	551,000	Dr. Howard J. Curtis.
Washington:			
University of Washington	7003	900,000	Dr. Stuart W. Lippincott.
Northwest Cancer Foundation.	7009	738,000	Dr. Simeon T. Cantril.
Wisconsin: Marquette University School of Medicine.	7007	300,000	Dr. John S. Hirschboeck.
Total (15 States and District of Columbia, 23 institutions).		11,641,820	

[1] Informal application.
(S) Requested over and above present active grant.

Institutions which have expressed their intent to apply

State and institution	Individual contact
Alabama: Muscle Shoals Heart and Cancer Research Clinic.	Mr. M. A. J. Phillips.
Arizona: Pima County Medical Society.	Dr. L. Lindberg.
California:	
Cedars of Lebanon Hospital.	Dr. N. B. Friedman.
College of Medical Evangelists.	Dr. W. F. Norwood.
Mount Zion Hospital	Dr. G. R. Biskind.
Florida: Florida State Board of Health.	Dr. R. F. Sondag.
Illinois: Brokaw Hospital	Mr. L. F. Shepard.
Indiana:	
University of Notre Dame	R. H. Sweeney, C. S. C.
Protestant Deaconess Hospital.	Mr. A. G. Hahn.

Institutions which have expressed their intent to apply—Continued

State and institution	Individual contact
Louisiana:	
Louisiana State University	Dr. William W. Frye.
Tulane University of Louisiana.	Dr. M. E. Lapham.
Minnesota: University of Minnesota.	
New York:	
Albany Medical College	Dr. L. W. Gorham.
Syracuse University	Dr. Allan D. Bass.
North Carolina: Wake Forest College.	Dr. C. C. Carpenter.
Pennsylvania:	
The American Oncologic Hospital.	Mr. V. H. Frazier.
Wills Hospital	Dr. Louis Lehrfeld.
Tennessee: University of Tennessee.	Dr. C. E. Brehm.
Texas: Baylor University	Dr. Warren T. Brown.

Institutions which have expressed their intent to apply—Continued

State and institution	Individual contact
Vermont:	
The Mary Fletcher Hospital.	L. E. Richwagon, Supt.
The University of Vermont.	Dr. W. E. Brown.
Virginia: The Memorial Hospital, Danville.	Dr. T. J. Moran.
West Virginia: Alderson Broaddus College.	Dr. Joseph Peary.
San Juan, P. I.: San Juan City Hospital.	Dr. Robert J. Jimenez Lopez.

Total of 17 States and 1 foreign country and 25 institutions represented.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

(Mr. MAHON asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he previously made in Committee.)

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH].

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, for the reason that the matter I wish to discuss deals with a situation which might affect any of us, I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to proceed out of order for this period of 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, the people of our country have great confidence in news reporting by the people of the press and the radio. This confidence that our people have in our news mediums is well earned. It is earned by a long period of accuracy and integrity. Accuracy first with reference to facts is fundamental in reporting and the accuracy of our press and radio on fact reporting is excellent. But even more important I think than accuracy in handling facts by press and radio reporters is the handling of quotations by public figures, yes, even by Members of Congress. Last week a radio-news-broadcaster not only misquoted a written statement made by me but reversed the meaning of what I said. I recite the story of this incident here and I put it in the permanent RECORD because I feel that such a misquote, whether it was unintentional or whether it was a matter of error, is something that undermines public confidence and, certainly, as in my own case, it somewhat personally damaged me.

Here are the circumstances. On last Thursday evening a news broadcaster by the name of Frank Edwards, broadcast over a Nation-wide hook-up of radio stations covering perhaps 200 stations. He was broadcasting for a sponsor. He was paid for the broadcast. I am told the sponsor of his broadcasts is the American Federation of Labor and that the program which costs the sponsor many hundreds of thousands of dollars annually is paid for by 8,000,000 members of the American Federation of Labor.

Mr. Edwards in his broadcast had been talking about a Member of the other body and certain charges that a Senator had made and then Mr. Edwards said:

> McCARTHY is under fire from his own party for his actions, too. Representative HARRIS ELLSWORTH, Republican from Oregon, said today:
>
> "So far as I am concerned, I believe the State Department is reasonably pure and McCARTHY's charges constitute merely a partisan outburst without much basis in fact."

Mr. Chairman, that is exactly the opposite of the statement I did make in a letter which I send out each week as a public service to the newspapers of the congressional district I serve. Here is the statement made in the letter to which undoubtedly the reporter had access in the radio gallery, since I send a copy of my letter there as a courtesy:

> So far as I am concerned, I would like to believe that the State Department is practically pure and that the charges constitute merely a partisan outburst without much basis in fact. Unfortunately, the attitude of the President and State Department officials has convinced me that there must be a great deal of very damaging truth in what Senator McCARTHY has said. If there is nothing to hide, if there is nothing to be ashamed of, or if there is nothing dangerous to our security in the records of anybody employed by our Government, let the President and the Department come clean on the whole thing and allow the Senate committee to have access to all information on this subject. As this is written they are looking as guilty as the boy with his face covered with jam.

That is the complete paragraph in the statement in my weekly letter. The news broadcaster, whether through accident or design, or for the purpose of furthering his own cause altered the wording and the meaning of it. When the broadcaster made his statement he completely reversed the meaning of what I had said. The broadcast went not only into the congressional district I serve, but throughout the Nation, completely misrepresenting me. As I said at the beginning of these remarks, this can happen to any of you. It is bad reporting, it is inaccurate, it should be frowned upon by the members of the Press Galleary and the Radio Gallery. I certainly hope that such misrepresentations or distortions of quotations will be avoided in the future. As a matter of fact, this sort of thing has occurred very seldom. I sincerely regret this instance and my having to take the floor for this purpose.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 hour to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

(Mr. GORE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, as I said a few moments ago, I will, at the proper time, offer an amendment to restore the cut that has been made in appropriations for the construction of hospitals under the so-called Hill-Burton Act. I believe it is essential that this program be continued in full force.

In order that this amendment not increase the over-all amount of the appropriation, I will offer or support amendments to reduce other less essential items in the bill by far more than the 75 million additional appropriation provided by this amendment.

Moreover, this money will not be used unless actually needed for construction of hospitals, and cannot be wasted.

The hospital construction program is a necessary step toward a sound answer to the need for adequate medical care, particularly in the small towns and rural communities of the United States. That problem presses for an answer.

The hospital is today the workshop of not only advanced medical science but also of the best diagnosties and present-day specialized medical care.

The high degree of specialization, the need for and benefit from costly apparatus and highly skilled technologists to operate these instruments of precision and to perform complicated laboratory procedures, have made hospitals absolutely necessary for adequate medical care. Most physicians, overworked as they are, have found it not only impossible to encompass all the required specialized knowledge but also economically impossible to finance the necessary equipment and technical personnel to provide patients with the full benefits of modern-day medical science.

This makes hospital construction particularly in rural community centers positively imperative.

Large cities have been able to cope with this problem fairly well but small towns and rural counties have been almost unanimously unable to do so. This is why Congress enacted and inaugurated this program.

The program is an example of cooperation between the Federal Government, State governments, counties, cities and individual citizens. It is good. The States, counties and cities have made definite plans on the basis of the act of last year. We should continue the program according to schedule.

Though vital and necessary, hospital construction alone is but the first step in solving the problems of adequate modern-day medical care. This is true in the Nation, and particularly in my home State of Tennessee.

Unless we have a trained and working team of doctors, nurses, and technicians in connection with hospitals constructed under this program, they will become mere works of brick and mortar.

How to provide an adequate quality and quantity of health service at a price that can be paid is the essence of our problem. The problem has three different parts: First, inadequate hospitals; second, shortage of doctors; and third, high cost of medical treatment and hospitalization.

Many people of good will seek a solution to this growing social problem. None are more diligently seeking satisfactory answers than enlightened physicians themselves. Theirs is not only a humane interest but also a very personal one.

In seeking a solution, we can profit by the mistakes of others. We now see the difficulties of the British system, about to bog down not only in costs that have gotten out of hand but also with inferior medical service. Surely the United States can provide a better answer to the problem.

Efficient service to the patient—not politics—should be the ultimate goal of all hospitals, medical training, research and practice, prevention, diagnosis, and treatment. In other words, our goal must be to give maximum quality and quantity of health service to those who need it and at a price which either our economy and society or the individual patient can stand.

This goal, we have it from no less an authority than Dr. Paul B. Magnuson, chief medical director of the Veterans' Administration, is not the fruit of so-called socialized medicine. He says:

> Wherever the compulsory health scheme has been adopted, the results have been poor as regards the medical care given to the individual, and poor as regards medical research.

Yes; we must avoid the regimentation of both patient and doctor, the bound-

less cost, the inefficiencies and politics of socialized medicine.

But positive action—not just negative complaining and criticism, is necessary to meet this growing problem.

The second step, public welfare demands the training of more doctors.

The shortage of physicians results from three main causes:

First. Artificial restrictions on the number of students admitted to medical colleges.

Second. An inadequate number of colleges offering medical training.

Third. The tremendous cost of obtaining a medical education.

The doctor shortage is particularly acute in rural areas. Inadequate hospital facilities not only partly cause the death of doctors in rural areas but aggravate otherwise the health problems of such areas.

In the State of Tennessee, for example, the records of the American Medical Association show that there were approximately the same number of recognized doctors in 1948 as in 1921. There were 3,328 in 1921; 3,255 in 1948.

I emphasize this because our population has not only greatly increased, but the number of things which doctors can do for people, and, therefore, the need for same, has greatly multiplied since 1921.

Here is another need for cooperation between the Federal Government, the State, counties, and citizens. We need a vigorous State and Federal aid program for giving medical training to more young men. This, too, I support. Action by this Congress is needed. Action by the States is needed.

Then, the cost of medical care is becoming more expensive rather than less. For one thing, there are constantly more and more health services that can be administered to people—preventative, ameliorative and curative. How can we as a free society ease the shock of ever more expensive health services and long periods of hospitalization? Is compulsory health insurance the answer? I believe there are better ways. Indeed, we have already made rapid advances in voluntary health insurance programs such as the Blue Cross Plan and the health insurance program sponsored by the various State medical societies. I think we should encourage such programs and give them a full and fair trial.

Surely it would not be the part of wisdom quickly to throw overboard a system which has brought medical science in the United States to a world peak of achievement and efficiency. Unless the need is reasonably met by building on the present system, another will knock at our door more loudly.

I think we should preserve the fruits of our experience and benefit from the enthusiasm and accomplishment of private initiative. And improve upon it. Improve we must. The challenge is real.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

THE LATE EVERETT BURGESS HOWARD

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in the absence of my colleague the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. GILMER], it becomes my sad duty to advise the House of Representatives of the death of one of his predecessors, a former Member of this House, the late Honorable Everett Burgess Howard. Word of Mr. Howard's death on yesterday was received from his son by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. REGAN]. Mr. Howard served with distinction in the Sixty-sixth, Sixty-eighth, and Seventieth Congresses. Prior to that time he had served our State as a member of the State board of public affairs and as State auditor. He was an outstanding public servant and a great American. Oklahoma mourns his loss. I extend my deepest personal sympathies to his loved ones.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. O'SULLIVAN asked and was given permission to address the House tomorrow for 40 minutes at the conclusion of the legislative program and following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to transfer to tomorrow the special order she had been granted to address the House for 5 minutes today.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

PUBLIC ENEMY NO. 1 IS STILL STALIN, NOT McCARTHY

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, the April 1, 1950, issue of the New Leader has an article by Eugene Lyons, contributing editor of that paper in which he cuts through the dust being thrown so vigorously in the air by those seeking to defend Government officials whose voluntary choice of leftist causes and organizations has properly caused either their political views or their judgment, or both, to be suspect. The New Leader as the organ of the Liberal Party cannot be accused of playing Republican politics. From their former association with the American Labor Party, the Liberal Party leaders are wiser regarding the wiles and ways of Communists and fellow travelers than either Republicans or Democrats, so many of whom are so frequently taken in.

A citizen has the right to join whatever he wishes, but other citizens have an equal right to draw conclusions about him by observing what he chooses to join and the causes he supports. Senator McCARTHY is not the one who discredited Dr. Philip Jessup, for example. He merely reported what Jessup had done to discredit himself.

Are we so hard up that out of 150,000,000 Americans, the State Department cannot find qualified persons to plan and conduct policy in the future except those who have been so naive or so easily misled in the past? How can we have confidence that they are any more hard-headed now?

The article deserves reading by all:

COMMUNISTS LUCKY TO BE INVESTIGATED BY DIES, McCARTHY

(By Eugene Lyons)

The luck of the Communists put a Martin Dies, then a Rankin and a Thomas, in the chair of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. That luck held good when Senator JOSEPH McCARTHY was cast in the role of Hercules cleaning the Augean stables of the State Department.

I imply no slur on the Wisconsin Republican. He undertook the mighty task through a series of accidents and could not have been fully prepared for it. His knowledge of Communist skulduggery—a complex subject bristling with booby traps—was apparently sketchy. Certainly he betrayed strategic limitation in choosing Judge Dorothy Kenyon as his initial exhibit.

But the hooting and whistling in the press and on the air should not be permitted to drown out the facts that those stables need cleaning.

The circumstance that Alger Hiss worked and prospered in the Department for more than a decade, in the face of repeated warnings from outside and inside, tells a melancholy story.

So does the collapse of China, in large part engineered by a State Department clique that counted, along with Alger Hiss, men like John P. Davies, Jr., John Stewart Service, John Carter Vincent, Walter Butterworth, Owen Lattimore, Philip C. Jessup.

It is not without significance that the Department's plans for the postwar period, elaborated up to 1946, did not even grant the possibility that the Kremlin might not collaborate for a peaceful and democratic "one world."

Such consistent miscalculation cannot be explained entirely in terms of stupidity. The country has a right to wonder how much shrewd malice entered into the equations.

Observers in Washington with a trained nose for Muscovite aromas have long known that the odor was especially acrid in the State Department. They find it hard to forget how Bullitt, Berle, Grew, and others who took a relatively realistic view of Soviet Russia were driven out by pro-Stalinist elements. They recall the distressing facts of the Amerasia espionage scandal, still visible through the coats of whitewash. When Acheson refuses to "turn his back" on a convicted Soviet agent, they are reminded of an earlier occasion when the same Acheson, then Assistant

THE LATE HONORABLE E. B. HOWARD

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. GILMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD with reference to the death of a former predecessor of his.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILMER. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply grieved to announce to the membership of the House of Representatives that Hon. E. B. Howard passed away on April 3. Mr. Howard was an illustrious predecessor of mine, having served the First District of Oklahoma in the Sixty-sixth, Sixty-ninth, and Seventieth Congresses. There are quite a few among you who served with Mr. E. B. Howard, and will remember him well.

He was born in Morgantown, Ky., and was 76 years of age at the time of his death. He was not only a Member of Congress for three terms, but also served as a member of the city council of Tulsa, Okla., and purchased the city's first waterworks. Mr. Howard also served with distinction as secretary of the State Board of Affairs of Oklahoma from 1911 to 1915, when he became State Auditor of Oklahoma where he remained until 1919.

Mr. E. B. Howard was my personal friend, and was also the very good friend of my father. The First Congressional District and the State of Oklahoma, in his passing, suffer the loss of one of the fine pioneers who helped create for our great State of Oklahoma the place of eminence which it now occupies.

AMENDING TITLE VIII OF THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 7846) to amend title VIII of the National Housing Act, as amended, to encourage construction of rental housing on or in areas adjacent to Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force installations, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain the bill and the need for the urgent action at this time?

Mr. SPENCE. I will be glad to explain the bill.

The bill simply implements the military housing billl which was passed some time ago. The Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Air Corps are all very anxious for the immediate passage of the bill. It permits the employment of architects and engineers to draw plans and specifications for the projects.

No money is required; we do not contemplate any appropriation, for the sponsors of the project will assume all costs of the operation of this bill. At the present time the sponsors of the projects have their own architects and engineers, but there is no uniformity in the plans and specifications. Therefore, there can be no truly competitive bids.

This resolution authorizes the Secretary of Defense to have uniform plans and specifications prepared that will be submitted to the sponsors so that there may be competitive bidding. There will be standard plans for all to bid upon and, therefore, it will make possible true competition.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. All it does is to expedite the procurement of bids and also to harmonize plans and specifications.

Mr. SPENCE. The gentleman is correct. It will expedite the procurement of bids, and it will also expedite the construction of these buildings which are so necessary to house the members of our armed forces. At the present time, I understand, the housing in many instances is so bad that it is difficult to get men to reenlist, and they leave the armed forces at a time when they are needed most. Under this provision they feel that they can immediately proceed with the construction of this much-needed housing, and we find that it is absolutely necessary to have a measure of this kind to implement the housing bill which passed.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I may say also that the Secretaries of Defense, of the Army, and of the Navy, and of the Air Force consider the passage of this bill now very important. They are anxious to have it enacted into law as soon as possible.

Mr. SPENCE. They have done everything they could to bring about its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That title VIII of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by adding the following new section at the end thereof:

"SEC. 809. Whenever the Secretary of the Army, Navy, or Air Force, or his duly designated representative, determines that it is desirable in order to effectuate the purposes of this title, the Secretary is authorized, without regard to the civil-service and classification laws, to procure, by negotiation or otherwise, the services of architects and engineers, or organizations thereof, under such arrangements as he deems desirable. Such services may include the development of plans, drawings, and specifications for rental housing under this title and other services in connection therewith. Such arrangements may include provision for advance or progress payments, for payment by third parties, for payment by the Government of any such compensation as is not paid for by third parties, for reimbursement by third parties to the Government of any compensation or other expenses paid by the Government pursuant to this section, or other provisions for compensation. The Secretary is further authorized to advance or pay to the Federal Housing Administration its 'Appraisal and Eligibility Statement' fees in connection with such rental housing. The Secretary is further authorized to procure options from private parties for the acquisition by third parties of off-installation sites intended for such rental housing, and to enter into arrangements by contract or otherwise for eventual acquisition, without cost to the Government, of all right, title, and interest in such sites and improvements thereon by the Government. Any public-works appropriations now or hereafter available to the Departments of the Army, Navy, or Air Force may be obligated by the respective departments for these purposes. Reimbursements to the Government on account of payments made pursuant to this section shall be made to appropriations against which such payments were charged."

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SPENCE: On page 2, line 6, change the period to a colon and insert "*Provided*, That such plans, drawings, and specifications may include the use on any project to be constructed under this title of alternate materials or alternate types of construction, including prefabrication, that provide substantially equal value and conform to the standards established by the Federal Housing Administration."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, line 22, insert a comma after the word "thereon."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances, and in one to include a resolution from the Hibernians of Massachusetts, and in another a resolution from the Massachusetts General Court.

Mr. JONES of Alabama asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Decatur (Ala.) Daily.

Mr. THOMPSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. MAGEE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a speech made by the Honorable PHIL J. WELCH at the ninetieth anniversary of the start of the Pony Express, which was printed in the St. Joseph News-Press on April 3, 1950.

Mr. HEDRICK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Charleston Gazette entitled "Low Brand of Politics."

Mr. HAYS of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. YATES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article appearing in the Monthly Labor Review for March 1950.

Mr. GORE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Chattanooga Times.

Mr. RAINS (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, in one to include a report of the Civil Aeronautics Authority, and in the other to include an address by Gen. Lewis A. Pick.

Mrs. BOSONE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include two editorials.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. LEFEVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune.

Mr. HINSHAW asked and was given permission to include certain excerpts and tables in the remarks which he expects to make in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. TOLLEFSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous material.

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. MACK of Washington asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous material.

Mr. COLE of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter.

Mr. EBERHARTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. TAURIELLO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in four instances and include extraneous material.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. GAVIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. BIEMILLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include certain answers from the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. KEOGH (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. HERTER (at the request of Mr. HESELTON) was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. HALE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address delivered by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. FELLOWS] at the Republican State Convention.

Mr. SANBORN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. JENISON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a speech he made at a communion breakfast last Sunday.

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in five instances and include certain excerpts.

Mr. STAGGERS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1951

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 132]

Anderson, Calif.	Herlong	O'Toole
Angell	Herter	Pace
Barden	Hoffman, Ill.	Patman
Barrett, Pa.	Holifield	Pfeifer,
Battle	Holmes	Joseph L.
Beall	Hull	Pfeiffer,
Bennett, Fla.	Jackson, Calif.	William L.
Bentsen	Jenkins	Plumley
Blackney	Jones, Mo.	Poage
Blatnik	Karst	Poulson
Bonner	Kean	Powell
Brooks	Kearney	Rains
Buchanan	Kee	Redden
Buckley, Ill.	Kelly, N. Y.	Reed, Ill.
Buckley, N. Y.	Kennedy	Reed, N. Y.
Bulwinkle	Kilburn	Ribicoff
Carlyle	Klein	Sabath
Celler	Kunkel	Sadowski
Chatham	Lanham	Scott, Hardie
Chesney	Larcade	Shelley
Chiperfield	Lichtenwalter	Short
Chudoff	Linehan	Smathers
Combs	Lynch	Smith, Ohio
Coudert	McCulloch	Sutton
Cox	McDonough	Tackett
Davis, Tenn.	McGregor	Taylor
Dawson	McMillen, Ill.	Thornberry
Dingell	Madden	Towe
Dollinger	Mason	Vinson
Douglas	Miles	Wadsworth
Fellows	Mills	Welch
Fulton	Monroney	Werdel
Gilmer	Morgan	Wheeler
Gordon	Morrison	Whitaker
Grant	Murphy	Wier
Green	Murray, Tenn.	Willis
Gregory	Nicholson	Wilson, Okla.
Hall,	Nixon	Wilson, Tex.
Leonard W.	Norton	Withrow
Harvey	O'Brien, Ill.	Wood
Heffernan	O'Brien, Mich.	Woodhouse
Heller	O'Konski	Young

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 302 Members have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1951

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] had consumed 2 hours and 52 minutes, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] had consumed 3 hours and 28 minutes.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON].

(Mr. MORTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.)

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to discuss a few questions in connection with chapter 9 of the general appropriation bill and to express my concern over a threat which seems to be developing in our handling of flood-control projects.

I notice from the report on the general appropriation bill that the budget request for the Corps of Engineers was reduced by the Appropriations Committee by approximately 25 percent. This cut applied to flood-control projects as well as rivers and harbors. I also find that a much less drastic cut has been applied by the committee to the funds requested for the Department of the Interior. These latter funds include the items for construction and rehabilitation carried on by the Bureau of Reclamation. To be specific, the general flood-control estimates for 1951 were $478,447,000. The committee has reduced this item to $341,055,000. In the case of the construction and rehabilitation funds for the Bureau of Reclamation, the reduction was from $320,000 to $297,000—less than 7½ percent. Since flood control is involved in both funds, I cannot understand the logic for the discrepancy in the reductions. It seems to me that the Appropriations Committee has discriminated against those communities in the eastern part of the country whose flood-control problems are, for the most part, handled by the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army. Conversely, the committee action seems to give special favor to the western communities where most of the work is done by the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior.

The city of Louisville, Ky., suffered the worst flood in its history in 1937. Shortly thereafter plans were developed for flood protection, and such protection was authorized by the Congress. The city of Louisville and Jefferson County assumed certain obligations to provide rights-of-way and to rearrange the sewage system so as to fit into the flood-protection plan. Bonds were sold and other local funds made available so that the city and county could meet their respective obligations. The war years intervened, and both appropriations and construction were understandably suspended. In 1945 another disastrous flood hit Louisville. In both of these floods property damage was far in excess of the total cost of flood protection. Income losses to the workers of Louisville, through the suspension of industrial and commercial operations, were staggering. There is also the very human element; namely, the thousands of men, women, and children who live in homes annually subject to the threat of flood.

The Corps of Engineers estimates that the reduction suggested by the committee in funds available for the Louisville flood-wall project will delay its completion until 1955. It is my opinion that the project can be completed at an earlier date if appropriations for fiscal 1952 and 1953 are made adequate.

I am concerned over the vast number of projects on which construction is begun and the relatively small number being completed.

In many projects, including the Louisville flood wall, the slow rate of progress may prove uneconomical in final analysis. The longer the delay in completion of these projects the greater the total costs will be to the American taxpayer.

The Congress has approved many public-works projects. In so doing it was never contemplated that all would be immediately begun. It was clearly pointed out that we must have a backlog of projects so that if at any time the economy of the Nation required Government stimulation of employment, certain of these projects could be set in motion. Without such a procedure the Congress might take very hasty action in the authorization of projects in time of economic stress. This would not be in the best interests of the taxpayers in the long run. As the committee report points out, the administration, through the Department of the Army, has encouraged local municipalities to provide funds for the local responsibilities of certain authorized projects when there was no intention of requesting Federal funds to commence work. This results in an understandable demand from the local government unit for Federal funds. The Congress, in order to meet this, has appropriated money in the past and taken it from those projects already under way.

I was happy to find the following on page 247 of the report:

> Reductions in appropriations made by the Congress may, at times, make for uneconomical construction because of the fact that the money must of necessity be applied to a great number of construction projects. It would seem to the committee that a better approach is to limit construction to fewer projects and complete or nearly complete those projects in order that the anticipated benefits may be derived therefrom prior to embarking on construction of additional projects. With this in mind the committee is recommending no funds for planning for the fiscal year 1951. It is felt that it is time for the Congress and the Corps of Engineers to take stock of the current obligations with the view of developing a more logical construction plan which will better serve the needs of the country and better fit into the current budgetary situation. Corollary with this thought is the recommendation that the Corps of Engineers discourage expenditures by local municipalities on the basis of surveys and recommendations made by the Corps of Engineers. It has come to the attention of the committee that, in some instances, local funds have been uneconomically employed because anticipated Federal appropriations were subsequently not made.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, it is my hope that in the future our appropriations for flood control and similar projects will be at a rate which makes for economy. It is my further hope that any projects will be undertaken only when the economy of the Nation and the Federal budget justify the expenditures involved. Unless we follow this plan, it seems to me that we will end up in a very costly hodgepodge. We will be spending hundreds of millions of dollars each year without providing flood protection for any sizable group of American citizens. Let us complete those items now in process before encouraging local entities to expect the immediate construction of their own new projects even though authorized.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

(Mr. ARENDS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, the single package appropriation bill now before us presents to each and every Member of this House one of the major issues of our day. This measure constitutes the Federal Government's fiscal policy for the coming fiscal year. In my considered judgment, no more important issue can be raised in any one bill than is raised by this pending measure.

The decisions we make in connection with this over-all appropriation program will directly affect every section of the country and every segment of our population. Our final decision may determine the future of this great, free Republic. I do not accept this responsibility lightly.

The bill as reported by the Committee on Appropriations proposes a spending program of over $41,000,000,000 for the coming year. This may be less than the budget estimates and it may be less than the expenditures this year, and I am grateful for every penny that may be saved. But we are faced with the ominous fact that the spending proposed is between four and five billion dollars more than the estimated revenue.

It is my prediction that the deficit resulting from this extravagant spending program will be even larger than that estimated by the committee. In the first place, the bill before us makes no provision for authorization programs which may subsequently be enacted. It includes no appropriations for foreign aid or other purposes now pending in legislative committees. And before the conclusion of this session we may be called upon to make certain additional deficiency appropriations. I sincerely hope not.

While we are faced with the prospect of still additional appropriations, we are also faced with the disturbing indication that the revenue receipts will be less than estimated. It now appears that the estimated income tax receipts themselves will be between a billion and a billion and a half less than the President estimated in his budget message.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, the administration's program as embodied in this bill will add between $5,000,000,000 and $6,000,000,000 to our already dangerously high national debt of around $258,000,000,000. The interest on our national debt is now around $5,625,000,000, and is one of the three largest items in the entire budget.

In another year of peace and a period of high prosperity, it seems to me to be indefensible not to bring the budget into balance, so that the burden of debt and taxes can be progressively lightened from the backs of our people. To say that the large sum carried in this bill is proof that Government spending is out of hand is to put it mildly. It would be even more accurate to say that the deficit spending policy advocated by the President in his budget message, and advanced by the funds provided in this bill, will inevitably lead us to national bankruptcy.

When I refer to the prospects of complete national bankruptcy as the inevitable result of this reckless deficit spending policy, I do so with the utmost sincerity and gravest concern for our system of free representative government. I again remind you that the deficit is being created in a period of relatively high prosperity, when the revenue is relatively high. A slight business recession will cause a revenue loss. The Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation estimated that even a 10-percent recession in the aggregate personal income would result in a loss of $5,000,000,000 in tax revenue. Should that situation develop, which is definitely a possibility, this Nation will face one of the most serious financial crises ever known.

In his opening statement the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. CANNON] frankly told us that there was a time when appropriation bills were drafted on the basis of the amount of available revenue, but the committee has long since ceased to consider expenditures from that point of view. It now follows the policy of spending the money, whether we have it or not, and leaving it up to the Committee on Ways and Means to find the tax revenue.

To this policy I do not subscribe. It is my conviction that the only way to economize is to economize. It requires the highest order of statesmanship. It requires political courage. It requires constant vigilance and careful scrutiny of every item of expenditure. The question always is, both with the running of your own homes and with the operation of the Federal Government, not what we would like to have but what we can afford.

As we go through this bill, chapter by chapter, I earnestly appeal to the Members, on both sides of the aisle, to view each item in the light of what we can afford. I suppose a justification can be made for every proposed expenditure. The question is not necessarily whether a particular thing has value or whether it is desirable. The question is whether we can afford it.

It is my firm conviction that this proposed spending program can and should be substantially reduced. As we seek to achieve that objective, I believe it would be helpful in our thinking if we divide

the various items of appropriation into three general categories: First, the necessities; second, the desirables, and third, the unnecessary.

The unnecessary can be completely eliminated. Those items that may be desirable can be reduced or at least postponed. That leaves us with the necessities and also with sufficient revenue available to meet those necessities.

I recognize that it is not easy to draw the line between these different categories. But I honestly believe that it can be done if we have the determination and the courage to put aside all special appeals and make the national interest paramount. That is the procedure I intend to follow as we proceed to consider each chapter of this bill, giving my support to the various efforts that will be made to reduce the proposed appropriations.

The proponents of this spending program take the position that these large expenditures are necessary, that they have been made necessary by the costs resulting from the past war and the costs involved in averting a future war. To be sure, there are some of these expenditures that are necessary. No one recommends their elimination. But it is my opinion, which I am sure is shared by the vast majority of the American people, that the costs of administering these programs is excessive, filled with duplications, overlappings, and extravagance.

Civilian employment in the Federal Government is more than double the prewar emergency peak. The civilian pay roll and administrative costs are around $7,500,000,000. Every one knows that there is an excess of personnel in practically every department and agency of the Government.

Let me present an example. In the March issue of the Country Gentleman, Mr. John Strohm wrote an article concerning a survey he made in De Kalb County, Ill., on the operations of the Federal Government in that county. In that single county of my home State, Mr. Strohm found 123 Federal employees and their wages and expenses from Federal funds amounted to $86,065.60. This was just the administrative cost of bringing the Federal Government's services to a county of 2,500 farmers. I am not passing judgment on the programs involved. I am emphasizing how much waste there is in the administration of programs. The farmers could, I am sure, receive exactly the same benefits, exactly the same assistance, and probably much more efficiently, at a fraction of the number of people and cost.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, by a careful scrutiny of every proposed item of expenditure substantial savings can be made for the American taxpayers simply in the administrative costs. This is one of the matters to which the Hoover Commission directed its attention; but, I regret to say, it has not been carried out with the speed and determination that the reorganization program should be.

It is time we call a halt. It is time we reduce these needless expenditures, bring our Federal budget into balance, reduce the national debt, and accumulate a surplus so that our people may have relief from the tax burden that is destroying individual initiative and robbing our economy of productivity.

I have taken this time to urge Members of this House to join with me in a real, honest, courageous effort to cut the cost of Government. If we fail in this responsibility I fear for the future of our free country.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

And pending recognition by the chair, I am certain I express the sentiment of the entire House when I say it is a matter of general regret to the Congress that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] has announced his purpose to retire from the House at the close of the Eighty-first Congress.

I trust he will reconsider that decision. May I say, Mr. Chairman, there is no more valuable Member in the House today. In all of my recollection there has been no one who has served in either House who has had a more detailed and comprehensive knowledge of river and harbor and flood-control affairs than the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON]. His services have been invaluable, and I trust that he can be prevailed upon to remain with us in the next Congress.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to my colleague from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to join the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] in what he says about my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON]. There is no more able, conscientious, patriotic Member of this Congress than WILL WHITTINGTON, of Mississippi.

He could be reelected if he wanted to return. Like the gentleman from Missouri, I sincerely trust that he will reconsider and come back and help to carry on the great battle that he has been waging for lo, these many years.

His retirement will be a great loss to his country.

If he is determined to retire, I want to assure him that he will carry with him the admiration and affections of his colleagues in this the greatest legislative body in the world.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In this connection too, Mr. Chairman, I should like to say that having served in the House for a number of years with the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON], I want to add my word of appreciation for the services he has rendered to the country. In particular, I want to mention his very great contribution in sponsorship of the Government Corporations Control Act. It was my privilege to be associated with him somewhat in the introduction of companion bills on that subject here in the House, but Mr. WHITTINGTON carried the burden of handling the bill before the committee. There has been no measure passed, in my recollection, which has done more to bring the extra-governmental financial operations of the Government into control than the Government Corporations Control Act which was sponsored in the other body by the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, Senator BYRD, and the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska, Senator BUTLER, and in the House by Mr. WHITTINGTON and myself. Mr. WHITTINGTON is the one who deserves the major credit for its passage in the House. It will remain as one of the permanent memorials to his outstanding service in the Congress.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I have now served in this Congress approaching 12 years. When I first came to the Congress I was attracted to the outstanding character and ability of the gentleman from Mississippi, Mr. WILL WHITTINGTON, and my service in the Congress I have continued to observe the high standards that he has employed as a Member of this House. I sincerely regret that he has deemed it necessary to announce his retirement from this Congress, because the Congress and the Nation are going to lose the services of one of the most distinguished men it has been my privilege to know in the 12 years that I have been a Member of this body.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS].

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, it is with deep regret that I learn that my colleague across the Mississippi River, the Honorable WILL M. WHITTINGTON, will voluntarily retire at the end of this session. I know of no man who has served his district, State, and Nation better than the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON]. The House of Representatives is a better legislative body because he has graced these Halls. The people of the Mississippi Valley and throughout America are happier, safer, and more prosperous because of his leadership and efforts in sponsoring all worth-while flood-control legislation that has been enacted by this Congress for more than two decades. His consideration and helpful assistance to younger Members of the House will long be remembered and cherished. He is the best-informed man in America on matters of flood control and rivers and harbors improvements. Let me say further that he has been an inspiration to me from the time I entered this House. I shall surely miss him since he has decided not to seek reelection and instead cast aside the cares of public service to return to his beloved Mississippi. He has well earned the solitude and contentment afforded him by being among his lifelong friends in his home city of Greenwood, Miss. I wish for him health, continued happiness, and a life filled with gladness as the years come and go.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, unless the Members of the House can prevail upon Mr. WHITTINGTON to reconsider his determination to retire, not

only shall we lose one of the outstanding Members of this House, but also one of the most experienced and capable and courteous chairman of committee that it has ever been my pleasure to appear before or confer with.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] has long been a great favorite in the House of Representatives and those who have worked the closest with him have the greatest admiration for him. He has an intimate knowledge of the affairs of the Government and a remarkable capacity for public service. He has made a great contribution to the welfare of the United States.

I was pleased to hear the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] speak a word in regard to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON]. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL], myself, and others who served as members of the Appropriations Subcommittee having to do with civil functions for a number of years worked very closely with the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON]; and we know of the excellent job which he did and is doing. I wish to pay tribute to this extraordinary and distinguished American at this moment as he appears to address the House.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, we undoubtedly shall lose one of our ablest and most valuable Members when WILL WHITTINGTON leaves. His has been a fine record of service which will live on for many years in the annals of American Government. His store of information on flood control is probably unsurpassed by that of any other person. We shall indeed miss him.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], the minority leader of the House.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I join with my good friends in paying tribute to a great legislator and a distinguished American. It was my privilege to come to the House with the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] 26 years ago. I know the tremendously able service he has rendered to his State and to the country. We all regret his leaving us because we know that his services have been so valuable it would be very difficult to find someone to fill his position in this particular period of our country's history.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN].

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON]. Not only is the State of Mississippi going to lose a great Representative but all of the States in the Mississippi Valley will lose one of their most ardent champions. We have looked to Mr. WHITTINGTON to lead us in the field of flood control.

Since I became a Member of this House I have called upon Mr. WHITTINGTON many times for advice and help. I sincerely hope that his constituents will prevail upon the gentleman to change his mind and that he will return to this House and help us continue a program that has not as yet been completed.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that all the water that ever rushed down the Mississippi River could never wash away the devoted record that WILL WHITTINGTON has made in the defense of the father of waters.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, when I first came to Congress one of the committees to which I was assigned was the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. I have always been grateful that part of my apprenticeship in this body was served in a committee on which the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] was a senior member. I was impressed and instructed by his extraordinary ability to go at once to the heart of a problem and to see the full import of legal language which I as a nonlawyer oftentimes had the greatest difficulty in understanding. He had an uncanny knack of cutting through doubletalk and the fog sometimes thrown up by witnesses, by asking blunt questions which would penetrate to the crux of the matter. He is more skillful at that sort of questioning in committee than anyone with whom I have been privileged to serve.

I remember particularly his invaluable work in connection with the Surplus Property Disposal Act, the Government Corporation Control Act, and, the full employment bill which our committee worked over for many weeks, and then scrapped as unsound and inadvisable, drawing up and getting enacted instead the present employment act the provisions of which were designed to stimulate and encourage maximum economic activity in our country and prevent excessive fluctuations between booms and busts in our country. The contributions of the gentleman from Mississippi can never be adquately measured or even adequately described. He may be sure he has the gratitude of a country that owes him a great debt and the affection and friendship of every one of his colleagues in this House. I wish him Godspeed in his well-deserved retirement, but I still hope that he may see fit to change his mind and stay with us because the Congress and the country can ill afford to lose the services of a man with his exceptional knowledge and ability, his forthrightness and integrity and his irreplaceable experience.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. MCKINNON].

Mr. MCKINNON. Mr. Chairman, while I am a new Member of the House, it has been my great pleasure to have become acquainted with the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON]. It is with extreme regret that I learn he is leaving this body. He exemplifies all the characteristics that make a committee chairman of great value to the House. He is one who has a keen comprehension, alert understanding, and efficiency in dispatching the problems presented to us. I wish to extend to him my best wishes.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I am deeply touched by the tributes of my colleagues respecting my services as a Member of the House. I value the good opinion of the Members of the committees on which I have served, and I appreciate more than I can tell the praise accorded me by Members who have spoken with respect to my legislative work. I will always treasure the approval of the Members with whom I have served through the years on committees and in the House.

I know of no place where there is greater opportunity for constructive work than in the House of Representatives. I had rather do anything else than disappoint a friend or disappoint the Members with whom I have served. I am most appreciative and grateful for your expressions of approval. You have honored me beyond anything that I deserve. I will carry with me to the end your commendation of the work I have undertaken to render as a Member of the House for more than a quarter of a century.

Mr. Chairman, in the pending bill for the first time the House is considering a general or composite appropriation bill for the support of all of the departments of the Government. Hearings were conducted by the subcommittees as heretofore. These subcommittees were contacted by a central or subcommittee on review before the reports were submitted. However, the pending bill embraces the combination of all the bills and the pending report embraces the combination of all of the reports as heretofore submitted. The practical difference before the bill is finally passed is that the conferees on the general bill will not be separate conferees on each separate chapter or subcommittee bill but will be members of the subcommittees handling the separate bills, together with members of the central subcommittee.

I have advocated the principle of the general bill. The House has before it the appropriations for all of the departments of Government. Comparisons in the estimates and in the appropriations for comparable agencies can be more readily and efficiently made. While the general bill is an experiment I trust that the experiment will be successful.

COMPARISON OF CORPS OF ENGINEERS AND BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

The Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation have generally acted for the best interests of the areas they serve. The same general costs obtain in both agencies. They have employed similar types of personnel and they have constructed similar projects. This last statement applies especially to

dams. It also applies to obligated and unobligated funds and to increased estimates in the costs of construction, as well as to the modification of adopted projects in the course of construction. The composite bill enables the House to compare the reports of the two subcommittees handling appropriations for these two comparable agencies.

The Bureau of Reclamation generally operates in the so-called arid States, while the Corps of Engineers operates in all of the 48 States. Flood control works aggregating hundreds of millions of dollars have been constructed in California, Oregon, Washington, and other arid States in which the Bureau of Reclamation operates. Sometimes the sponsors of reclamation have indicated that in the costs of irrigation there is discrimination between general flood control and reclamation works. Quite the contrary is true. The same local contribution for flood control works obtains in the 12 arid States that obtains in all of the other 36 States of the Union. If it should develop that reclamation should be extended to other States, the same local contribution that is required for reclamation would be required in the other States. There is no discrimination. The same yardstick in both general flood control and reclamation obtains.

APPROPRIATIONS

The budget estimates for reclamation were reduced in the pending bill by 8.1 percent, while the estimates for general flood control and rivers and harbors were reduced by 24.8 percent. The appropriation for rivers and harbors is $187,678,000; for general flood control, $341,055,000. With the appropriation of $65,000,000 for the Mississippi River and tributaries, the appropriation for rivers and harbors, general flood control, the lower Mississippi River and tributaries, and Sacramento River, Calif., aggregate $600,933,000, while the appropriations for reclamation aggregate $297,467,000.

The report of the Subcommittee on Civil Functions states that no amount is included for planning for rivers and harbors and flood control, while the report of the subcommittee on the Interior Department, handling appropriations for the Bureau of Reclamation, shows that $5,150,000 is included for planning. Both the bill and the report indicate that planning funds are included for the Mississippi River and tributaries and for the Sacramento River.

UNOBLIGATED FUNDS

The report on civil functions states that appropriations for general flood control and rivers and harbors were reduced, among other reasons, because of unobligated funds. Funds have been obligated to December 31 to cover 53 percent of the appropriation for rivers and harbors and general flood control, while 45 percent of the appropriation for reclamation have been obligated. There is no argument for a reduction of reclamation appropriations because of unobligated funds, as is the case in the report covering appropriations for general flood control and rivers and harbors. The fact is that the unobligated funds in both agencies are substantially normal. In 1948, up to March 31, 70 percent of available funds had been obligated by the Corps of Engineers; on March 31, 1949, 67 percent of appropriations had been obligated; and on February 28, 1950, 60 percent had been obligated. These trends show that the obligations of 1950 for a comparable date will be in excess of obligations for 1948 and 1949, and by the end of the fiscal year all work programmed will be under way.

MODIFICATIONS

The report on civil functions criticizes the Chief of Engineers for increased estimated costs of authorized projects, especially for modifications in the projects. While increased costs in the Bureau of Reclamation are much larger, the report of the subcommittee on the Interior Department makes no such criticism.

The report of the Subcommittee on Civil Functions criticizes the Chief of Engineers for including a project on the Arkansas River on the ground that bank stabilization would be completed for the current year and that the committee of conference so provided. My understanding was that there was nothing in the conference report to notify the engineers that the previous appropriation had been made with that provision.

The Bureau of the Budget declined to approve a modification of the Yakima project in Washington, a Bureau of Reclamation project. The subcommittee on the Interior Department, however, overruled the Budget Bureau and made an appropriation for the modification, stating that the project is not new but is part of the Yakima project originally authorized.

The report of the Subcommittee on Civil Functions is very critical of the Corps of Engineers for modifications of projects with increased estimates, although the Corps of Engineers maintain that the modifications are authorized by existing law. There is no such criticism in the report of the Subcommittee on the Interior covering the modification of reclamation projects. On the contrary, the modifications, as shown by the Yakima project, were proved by the Subcommittee on Interior appropriations to be within the law and necessary to the public interest.

The report of the Civil Functions Subcommittee contains criticism of the Chief of Engineers with respect to the initiation of new projects and with respect to increased costs of adopted projects that, in my opinion, is undeserved. There is no such criticism of the Bureau of Reclamation. It is fair to say, however, that while the Chief of Engineers was not charged with deception or misrepresentation, the report of the subcommittee on Interior appropriations does contain language that is certainly not complimentary to the Bureau of Reclamation. The subcommittee charges that the Bureau of Reclamation has, to use the wording in the report, a "propensity for subterfuge." These words were used in connection with the Colorado-Big Thompson project.

ECONOMY

I must not be misunderstood. I know the tendency of all departments of the Government is to spend. Where not justified that tendency is properly subject to criticism, but the criticism should be deserved. If the increased costs of a particular project are not justified the remedy would be to deny the request for the increased appropriation. If, however, the Chief of Engineers requests a modification to protect lives and property, even though the costs be increased, it is my belief that the public interest is served by granting such increased appropriation. The engineers, or the Bureau of Reclamation, as the case may be, have discharged their obligation when they recommend such modifications. If damage or injury result because of a denial of funds to carry out the modification then the appropriating subcommittee is at fault.

I favor the reduction of all appropriations where justified. I believe that similar treatment, however, should be accorded rivers and harbors and flood-control works and reclamation. I want to emphasize that rivers and harbors and flood-control works affect all of the 48 States whereas reclamation, important as it is, affects only the 12 arid States. In the public interest, if budget recommendations are to be reduced for one agency it occurs to me that comparable treatment should be accorded to the other agency.

Personally, I advocate strengthening both the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. They are established agencies. They have both done efficient work. I oppose the substitution of authorities which would deprive these agencies of their functions. I have generally supported the subcommittees in their appropriations for rivers and harbors, for flood control, and for reclamation. I feel, however, that I would be remiss if I did not urge that we eliminate the discrimination between the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation set forth in this composite bill which carries appropriations for both agencies. In all fairness, I do not believe that the Chief of Engineers deserves the condemnation contained in the report.

REDUCTION IN FLOOD-CONTROL AND RIVER-AND-HARBOR APPROPRIATIONS

The Subcommittee on Civil Functions states that the reduction in the budget estimates for civil works is based on two major premises.

First. The delay in appropriations until October 1949 for the current fiscal year is given as one major reason for reducing the appropriations now under consideration. It is stated that substantial unobligated balances are available and support the reduction. I have already referred to the matter of unobligated funds. There was much discussion respecting unobligated balances in the last session, with the result that the contention of the Committee on Civil Functions was finally rejected. This argument for reduction fails because continuing resolutions were adopted a number of times and these resolutions provided for continuing construction of previously authorized works.

Second. Another argument for reduction was that in most instances, where possible and feasible, construction should

be spread out. Instead of justifying a reduction this contention really supports an increase. The argument contradicts itself. The Chief of Engineers is criticized for recommending too many projects, on the one hand, and on the other hand, is criticized for failure to spread construction activities.

Third. A third objection in behalf of reducing appropriations is the tendency of the Chief of Engineers to request funds for initiation and construction of too many projects. The hearing discloses that the Chief of Engineers was restricted by the Director of the Budget largely to projects that were under construction. The Chief of Engineers recommended for the last three fiscal years only the following new projects:

	New projects
1949	19
1950	6
1951	None

Again the contention of the committee is contradictory. In one paragraph it advocates spreading out which can only result from new projects. In another paragraph it insists that only projects under consideration shall be considered for appropriations.

Fourth. Finally, the committee states that the Chief of Engineers, the Bureau of the Budget, the Civil Functions Subcommittee, and the Congress should insist that adequate plans and designs be prepared in detail before construction of any project is initiated. This is a correct contention but the subcommittee completely contradicts itself by denying funds to accomplish the planning which it constructively recommends.

I believe that the criticism of the subcommittee with respect to increased costs of projects is not justified. Many projects were authorized several years ago. Some were authorized before World War II, others following World War II. The costs of construction have increased, no matter what index is used. The cost of highway construction, for instance, between 1941 and 1949 increased 123.6 percent. This covers materials and labor. Moreover, the cost of projects involving steel, because of the increased cost of steel, have been materially increased. The Corps of Engineers should be commended for the construction of dams that are strong and will withstand major floods. The country always has the Johnstown disaster in mind. The Corps of Engineers should be commended for building flood walls that are adequate to withstand major floods. Many lives and much property would be destroyed without these safeguards.

Whatever may be said with respect to the proper index with regard to increased costs and estimates, I am inclined to believe that the Engineering News Record Index is probably more applicable to river and harbor and flood-control improvements than that of the Department of Commerce, for instance, or the Public Buildings Service. At all events, whatever may be said with respect to increased estimates, it is well to keep in mind that the work of the Corps of Engineers is awarded by competitive bidding. The low bidder gets the work, and if the estimates are too high, competition will protect the Federal Treasury.

In support of its criticism as to increased estimates, the Subcommittee on Civil Functions, under general flood control, refers to the Hoosick Falls, N. Y., project. It was modified. The modification will increase the cost, as I recall from $925,400 to $1,300,000. A major flood occurred after the project was authorized and after construction was begun. I believe, in the public interest, the project should be modified, to prevent a recurrence of a major flood.

Another project with respect to increased estimates is the project at Portville, N. Y., in which the estimates were increased from $1,900,000 to $2,366,800. After its construction was originally planned, there was an unprecedented development on account of World War II. The population largely increased. Many new homes were erected. It strikes me that the increased estimates are justified. It is certainly in line with the contention of the Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations in justifying increased costs of the Yakima, Wash., project.

INCREASED COSTS IN RECLAMATION

There is no criticism in the pending bill of the increased estimates in the cost of projects undertaken by the Bureau of Reclamation although the increase in costs of these projects largely exceed the cost of the two projects I have referred to under general flood control. I mention only a few of the increased estimates under the Bureau of Reclamation which are not, and should not be, condemned by the Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations. The Gila, Ariz., project, for instance, has increased from $32,000,000 to $53,000,000. Likewise, the All-American Canal project of the Bureau of Reclamation has increased from $38,000,000 to $76,000,000, in round figures.

Other Bureau of Reclamation projects show similar increases, as follows: Boulder Canyon, $126,000,000 to $173,000,000; Colorado-Big Thompson, Colo., $44,000,000 to $150,000,000; Central Valley, Calif., $170,000,000 to $581,000,000; Davis Dam, $41,000,000 to $114,000,000; Hungry Horse, Mont., $38,000,000 to $108,000,000; Missouri River Basin, $529,000,000 to more than $2,000,000,000. I could mention many more reclamation projects where the estimated costs of construction have been increased. I have mentioned enough to show, however, that estimated costs have been increased not only in flood control and river and harbor improvements, but in reclamation as well. It will be remembered, however, that the Subcommittee on Interior made no criticism of these increased estimates while on the other hand, the Subcommittee on Civil Functions criticized the Chief of Engineers for increased estimates in connection with general food control projects, although many of the increased estimates in both general flood control and reclamation occur in the same river basin.

If a project is modified to protect lives and property the Chief of Engineers is to be commended for recommending modification, if authorized, for if there should be death and destruction the responsibility would be with the Civil Functions Subcommittee and not with the Chief of Engineers.

Yet, in the bill we have under consideration, the general bill, the composite bill, the Corps of Engineers is criticized because they have come forward and given us the facts and given us increased estimates, and there is no criticism of the Bureau of Reclamtion.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman, in his very interesting and very able discussion, has referred to the original estimates and increases since the original estimates were made; but he has gone clear back in some cases, for instance, in the case of Boulder Dam, 20 or 25 years, away back into antediluvian days, which would not apply to the criticism contained in this report. This report refers exclusively to criticism of estimates which were made last year as compared with this year, and they covered, as I recall, only last year's estimates. The gentleman's reference to very ancient estimates I am certain is not apropos.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I mentioned the reclamation projects because many of them were authorized years ago. So were many flood-control projects. I mentioned Boulder Canyon, but the last project I mentioned a few moments ago was in the Missouri River Basin. That project was authorized in 1944, and there were not any appropriations made during the war as I recall; it is rather recent. The one before that is the Hungry Horse, one of the projects recently authorized, and that was increased from $38,000,000 to $138,000,000. I am aware of what the gentleman says about estimates, and I am about to get to that as to 1949 and 1951. But the Missouri River Basin is not antediluvian; that Missouri River Basin is recent, and the cost, for instance, of Garrison Dam in the Missouri River Basin has been increased by millions and millions of dollars in the last few years.

Mr. CANNON. I trust that the strictures in the report which were very carefully considered before they were adopted by the committee, will be considered in connection with the fact that the estimates which were submitted to us last year as compared with those for this year show an unconscionable increase in estimated total cost.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Which I am going to get to.

Mr. CANNON. They can be explained only by incompetence or by intention to mislead the committee when they initiated the project, because the cost indexes do not bear out the increases in 1950 over 1949. The committee did not criticize 1949.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I am very glad to have the gentleman's statement, and I can understand that he was misled. I know about the statement in the report of the committee. The Corps of Engineers were criticized for using the Engineering News Index for the increase of cost. I think the Engineering News

Index is a better index than that of the Department of Commerce, for the Department of Commerce index has to do with the building of all types of construction. The Engineering News Index has to do with the building of dams and the building of roads; and I think that index is preferable, for instance, to the index of the Public Building Service. They gave you the facts, but the engineers gave you the facts not only on increased costs of construction, but on other items. I want to call attention in just a few moments to the increase that was caused by engineering cost increases and the increased costs of construction. I am glad for us to air this matter and to get the thing fully before us, but I would say that in the construction of highways, the index shows that there was an increased cost of construction from 1941 to 1949 of 123.8 percent. There has been an enormous increase in the cost of construction. These works were not built during the war, and there has been a large increase in the cost of construction from 1945 to 1948. The increase particularly applies to the increased cost of steel, and steel is used in the building of dams and reservoirs. So, in my judgment and with all due deference to the gentleman, these increases in costs are not attributable only to the price index, not attributable only to the increased cost of construction in the last year or two; and my judgment is, with the information at my command, that the costs of construction have actually decreased since the gentleman conducted his hearings. I think the findings in the Committee on Public Works show that lower bids are now being received for public road construction and for this type of construction than were being submitted a few months ago and at the time the budget estimates were made.

With respect now to the chairman's statement, and I am very glad to have him bring it out, as to the difference in the cost in 1949, 1948, and 1951, there were 63 projects submitted as disclosed by the hearings, and the amount of those increased costs, some of them were authorized in 1936—and some in other years—was in the neighborhood of $503,000,000. According to the facts that were submitted those increased costs in construction as shown by an analysis are as follows:

An analysis of the increase shows that 34 percent are due to increased construction costs, 25 percent to enlargements and expansions authorized by specific or general legislation, 8 percent to conditions that could not be foreseen, 11 percent to the increased cost of land and right-of-way.

I think, whatever my opinion may be worth, I did right in calling your attention to the projects that were authorized in 1928, Boulder Canyon, and in 1936, as well as later, because there has been a tremendous increase in the cost of land and therefore the rights-of-way costs have been tremendously increased before they get to construction. And, finally, in an analysis of this increase in these 63 projects, 22 percent are attributable to engineering and construction modifications.

The committee states that no funds are to be allowed for planning and in the appropriation for rivers and harbors the word "planning" is omitted and no funds are provided. In the language on page 339 of the bill, while the report states that no funds are provided for planning for general flood control and while that statement is supported by the break-down, nevertheless on page 339 of the bill as reported there is provision for planning. Now, one or the other of those contentions is wrong. In other words, this committee now has reported that no funds are to be used for planning, yet on page 339 of the bill it is stated: "detailed surveys, and prepare plans and specifications."

I think in all candor, a mistake was made and that mistake should be corrected. It does strike me that if the Congress is to be asked to appropriate substantially $600,000,000 with not 1 cent for planning, when the investigation and the facts submitted show that planning funds have been exhausted, the committee should amend the bill to provide a reasonable appropriation for planning funds.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON. That is due to a decision to start no new projects in compliance with the recommendation made in connection with the Hoover Commission report that all projects now under operation be completed or, at least, be continued at a minimum rate but that no new ones be started. What appears to the gentleman to be a discrepancy there is that the planning referred to in the second place is planning of details of projects already approved, and not on new projects which have not yet been initiated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 15 additional minutes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I have this to say in reply. I have a copy of the appropriations act for the current fiscal year before me and the language is identical. It is the language that has heretofore been carried in appropriation bills, which have always provided for advance planning, and not used for planning projects under construction.

Now, with respect to the contention that the budget in the first instance restricted the Corps of Engineers to reporting on projects that were under construction, the committee in line with that asked the Corps of Engineers to emphasize the projects that were under way, I have this to say, and I speak by the record: In the United States in 1949 the Corps of Engineers reported on 19 new projects, in 1950 on 6 new projects and in 1951, the pending bill, none.

I have this further to say, that the committee in the report criticizes the Chief of Engineers in very severe terms on the one hand for recommending and submitting estimates on other projects, and yet in another paragraph says that instead of concentrating on the few projects the work should be spread out in all parts of the country. Now, those two contentions or arguments in the report are contradictory. They should be corrected, or clarified.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman understands that this version was from the standpoint of time and not from the standpoint of projects.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Well, I was just replying to the gentleman's contention about new projects.

Mr. CANNON. To the best of my recollection the Hoover Commission recommended in their printed report that we continue work on projects in progress but that we start no new projects.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I think I understand the gentleman. Generally, I think the projects under way ought to be completed, but the report criticizes the engineers for not spreading the work out.

Mr. CANNON. That reference is to time and not projects.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Well, I do not see how on earth you can spread out work unless you spread the projects, and I submit the matter with that statement.

I know that there is a tendency of all agencies of the Government to spend and ask for increased appropriations. Personally I believe in a balanced budget, and I believe that all agencies of the Government ought to be treated in a similar fashion, and in an effort to balance the budget, if funds for planning should be eliminated for rivers and harbors, why I cannot see why those funds in the sum of $5,150,000 for planning in the same bill should obtain for a comparable agency. For that reason I am drawing the matter to the attention of the Committee of the Whole. The desire of the committee to economize is understandable, but I submit this matter to you. Heretofore there have been, I think, four or five million dollars for planning for rivers and harbors and general flood control. Yet it takes a lot to build $600,000,000 worth of work, and the basis and the foundation is planning, and adequate planning. It just cannot be that all previous Congresses were in error in appropriating annually for planning. I submit now that if the $2,000,000 recommended by the budget for planning for rivers and harbors is rejected, as this committee has rejected it, and if the $4,000,000 recommended for planning for general flood control by the Director of the Budget is rejected, as this committee has rejected it, then you have got an agency composed of trained engineers and trained personnel that will have to be eliminated, and in my thought it will cost the Government more money next year or the year that follows to reinstate and reestablish that agency than it would be to carry it on with a reasonable appropriation for planning.

Now, I said that the work of the two agencies is comparable. I would like to be helpful; I would like to be constructive. I think that Congress has a responsibility in the matter of eliminating

any discriminations that obtain between these two agencies.

DISCRIMINATION IN LAWS

Both the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers are on a solid foundation. Their construction and their planning methods have been tested. The Corps of Engineers improve our rivers and protect our valleys. The Bureau of Reclamation reclaims our arid lands. Both develop power where it is necessary. I have advocated that Congress has the responsibility to eliminate discriminations that now obtain with respect to power projects constructed by these two agencies. The same rate of interest in the evaluation of benefits should obtain. The same charge for the disposal of power should obtain. I believe Congress should promptly pass legislation eliminating discriminations in existing laws in evaluating benefits and disposition of power in projects constructed by the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. The Public Treasury will be protected. Rivalry between the two agencies will be eliminated. Undesirable competition will be avoided.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS TO PROVIDE FOR PLANNING FUNDS

I believe that the Subcommittee on Civil Functions, on reflection, will submit an amendment to provide for adequate planning funds for river and harbor and flood-control improvements. It is unthinkable to me that $5,150,000 should be provided in connection with appropriations for reclamation amounting to $297,467,000, while no planning funds are provided for rivers and harbors and flood-control projects aggregating $535,000,000. I have already referred to the inconsistencies and contradictions in respect to the arguments for eliminating planning funds. The Bureau of the Budget recommended $2,000,000 for river and harbor planning. The amount is justified. Harbors should be planned along the Atlantic and other coasts to provide for safety to human life. Modern vessels require deeper channels. Funds should be appropriated and I believe that the $2,000,000 recommended should be provided for planning for river and harbor projects. Although the report and the bill eliminate such funds, every previous bill passed by the Congress for river and harbor appropriations contained such planning funds. With the multiplying populations and the progress of our Nation the need now is greater than ever before. If $5,150,000 should be provided for reclamation projects aggregating $297,467,000, surely $2,000,000 is justified for river and harbor projects aggregating $187,678,000.

But even more essential are planning funds for general flood control. The appropriation is $341,055,000. The inconsistencies and contradictions are accentuated by the fact that in the pending bill, page 339, as I have pointed out, a statement is contained that the funds appropriated may be used for planning, while the report states that no planning funds are included. The matter should be clarified and I believe the committee should submit an amendment to provide $4,000,000 for planning of general flood-control improvements as recommended by the Bureau of the Budget. Planning funds have been carried, I repeat, in every other appropriation for flood control.

The elimination of planning funds instead of providing for economy would promote extravagance. To use the language of the subcommittee respecting the Chief of Engineers, it might properly be termed "promotion of profligacy." A competent staff with experience for planning cannot be recruited overnight. If planning funds are eliminated, the staff would have to be eliminated. Costs of future planning would be increased instead of reduced.

I trust that the committee will offer an amendment to provide planning funds for general flood control for at least $4,000,000 recommended by the Bureau of the Budget.

In this connection, as I have stated, the subcommittee refers to the increased costs from 1948, 1949, and 1950 to 1951 of 63 projects aggregating $503,116,000. An analysis of the increase shows that 34 percent are due to increased construction costs, 25 percent to enlargements and expansions authorized by specific and general legislation, 8 percent to changes in conditions that could not have been foreseen, 11 percent to lands, rights-of-way, and so forth, and 22 percent on account of engineering and construction modifications. I emphasize that construction modifications obtain in the larger dams primarily as the result of the installation of units for power involving steel where the price of material has increased. It would be most unwise, because of increased estimates, to deny any planning funds whatsoever.

As a further illustration of the inconsistencies and contradictions with respect to planning, H. R. 5472, the omnibus rivers and harbors and flood-control bill already passed by the House, provides that the Corps of Engineers should make plans respecting the water resources of Alaska. Despite this fact, and against existing statutory authority, the Interior Subcommittee approved $250,000 for Alaska planning and investigations by the Bureau of Reclamation. I could cite further needs in behalf of planning, but I believe the reasons given here for adequate appropriations for planning funds will justify the committee in submitting an amendment for such funds.

I personally think both of these agencies ought to be retained. They have done splendid work. But the fact remains now that under laws passed by the Congress, for which this committee is not responsible, there are some discriminations between the works done by the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. In estimating the benefits, one agency uses a certain rate of interest and the other another rate of interest. In providing for the disposition of power, one rate is fixed for one agency and another rate is fixed for the other agency.

In my judgment, the work of these two excellent agencies can be promoted by the Congress of the United States passing laws that will eliminate the discrepancies and discriminations that occur.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I agree with what my colleague from Mississippi says about the Army engineers. I served on the Committee on Rivers and Harbors for many years. I never found a more accurate, more reliable, and more conscientious group of men to deal with in my life than the Army engineers. They gave us the facts. I deplore this criticism in this report. From my viewpoint, it is thoroughly unjustified.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I would like to say in response to the question of the chairman with respect to surveys and studies, that the funds for surveys and studies in all of the bills that we have ever passed are different from funds for planning. The surveys and studies have to do among other things with the resolutions that are adopted by the Committee on Public Works every week with respect to study of projects which have never been conducted. Heretofore there has been one break-down in the report of the committee for an appropriation for these studies and another for planning, or they have been included and mentioned in the break-down. In your break-down you do not include the word "planning" with the word "studies" in this bill this year.

Mr. Chairman, my thought was to call attention to the fact that there was no criticism in the Bureau of Reclamation because of unobligated funds, no criticism of that Bureau because of extension and increase of estimates, no criticism because of increased costs; money is provided, $5,000,000 for planning; whereas, on the other hand, with respect to civil functions, the unobligated funds were used as an argument for reducing 24.8 percent the budget estimates. While the reduction of only 8.1 occurs in the Bureau of Reclamation estimates. The extension was criticized, and finally with no funds provided for planning for flood control, for rivers and harbors, the committee concludes its report by saying:

> The Chief of Engineers, the Bureau of the Budget, the Civil Functions Subcommittee, and the Congress should insist that adequate plans and designs be prepared in detail before the construction of any project is initiated.

I think that is fundamentally sound, but I know of no way to prepare plans unless you appropriate money for the preparation of those plans. I was in Congress during the great depression; I remember that under the act of 1936, when there was widespread unemployment there were few plans. I trust we are not going to have any unemployment, but the matter of plans was never more important than it is today. I know of no way for this constructive recommendation of the committee to be carried out unless this bill is amended to provide reasonable amounts for planning.

I conclude by saying, Mr. Chairman, that I appeared before the subcommittee together with Representatives from the lower Mississippi River and its tributaries. That committee gave us with a full attendance most patient hearings.

I am grateful. With two exceptions through all the years I have never offered any amendments on the floor of the House to appropriations for flood control or rivers and harbors. In the case of those two exceptions it happens that the House agreed and adopted the amenments that I proposed.

Personally, I wish that the appropriation for the lower Mississippi Valley had been as recommended by the President, and I am talking about the recommendation of President Truman in his budget. I have gone along with the committee generally in the past and I want to go along now. I am sympathetic with all efforts to reduce and to economize, but we must not reduce where it is absolutely necessary that we carry on. I have no project that is involved in planning, not one in my district, under general flood control but I think that the general public interest of all river basins in the United States would be promoted by this committee making it clear, removing any doubt, that you mean for an appropriation to be made to plan not only fundamentally before the projects are adopted but as the units are constructed and for the completion of the projects and for rivers and harbors as well as planning for new projects. I do trust that provisions for reasonable amounts for planning for general flood control will be provided. When I ask for that or suggest it I am suggesting that to the committee itself, in whom I have every confidence because like you I would like to see the budget balanced, but with unemployment in the offing, for whatever my humble view may be worth, I respectfully urge that the committee make no mistake by amending the bill definitely to provide for planning.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. As always, the Members of the House derive great profit and knowledge from what the gentleman says when he takes the floor. I am very happy that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] has explained this matter, because there is no man in Congress or no man who has ever been a Member of this Congress better qualified, who has more knowledge and a more clear conception of the rivers and harbors and flood control problems of America than does the gentleman who is now addressing the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman has worked in committee and has worked with the Army engineers and possibly knows better than anyone in this country the good work that the Army engineers have done. Would not the gentleman say that they are efficient, that they do a wonderful work, that they do it without the thought of politics in any way, shape, or form and that they must have an opportunity to carry forward the engineering which the gentleman has just indicated?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. May I say that the Army engineers are not perfect, but I believe they should be supported just as I believe the Bureau of Reclamation should be supported. They are the most efficient flood control and river and harbor engineers in this or any other country. They enjoy the confidence of the country and the Congress. I recall during the great depression when one WPA civilian administrator after the other in various sections of our country had failed, that finally the members of the Corps of Engineers were called on to do that job. Whatever you say about them, they are appointees to West Point, they are servants of the people, and of the Congress. I cannot conclude without saying that while the Committee on the Interior did not criticize the Bureau of Reclamation as the Committee on Civil Functions criticized the Chief of Engineers, I will say again that they used some language that was not altogether complimentary when they said that the Bureau of Reclamation had "a propensity for subterfuge," and that more than equals the language of the Committee on Civil Functions when they referred to the "profligacy" of the Corps of Engineers.

I believe in equal treatment for the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers. I urge the committee to submit a committee amendment to amend the pending bill to provide reasonable appropriations for adequate planning for rivers and harbors and for general flood control in accordance with the appropriations that have been made previously annually for planning.

No agency of the Government has ever wrought better than the Corps of Engineers. They are honest. They may make mistakes, but their record is without stain or blemish. Their works are their monuments.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED].

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my appreciation to the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee for the time he has yielded to me today. I know the Appropriations Committee has put in many days, weeks, and months of work and study on the bill now before us. They are trying to economize without stopping all progress in this country, especially with reference to defense projects. They have done a fine job in the preparation of this bill, but a bill of this proportion, regardless of the amount of work that may be devoted to it by all of the various subcommittees, needs a full discussion and debate on the floor of the House. Sometimes I wish it were possible for all the Members of the House to serve on each important standing committee for awhile, because if were able to do that, I believe we would become impressed with the idea that members of the committee know so much more about a particular bill which comes from their committee than some of us do, that we would feel slow about challenging the merits of the bill which has received so much study. I have observed, and you have observed that when the ECA bill comes up for discussion, the distinguished members of the Foreign Affairs Committee, from both sides of the aisle, are for the bill, and this situation is true of almost all important bills that come from an important standing committee of the House.

With reference to this bill, some of the members of the committee want more economy than others, some feel that we cannot balance the budget at the present time, but that it must be done slowly and that we cannot balance the budget at the sacrifice of the proper defense of our country and proper efforts to maintain the peace.

The people of the Nation are economy minded, but I believe, in spite of that fact, they want peace at almost any price as long as it is an honorable peace. This is true because we have all suffered the horrors of war, and without relating the experiences which have come to each one of our families, we know this is true. Our first objective then is to maintain the peace, and our second objective is to be ready for war in the event it comes.

In order to be ready for war we must have our Army prepared, our Navy prepared, and our Air Force prepared, and we cannot stop all progress in this country, especially as far as defense and security projects are concerned.

I may not be able to be present when an amendment will probably later be offered to this bill to restore a greater portion of the funds to what I consider a security and defense project which was recommended by the President and approved by the Bureau of the Budget, and practically eliminated by the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. Chairman, I listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON]. I want to say that I concur in everything that he said in the well of this House today.

As a new Member I wish to say that it has been an inspiration to me to have known the gentleman from Mississippi since I have been in the House, and to have been associated with him to some extent. I appeared before a subcommittee of the gentleman's committee yesterday and I wish to say again how much I appreciated the courteous and the patient hearing that subcommittee gave to us.

One thing that the gentleman from Mississippi said especially impressed me; that was his statement to the effect that he was for economy; that he realized we had to reduce the expenditures of Government in all lines in order to eventually have any hope of balancing the budget, but at the same time he said that there were certain projects in chapter 9, that deal with rivers and harbors, that had to be carried on in spite of the necessity of reducing expenditures.

I want to talk to you just a moment about one of those projects which has been left out of this bill almost completely, and which I consider an essential project, a necessary project, a project that is necessary for the proper defense and security of this Nation.

I refer to the Demopolis lock and dam project in Alabama.

The River and Harbor Act, approved March 2, 1945, authorized the modification of the project by the construction

of a new lock and dam in the vicinity of Demopolis to replace the existing structures, 4, 5, 6, and 7. Funds for the initiation of construction work in the amount of $1,000,000 were provided in the Civil Functions Appropriations Act for 1950. About the 19th of last December, General Pick went to Alabama. We had groundbreaking ceremonies at Demopolis. The ceremonies were attended by most of the Members of the Alabama delegation, including one of the Senators from Alabama. The other Senator from Alabama was unavoidably absent. It was impossible for him to be there at the time.

Thousands of people attended the ceremonies. I wish you could have been there to hear the magnificent address by General Pick on that occasion.

All of us assumed that because the $1,000,000 had been appropriated for the commencement of construction of that important project, that it would be gone ahead with.

The Warrior River system has been improved by the construction of 15 locks and dams to provide slack-water navigation between Mobile and Birmingham, Ala., a distance of about 450 miles. The older structures were completed during the period 1902 to 1915. Due to the age of these structures and the increased tonnage on the stream, three of the structures, 10, 11, and 12, were replaced by a modern lock and dam at Tuscaloosa, this lock being placed in operation in 1940.

The River and Harbor Act approved March 2, 1945, authorized the modification of the project by the construction of a new lock and dam in the vicinity of Demopolis to replace existing structures 4, 5, 6, and 7. Funds for initiation of construction work in the amount of $1,000,000 were provided in the Civil Functions Appropriation Act for 1950. The total estimated cost of the Demopolis Lock and Dam is $20,843,000, of which $1,342,500 has been provided to date leaving a balance of $19,500,500 remaining to complete. The funds provided in the Civil Functions Appropriation Act for 1950 are being applied to access road construction, clearing the site, and common excavation and cofferdike construction for the lock. The approved budget estimate for 1951 is $4,000,000 and was scheduled for application to land acquition in the amount of $360,000 and the remaining funds to the initiation of a continuing contract for construction of the lock and spillway. The amount allowed by the House Committee was $358,000 which would, of course, preclude the commencement of construction work on the lock and spillway.

Demopolis lock and dam at the junction of the Tombigbee and Warrior Rivers is a link in one established major transportation system and will also be a link in another upon completion of the authorized Tennessee-Tombigbee waterway. It will replace four obsolete locks with a modern 600-foot lock capable of handling more traffic in less time.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. What is the traffic density on the Warrior system at the present time?

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. I will give you that right now, sir.

Traffic on the Warrior system has increased considerably during recent years due to the importation of ore from Sweden and Brazil to the Birmingham area. Increased movement of oil is also expected from surrounding oil fields. The tonnage handled on the waterway was about 1,974,000 tons during the calendar year 1948, an increase of 150,000 tons over 1947. While we do not have the complete figures for the year 1949, the tonnage will well exceed 2,000,000 tons and would have been far greater had not the towage had to be broken down at many of these ancient and dilapidated locks along the Tombigbee and Warrior Rivers.

The Warrior system connects Mobile, ranked by the Department of Commerce as the sixth most important port in the Nation with Birmingham, a city of industrial importance and the second largest producer of steel in the United States.

I wish to read a letter from the Warrior & Gulf Navigation Co., Chickasaw, Ala., dated March 27, 1950:

WARRIOR & GULF NAVIGATION CO.,
Chickasaw, Ala., March 27, 1950.

Hon. EDWARD DEGRAFFENRIED,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DEGRAFFENRIED: I acknowledge receipt of your letter of March 24 relative to the drastic reduction made by the Committee on Appropriations for the construction of the new lock and dam at Demopolis on the Tombigbee River. The news of this reduction was indeed a blow to our hopes that the improvement program to the Warrior-Tombigbee Rivers which was interrupted by World War II would again get under way. It is very difficult for us to understand a decrease in the appropriation for this particular project of 91 percent as compared to a reduction of slightly less than 30 percent in the over-all appropriation bill covering the other authorized projects over the country. Such a reduction is to say the least discriminatory and unequitable. Failure to construct the Demopolis lock would endanger the continued use of this important artery of commerce in view of the deplorable condition of locks 4, 5, 6, and 7 which the new lock will replace.

Construction of the proposed Demopolis lock will provide a standard Ohio River size lock chamber 600 feet long by 110 feet wide and will replace four small locks now in use, Nos. 4, 5, 6, and 7 above it. These existing obsolete locks have very small lock chambers, 286 feet long by 52 feet wide. The savings to water carriers and operators from the replacement of the existing obsolete locks, 4, 5, 6, and 7, are very important, especially when it is realized that these locks are badly in need of repair and that any one of them could easily be put out of commission at any time, thus blocking all traffic on the Tombigbee-Warrior River system. The average tow now in use on this system has to be broken up at each of these locks and three separate lockage operations are required to pass the tow through each lock. A standard 8-barge tow passing through the four locks referred to requires 12 hours each way, or a total of 24 hours per round trip. The proposed new lock would eliminate the existing locks and require only one lockage for the standard eight-barge tow. In addition, the deeper water which would be provided by the new lock and dam in the three pools above it would enable an increase in speed of the tow to more than double the present speed and afford an additional saving of time of approximately 7 hours. The above figures are based on a study made by this company on the actual performance of tows under present conditions in the pools above lock 4 as compared to the speed of tows in the deep pool which exists above lock 17 on the Black Warrior River above Tuscaloosa, Ala. The total saving in time which would be afforded by the proposed new lock at Demopolis in reducing the present 21 lockages in each direction to a single lockage plus the saving in towing speed, we estimate would save $750 per trip on present-day operating costs. On the basis of an existing schedule of 24 trips per year per vessel, the monetary savings would amount to approximately $18,000 per year per vessel. This saving multiplied by the four vessels which we now have in service will result in a total annual saving of $72,000.

In addition to the savings outlined above, the decrease in the number of days required for each trip will be the equivalent of three extra round trips per year, or an estimated additional 24,000 tons of revenue freight. The only cost involved in moving this additional tonnage is the actual fuel, lubricating oils, and miscellaneous deck supplies consumed while making the three extra trips. Vessel expense, such as wages of crew, depreciation, taxes, insurance, etc., is an annual expense continuing throughout the year and naturally if additional trips can be made, this cost will be spread over a greater tonnage, thereby resulting in further savings.

I am enclosing a savings chart which was prepared by the district engineer at Mobile showing the annual savings to be realized by the construction of the proposed lock. Please note that the annual savings in operation and maintenance costs to the United States Engineer Department plus the savings to users makes a total saving of $476,100 annually which is in excess of the 358,000 appropriated by the committee for construction work on the new lock in 1951. In other words, for each year that the construction of this lock is delayed, the Government and users of the River are losing $476,100 and this figure will be increased in direct proportion to the increased use of the facilities which is now taking place.

It is now public knowledge that the production of high-grade iron ores from the Mesabi Range in Minnesota will almost disappear within the next 20 to 25 years. Realizing the seriousness of this situation, the U. S. Steel Corp., after spending millions of dollars in exploration of world ore reserves, located vast deposits of high-grade iron ore in Venezuela. Plans are already under way to commence shipment of some two million tons annually from this field to the Birmingham district, all of which is scheduled to move through the port of Mobile. The rich Venezuelan ore (over 60 percent iron) will be mixed with native low-grade ores and based on experiments made by the steel mills of the Tennessee Coal, Iron & Railroad Co. in Birmingham will result in an increased steel production of 15 percent with the existing facilities. Obviously, the movement of such a large volume of bulk ore must be done as cheaply as possible in order to make its use economical in Birmingham. This cannot be accomplished with locks built more than 40 years ago whose narrow and obsolete size require multiple lockages of tows, restricts the passage of larger tows that are in use today and will further restrict the still larger units and tows that will be employed with increasing movement of huge quantities of raw materials. A reduction in the number of dams and enlargement of lock chambers as proposed in connection with the new Demopolis lock and dam so as to permit the passing of tows intact will result in lowered transportation costs and assure

the continued movement of this commodity over the river.

The value of the new iron ore discoveries in Venezuela and its movement by water to the steel mills in Birmingham cannot be over-emphasized from the standpoint of national defense as well as peacetime production. Should this country be faced with another war of similar proportions to the last, our ability to produce a war machine capable of defending the country is open to question in view of our present depleted iron ore reserve. The movement to the mills of a large volume of foreign iron ore by the use of a modern waterway will supplement our diminishing ore reserves and provide a margin of safety in time of war. We have information that the U. S. Steel Corp. by 1955 will be shipping upward to 2,000,000 tons of ore annually to its Birmingham mills. It is urgent that construction of a new lock at Demopolis proceed at once in order that it will be completed by the time this large volume of ore commences to move.

The above has been hurriedly and poorly written in view of the urgency of this matter. However, I hope that it will be of some assistance in acquainting you with the situation. For your further information, I am attaching photographs showing the condition of locks 6 and 8 and a typical tow of iron ore moving upstream. Also enclosed is the story of the Venezuelan ore discovery which I trust you will find interesting reading. I sincerely hope that it will be possible to salvage part of this appropriation in view of its vital importance to all of us in this area.

Looking forward to seeing you in Washington on the third, I remain

Yours very truly,

W. I. McELROY,
Superintendent of Operations.

The continuation of the construction of this lock and dam is necessary at the present time. It will facilitate the taking of iron ore brought from Brazil, Venezuela, Sweden, and other places from the port of Mobile to Birmingham, Ala., a major steel-production center. By using a great portion of this iron ore now, we can salvage our own iron-ore deposits in this country for use during any war which may come. When war comes, we may be cut off from bringing this ore from other countries to the United States, and, if so, it will then be necessary for us to use our own iron-ore deposits in great measure and they may be speedily exhausted. Therefore, they should be conserved now, and the only way to conserve them is by using the ore brought in from these other countries. Also, in the event of war, we can bring in iron ore from Brazil and Venezuela, until we are cut off from getting it, by using the Caribbean Sea and receive the protection of Cuba and Puerto Rico and other islands until we get it into the Gulf of Mexico and thence to Mobile. It will be almost like using an inland water route instead of hazarding convoying ships to the submarine menace which will probably be present in the Atlantic Ocean. Knowing that all of the Members of the House have the welfare of our country at heart, I cannot help but feel that they will want a major portion of these funds restored to this project so that it will not have to be abandoned at the present time. The proper defense of our country and the security of our Nation demand that this be done.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. What is the character of dams that the new dam proposes to replace?

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. They are old wooden structures, very small and dilapidated. Some of the locks along the river are hand operated. Some of them were built as long as 40 years ago. They have had several breakdowns at those locks.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. What is their present condition?

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. They are in very, very bad condition; they are in very much need of repair.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. If one of the dams were to deteriorate to the extent that it could not be used, would it impair the whole river system?

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. It could not be used. It would stop the whole transportation.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. The entire river system, then, depends upon the replacement of these inadequate and dangerous dams that are in the river at the present time?

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. The gentleman's observation is correct.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I agree most heartily with what the gentleman from Alabama says regarding the importance of the inland waterway in connection with our steel industry. I wish to call attention to the fact also that in case of war, unless this inland waterway is provided, the chances are that Pittsburgh, Pa., would be shut off from the Venezuelan iron mines where she is now getting her iron ore.

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. I thank the gentleman from Mississippi for his contribution.

I am sure that the members of the Appropriations Committee want to be fair and surely they do not want to cut this project 91 percent when other projects under construction are being cut only from about 10 to 30 percent throughout the Nation. I ask the members of the Appropriations Committee and the Members of the House to give the amendment dealing with this project careful consideration when it is presented for your consideration.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us today is more than an appropriation bill. It is the symbol of 18 years of irresponsible political philosophy in our Government. It is the symbol of a dangerous political theory that has fastened itself on one government after another down through the centuries and ended in the fall of every one of them.

One of the banes of civilization is the fact that in every generation there are men in public life who will gamble with the public welfare and the safety of the economy to gain their own political ends. The callous recklessness of such leaders has undermined the economic security and happiness of scores of nations down through history. The tragedy has always been made more grim by the fact that economic quackery has always had a wide appeal until disaster struck.

As governments have fallen, others have arisen in their place, usually with safeguards designed to prevent recurrence of the ailments. The founders of our own United States labored long and hard in their efforts to write safeguards into the Constitution that would prevent economic catastrophe from overtaking the American people. They very wisely placed the power of originating appropriations and the levying of taxes in that branch of the Government which most closely represented the people—the House of Representatives. They did not vest that power in the Senate, in the judiciary, or the executive—they specifically limited it to the House of Representatives. They were fresh from the realization that the power to tax is the power to destroy, and they were determined that if America must ever die, it would be by suicide, not homicide.

The founding fathers envisioned the President of the United States as no more than an administrator, an official of limited powers who would do no more than carry out the instructions of the elected representatives of the people. For 157 years—until 1933—the great American form of government which they had designed withstood the onslaughts of the economic witch doctors who at numerous times during that period attempted to gain power by advocating their quackeries.

It is particularly important to note that the Presidents who had occupied the White House during those 157 years had respected the safeguards which had been cemented into the Constitution for the highest purposes. For example, no President in that time ever so much as considered vetoing a tax bill, as Presidents Roosevelt and Truman have both done in recent years. No President in that time would have dreamed of threatening to veto a tax bill if it did not meet his specifications, as President Truman did in his 1950 state of the Union message. Those Presidents respected the fundamental thesis that only the elected representatives to Congress should exercise the power of taxation with all its inherent dangers.

The year 1933 undoubtedly will go down in history as the turning point in America's political and economic progress. It will go down in history as the beginning of a period in which men endowed with more recklessness than wisdom tried every economic panacea that they could find, and having tried them decided to weave them into the permanent fiber of government. Easy money, easy credit, easy debt, and a whole flock of other easy-come easy-go schemes became the backbone of government as it was operated by those in power.

For six long peacetime years deficit, Government hand-outs, and easy credit were the dominating policies. Glib phrases filled the air. "Pump-priming," "compensatory spending," and "we owe it to ourselves" were the catchwords of the day, and what was solved?

When the New Deal took office in 1933, there were 13,000,000 unemployed. Six years later, before national-defense spending began, there were still 11,000,000 unemployed. All the fabulous economic panaceas and political quackeries had not solved the problem. The national debt had more than doubled, the tax burden had tripled, and we still had almost the same number of unemployed as 6 years earlier.

Today it is a recognized fact that a world war and only a world war relieved the New Deal of its most colossal embarrassment, specifically the fact that it had failed to solve the problem of unemployment, in the name of which it foisted all its economic theories and panaceas on the American people. What the economic medicinemen, and the socialist planners had failed to do, a devastating war did for them.

With the nations of Europe needing war materials, we supplied them and thus provided our own people with jobs. Unemployment figures at last began to drop. With the coming of Pearl Harbor and our own entrance into the conflict, our problem became not one of unemployment but of actual shortage of manpower.

So the war was waged at enormous cost, the debt was increased almost 500 percent, and the tax burden was raised to perilous heights—seven times higher than it had ever been in history. Of course the overwhelming majority of the American people paid the price willingly and accepted the attendant sacrifices without complaint. They expected, and they were entitled to expect that once the conflict was over, there would be a period of adjustment and that within a few years a substantial return to more normal peacetime conditions would be achieved. They expected, and they were entitled to expect, that taxes would be lowered, that payments on the debt would begin, that rationing and controls would end, and that the enormous shortages resulting from 5 years of war would provide the economy with sufficient momentum to cause the wheels of industry to hum and jobs to be plentiful. That is what they expected and, I repeat, that is what they were entitled to expect.

But their expectations were based on miscalculation. They had forgotten, under the terrible stress of war, that there were still in power the same economic witch doctors and the same disciples of socialism, who had failed to solve the problem of unemployment in a half-dozen long years of fruitless and costly frittering with economic theories that had been proved, a hundred times over, down through history to be false and disastrous to any government that embraced them. They had forgotten that the history of these men was that once a tax was enacted it was never repealed, that once a power was gained it was never willingly given up, that once a control had been imposed it was never relinquished if these men could help it.

It simply did not occur to most Americans that the schemers in Washington would employ the terrible machinery of war, the terrible burden of taxes, contrals, and emergency powers to achieve political ends that could never be won at the polls, that would never be willingly voted by the American people.

So what happened?

Did they want to give up the controls?

No. President Truman demanded their retention. The left-wing trumpets let loose in full blast against Republican efforts to force the Government to keep faith with the American people and the American way of life.

Did they want to cut back taxes?

No. President Truman demanded more taxes. The left-wing trumpets blared in a fanfare against Republican demands for tax reductions.

Did they want to cut spending?

No. President Truman rushed to Congress with a score of new spending schemes. The left-wing trumpets rent the air with demands for spending schemes that were fantastic, for nostrums that were costly beyond belief.

What happened is a matter of record. Shortages mounted disastrously, people lined up in front of stores simply to obtain food, and business stagnated while the President and the left wing stubbornly insisted on retention of controls. It was Congress, with the Republicans leading the fight, throughout the entire summer of 1946, which finally forced an end to rationing.

It was the Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress which passed the first tax-reduction bill in a generation, and it did so over three vetoes by President Truman.

It was the Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress which forced a balanced budget and a reduction of the national debt for the first time in a generation. The reckless spending measures proposed by the President and the left wing were effectively blocked, and the American economy at last was going full speed ahead. There was virtually no unemployment, shortages had disappeared to a large extent, and the economic future looked holpeful for the first time in years.

With the reelection of President Truman and the return of the Democratic Party to control of Congress in 1948, the spenders and the princes of planning were in full cry once again. The President sent a program to Congress that called for huge outlays of public moneys, a $4,000,000,000 increase in taxes, and socialization of credit, agriculture, medicine, and our natural resources. Efforts by the Republicans to continue their tax-reduction program, which had given the economy a fresh stimulus, were bitterly opposed by those in power, and an excise-tax-repeal bill which I introduced in February of 1949 lay in a convenient pigeonhole in the House Ways and Means Committee.

Unemployment started to mount. Business, threatened with new and ever-heavier taxes, slowed down to a walk, and the situation by midsummer became so threatening that the President was forced to say he would not press immediately for his tax-increase proposals. But he steadfastly adhered to the balance of his reckless program, and the American public was treated to the economic spectacle of a government which had already run the public debt up to a quarter of a trillion dollars, start deficit spending once more, not as a temporary policy, but virtually as a permanent step.

Think of it, in less than 2 years, the President has outlined deficit-spending programs blanketing the fiscal years of 1949, 1950, and 1951, that will run up a total deficit of $13,000,000,000.

That figure is $4,000,000,000 more than the entire cost of the Federal Government in 1939 when Government was also operating on a deficit basis.

In January of this year, the President sent to Congress a state of the Union message, an economic report, and a budget message; and those three messages charted a future course of ever-rising taxes and ever-rising spending that no government in the history of this earth ever attempted before. If ever a blueprint for socialism was laid down, these three messages were it.

The American people, already carrying a tax burden in excess of one quarter of the national income, were being told in in effect, that their tax bill eventually would be doubled, that Government spending, already at the back-breaking level of $43,300,000,000, would eventually be increased 100 percent, and that the Federal Government would become the overseer of the family, the sickbed, the schools, our natural resources, and the private credit of our economy.

I say to you that if this program is carried out, America as we know it is gone. I say to you that the pump primers are now priming the pumps for disaster. America's leadership role among the nations of the world will vanish much as Great Britain's has, as we borrow the socialistic schemes which have brought that great nation to its knees.

The awful impact of this irresponsible, reckless program is already becoming tragically apparent. Unemployment is rising and today we have approximately 4,500,000 unemployed in the United States. Men with families are out of work, veterans and young people are finding it increasingly hard to obtain employment, and with the graduation from our schools and colleges this spring, another half million people will be added to our labor force with little hope of obtaining jobs.

It is time that America woke up. It is time we realized that the same architects of disaster, the same specious theories and economic quackeries, the same socialist schemers, dominate our Government today just as they did throughout the thirties. They never solved the problem of unemployment in the thirties and their continued use of the very same fallacious economic philosophy which they employed then is now causing unemployment and raising once more the dreaded possibility of an economic crisis.

It is appalling to realize that if this country must face economic or military hardship in the future, it must do so with the national debt at an already impossible level, with the tax burden at a point where it depresses our economy, and with Government spending already going on a rate which cannot be increased without compounding an eco-

nomic malady it attempts to cure. The very security of America is at stake, but irresponsible men and irresponsible leaders insist on gambling with that security to achieve their own political ends.

I repeat—the bill before us today calling in all for almost $39,000,000,000 of Government money, credit, and contractural authorizations, lies like a giant boulder on the American economy. The American economy has withstood the depressive acts of Government time and again, but inevitably the breaking point must come.

We in Congress have a responsibility that is far more than political. We must answer at all times for the very security of America, and where the security of America begins, partisanship should end.

I talk to you not as Democrats or Republicans but as Americans. Every one of us knows deep in our hearts that this pump-priming for disaster must stop. These economic quackeries must end.

These socialistic schemers and political medicine men who now infect the executive branch of the Government must be run out of Washington. We also know that if this is to be done, only Congress can be depended upon to do it.

Let us face the facts—the tide of unemployment is rising steadily in the United States.

In February, the number of jobless increased by 204,000, making the total 4,684,000—the highest in 9 years.

In March, there were 561,000 less unemployed, but this was regarded as seasonal.

Forty-three areas throughout the country were classified by the Department of Labor in February as critical areas, which means that 12 or more out of every hundred workers were pounding the streets looking for jobs.

At this moment, unemployment-insurance payments are at record levels, and more than 2,000,000 people have exhausted the benefits to which they are entitled. All reports indicate that people over the age of 45 are having great difficulty in finding work.

Unemployment usually grows like a snowball rolling downhill. Government agencies, although they expect a slight seasonal pick-up this spring, have predicted more than 5,000,000 unemployed by June.

Leon H. Keyserling, acting chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, recently said there are circumstances that might lead to 12,000,000 jobless by 1954. Mr. Keyserling needs no identification before this House. Mr. Keyserling is one of the medicine men whom I have been discussing, one of the doleful defeatists who regard unemployment as permanent, one of those who say that we must continue to have a large segment of our labor force unemployed and that there is nothing much that can be done about it.

Such talk is tommyrot.

The time to check unemployment is now; before it gets worse. The longer we wait, the more difficult the task will be. The way to check unemployment is to go to the root of the trouble—to cure the conditions that are causing it.

Fortunately, there are five basic steps that President Truman and Congress can take immediately that would go far toward reversing the tide. Here are the five main steps in a nonpartisan prosperity program:

First. Remove the wartime excise taxes.

These taxes were levied during the war to discourage purchase of goods and services that were in short supply, and they have continued to have the same effect in peacetime. The American Federation of Labor has said the excise taxes are strangling business and employment. In luggage, furs, jewelry, cosmetics, transportation, amusements, telephone, telegraph, and scores of other industries, the story is the same—depressed sales and jobless workers because of the staggering excise taxes. Many communities in New England, for example, have said that repeal of the wartime excises would be the strongest possible shot in the arm for their areas.

Second. Create tax incentives for small business.

At present the small-business man is shackled by severe taxes, which prevent him from accumulating the capital he needs to launch a new enterprise or to expand an existing business. Yet this kind of growth is essential if we are to have an expanding economy. In order to create jobs for our growing population, new firms must be springing up constantly. Our tax system should be designed to give the small risk taker every encouragement. We must stop hamstringing him.

I am confident that, if small business were given additional tax incentives and if the wartime excises were repealed, business would receive such a hefty stimulus that there would soon be an increase in tax revenue that would more than offset the initial reduction.

Third. Balance the budget and begin retirement of the national debt.

A balanced budget is the surest guaranty of our economic strength. A solvent Federal Government is a bulwark against excessive ups and downs in the business cycle, and it sets a tone of stability and responsibility for our entire business life. A businessman who can count on the value of tomorrow's dollar is able to do the long-range planning that means jobs—steady jobs. A worker who can count on the value of tomorrow's dollar is able to save with confidence that his bank deposits, his insurance, and his old-age pension will be worth what he put into them.

The most direct way to balance the budget is to cut spending. This would open the way to reducing the national debt and eventually to lowering taxes, which would free billions of dollars in purchasing power that are now being shunted up the dead-end road of Government spending.

Fourth. Administer the tariff program more carefully.

While world trade should be encouraged, the reciprocal-trade program should be managed in such a way that no particular areas or industries will be crippled. This is not the case at present. Too often the benefits of our tariff reductions are not reciprocal. Too often the benefits flow only to foreign producers and foreign workers, while American workers see their markets disappear.

In New England, and in other States as well, there is widespread unemployment from the flood of cheap goods from abroad—watches, pottery, hats, shoes, rubber wear, fishing products, and many others. For instance, Marx Lewis, general secretary of the United Hatters, Cap, and Millinery Workers, AFL, has said that a wave of imports from Czechoslovakia threatens to reduce the hat-making city of Danbury, Conn., to a ghost town. On the Pacific coast, the story is much the same in lumber, fishing, fruit, nuts, and many other industries that are the mainstays of employment.

Fifth. Remove the threat of socialization that hangs over the country.

As long as the United States is pushed down a course that parallels Britain, there will be a damper on the enthusiasm and daring that are the cornerstones of lasting prosperity. No one can plan confidently for a future that may be so ominous. One possible symptom of fear was in the Securities and Exchange Commission's report of Friday, which said that American business in 1950 will spend about 11 percent less on new plant and equipment than in 1949.

Now is the time for leadership to show its mettle. Almost 5,000,000 jobless Americans are crying for action. There is no reason why President Truman and the leaders of Congress cannot carry out a program like the one I have outlined. There are 5,000,000 reasons why they should. If they do not, the country will know where to place the responsibility.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON].

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, the tremendous appropriation bill now before the House for approximately $28,000,000,000 should cause every Member of Congress and every citizen of the United States to stop, look, and listen. It is estimated that if this bill is passed together with other bills for foreign aid and so forth, it will mean a deficit at the end of the fiscal year of approximately $5,000,000,000. How long can this Nation of ours continue to spend, year after year, more than we take in and remain solvent? No individual nor any businessman can continue to spend more than he receives without facing a condition of bankruptcy. This is equally true of a nation. Therefore, I repeat, we must stop, look, and listen before it is too late.

In 1932 Franklin D. Roosevelt, then a presidential candidate, had this to say about Government spending:

> Any government, like any family, can for a year spend a little more than it earns. But you and I know that a continuance of that habit means the poorhouse.

Those words are equally true today and have even greater significance than at the time they were spoken. They deserve to be emphasized because in every year since 1932 with the exception of the 2 years of Republican control our Federal Government has spent more than it has collected.

In 1932 our Federal expenditures amounted to only $4,500,000,000. Today,

it is estimated that our expenditure for the fiscal year 1950 will amount to $45,000,000,000. That is 10 times the amount expended 17 years ago. And we must not overlook the fact that this is a peacetime expenditure. There has never been any similar expenditure in a time of peace.

The Reader's Digest of January 1950 has set forth in an article a vivid explanation of what this means. In part it reads as follows:

To give you an idea of just how much money this is, consider these facts:

1. If everyone in the United States cashed in all his life-insurance policies, the total would amount to $44,000,000,000. This would not be enough money to run the Government for 1 year.

2. If every urban home owner in this country sold his home, the total would amount to $30,000,000,000. That's just enough to run the Government for 8 months.

3. If every farmer in this country sold his farm, farm equipment, and livestock, the total would amount to $25,000,000,000. The Government could not run for 7 months on that amount of money.

These facts put a new light on the staggering size of our Federal Government's planned $45,000,000,000 expenditure for the fiscal year 1950. And remember, this excessive spending is in the face of a national debt of more than $250,000,000,000.

Isn't it as true today as it was in 1932 that a continuance of that habit means the poorhouse?

Increased spending means either an increased deficit or increased taxes. The tax burden on the people of this Nation in direct and indirect taxes for Federal, State, and local purposes approximates one-third of the national income. And, yet, notwithstanding this heavy take from the income of every worker the President advocates and has asked Congress to provide additional taxes. There is no justification for such a course. Taxes should be decreased and not increased.

The most sensible way to meet the situation that now confronts us, as a result of insufficient Federal revenue to meet expenditures, is to reduce expenditures. It can be done if waste and extravagance in our Federal Government is eliminated, and, this can be done without in any way adversely affecting the necessary functions of government.

In the consideration of this appropriation bill it is my intention and purpose to support the effort that will be made to bring the amount to be expended in conformity with the expected revenues of the Government. A balanced budget is necessary to the financial stability of this country. Our ability to help our people and fulfill our obligations at home and abroad demands that we be financially sound.

(Mr. WOLVERTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS].

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, the 1951 general appropriations bill, as reported to the House, has brought Congress face to face with a series of policy decisions that have importance and implications far beyond what at first sight might appear to be justifiable action.

A special severe blow is meted out to the important flood-control project in eastern Kentucky, made up of the Dewey Reservoir and its appurtenances. The project is almost complete and there is required only $600,000 to acquire the remaining lands. I wish to state that all construction is already complete. I know that there is not a man in this body that believes in permitting his own dwelling house to deteriorate by reason of nonoccupancy after construction has been completed, simply because he does not have an entrance. American citizens are simply against this type of false economy.

The reasons given for this unprecedented action is not that the project is unwise or even that it is contrary in any way to policies long established and supported by Congress. It is wholly that the costs of completing the remaining phases of this and for other projects are now found to be in excess of earlier estimates submitted by the great engineering agency which develops the plans, makes the recommendations and carries on all of the activities connected with the construction, maintenance, and operations of many important and useful projects in nearly every State in the Union.

In all of these, the agency recommendations are discussed and approved by Congress under an atmosphere of high mutual trust that is unusual in the dealings between Congress and the executive agencies.

The amount required for the completion of this important flood-control project is denied and the project must go uncompleted.

If nature will just stage its floods somewhere else, the cost of the delay will be progressive disintegration of the project facilities that will set in at once from nonuse of costly works on account of lack of funds for completion.

The project is designed to prevent a disaster that has many times been considered real and threatening by Congress.

At this point I would like to make available to the entire Congress information furnished me by the Corps of Engineers in response to my direct questions, which clearly point out the reasons for the underestimate in the 1950 budget, as well as the discrepancy in the amount of funds now necessary to complete the project in relation to the amount provided for in the 1951 budget:

INFORMATION FURNISHED BY THE CORPS OF ENGINEERS IN MY OFFICE MARCH 24, 1950

Question (Mr. PERKINS). Will you briefly describe the Dewey Reservoir—I mean whether it is flood control, recreational, or both?

Answer. The Dewey Reservoir project was authorized as a flood-control reservoir by the Flood Control Act approved June 28, 1938. It is a unit of comprehensive flood-control plan for the Ohio River Basin. No other reservoirs have been constructed or are under construction in the Big Sandy Basin.

The project is located on Johns Creek about 7 miles southeast of Paintsville, Ky., and 5.4 miles above the confluence of Johns Creek with Levisa Fork, which, together with Tug Fork, forms the Big Sandy River. The dam is a rolled-earth fill structure having a maximum height of 118 feet and a crest length of 920 feet. It creates a reservoir having a total capacity of 88,000 acre-feet, of which 77,000 acre-feet are reserved for flood control, and the remainder of 11,000 acre-feet are reserved for a conservation pool which can be utilized for increasing low-water flow, pollution abatement, and recreation.

In addition to constructing the dam, together with the spillway, outlet works, and a dike, it was necessary to acquire title to, or flowage easements over, approximately 15,000 acres of land, and relocate approximately 8.3 miles of highway, 17.6 miles of pipe lines, and 56 cemeteries involving 718 graves.

Question (Mr. PERKINS). I notice the Corps of Engineers estimate on the total cost of Dewey Reservoir as made last year was $6,246,800. This year the Corps of Engineers estimated before the House Appropriations Committee the total cost to be $7,456,500. Can you explain at this time why the Corps of Engineers underestimated the cost of the reservoir when they were testifying last year, and if so, what you now estimate the total cost of Dewey Reservoir to be?

Answer. A comparison of the 1950 and 1951 estimates of costs follows:

1950:	
Construction	$3,434,800
Relocations	1,126,700
Lands	1,685,300
Total	6,246,800
1951:	
Construction	3,474,800
Relocations	1,126,700
Lands	2,855,000
Total	7,456,500

It is of note that there is little difference in the estimated construction costs for the 2 years, that there is no difference in the relocation estimated costs, and that the increase in the total cost of the project is almost entirely due to the increased estimated cost of the lands in the reservoir approximately $1,169,700. The reason for this increase is as follows:

The estimate of $1,685,300 was based on a gross appraisal of the lands required for the reservoir. During the process of acquiring these lands, it was necessary to make individual tract appraisals and, later, it was necessary to resort to condemnation to acquire some of the tracts. The individual tract appraisals revealed that land values were approximatley 25 to 30 percent in excess of those used as a basis for the gross appraisal. Condemnation suits resulted in awards by three commisisoners appointed by the Federal court approximately 115 percent in excess of the Government appraisals. In the light of the above, it became definitely apparent that the original gross estimate for land acquisition was too low, and after a thorough analysis was made, it was determined that the lands would cost approximately 70 percent more than originally estimated, and that the total estimated cost of the project would necessarily be increased by the addition of $40,000 for construction and $1,169,700 for lands, or a total of $1,209,700. The total estimated cost of the project was, therefore, revised to $7,456,500. As a total of $6,116,000 had previously been allotted to the project, it became necessary to request an additional $1,340,500 for fiscal year 1951, in order to complete the project.

All agreements covering the relocation of utilities and highways have only recently been executed, with the result that they total approximately $826,000 in lieu of the estimated total of $1,126,200, thereby effecting a saving of approximately $300,000. Furthermore, the land-acquisition program has advanced sufficiently to such a stage, that it has been possible to effect further savings for the following reasons:

1. Recent decisions of the court in condemnation suits have been much more favorable to the Government as a result of

changes made by the Department of Justice in the handling of condemnation suits.

2. Property owners have agreed to retain certain portions of their properties lying outside of the reservoir area proper, thereby reducing the lands or easements to be acquired from 15,500 acres to 14,500 acres.

3. Property owners in the upper reaches of the reservoir where infrequent inundation will occur, have agreed to sell flowage easements over their properties rather than sell them in fee.

As a result of the above economies, savings approximating $440,000 in land costs will be effected.

As a result of the savings of approximately $300,000 in relocation costs and approximately $440,000 in land costs, the amount required for completion of the project is reduced to approximately $600,000.

Question. (Mr. PERKINS). You are in a better position at this time to make an accurate statement on the total estimated cost of this reservoir than the Corps of Engineers were last fall. Am I correct in that statement?

Answer. That is right. The estimates supporting the 1951 appropriation were made in August 1949. A good deal of the work has been performed since then to indicate to us more closely what the actual costs would be. All the agreements in connection with relocations have been executed so we have a definite figure rather than an estimated one as to the total cost. We have completed the appraisals of all the individual tracts of land which we have to acquire, and in that case too we have a definite figure rather than an estimated figure.

Question (Mr. PERKINS). Assuming that the Appropriations Committee failed to grant the $600,000 which you state is necessary for the completion of Dewey Reservoir, what effect, if any, will that have on being able to utilize the project to its fullest extent, and getting a return on the money already invested?

Answer. Unless the amount of $600,000 is made available for fiscal year 1951, completion of the project will necessarily be deferred. Construction of the dam is now complete, and the relocations will be completed before the end of fiscal year 1950, leaving only acquisition of the remaining lands to complete the project. Until such time as all the lands or easements are acquired, it will not be possible to utilize the reservoir to its fullest extent for flood control. Should a major storm occur and it becomes necessary to use the reservoir to its fullest extent, unacquired lands will be affected, with the result that it will be necessary to pay damages to the owners of such land. To obtain the maximum use of the reservoir area for flood control, it may be necessary to lower the conservation pool during the flood season to obtain more storage of flood waters. Furthermore, a complete return on an investment of over $6,000,000 cannot be obtained until the reservoir project is completed.

Every Member of this House knows that the estimates submitted on these projects are sometimes above and sometimes below the amounts that Congress first approves.

The committee action if permitted to stand would simply cost more money and delay the benefits to the people. I can see no economy or justification for such action and trust that such errors in this bill will be corrected.

(Mr. PERKINS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED] follow in the RECORD immediately after the remarks of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

(Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. GOLDEN].

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Chairman, the estimated cost of this project is $1,233,000 to the Federal Government and $490,000 to the local people.

The following are the estimated flood damages to Pineville for the period between January 1918 and June 1947:

Date of flood	Stage in feet	Estimated damages
January–February 1918	47.3	$806,000
November 1928	(1)	409,500
March 1929	47.3	806,000
January 1932	(1)	325,000
February 1939	44.3	58,500
February 1940	41.8	15,600
January 1946	49.3	1,451,500
June 1947	42.5	19,900
Total for floods of record		3,892,000
Estimated average annual damages, 30-year period		129,730

[1] From damage survey.

The 1946 flood was the most devastating and destructive of any flood on record for Pineville, and the estimated flood damages for that year are broken down as follows:

Item	Units	Damages
Residential property damaged	563	
Residential property destroyed	100	$723,900
Commercial and industrial property damaged	121	614,800
Institutional property damaged	18	99,800
Streets and miscellaneous property		13,900
Total		1,451,500
Loss in taxes, Federal, State, county, and city, on account of 1946 flood amounted to		450,000

The city of Pineville lies on the Cumberland River in southeastern Kentucky. The Cumberland River rises and has its source in the county above where Pineville is located. The business and greater part of the residential sections of Pineville are located on the comparatively level flood plain and lie in an area roughly semicircular in shape about three-eighths mile wide and three-quarters mile long. The last official census of Pineville is 3,900 and it possibly has 4,000 now.

We have frequent and recurring floods, some of which are small ones, and we have had four tremendously large ones. The last large flood was in 1946. The damage done in this one flood, according to official estimates of the Army Corps of Engineers is practically sufficient to pay the entire cost to the Government and to the citizens for complete protection. The water in 1946 was from 6 to 8 feet deep in the homes, public buildings, schools, and business places in the town. Frequently in the past we have had from 3 to 5 feet of water in our homes and business places, and the plan of the Corps of Engineers, which has been completely worked out, will give us complete protection from these devastating and almost annual floods. It presents a serious health problem each time we have a flood. There has been practically no building and no expansion in the last 20 years on account of the floods, and it is the center for the coal fields.

The citizens of Pineville, through their city council, passed an ordnance, called an election and voted to issue bonds for $490,000 to cover the full amount recommended by the Army Corps of Engineers for their share of the cost of the proposed flood protection.

(Mr. GOLDEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK].

ECONOMY IN GOVERNMENT

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very glad that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] made the constructive speech which he did a few moments ago.

I agree with the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] in his high estimate of the integrity and ability of the gentleman from Mississippi. I have been a member of the House Committee on Public Works for 3 years. As a member of that committee I have served under the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi. It is my opinion that he knows more about the rivers and harbors and flood-control problems and needs of this country than any man in the Congress or in the United States.

The average American now works 61 days a year to earn the money to pay his annual Federal, State, and local taxes. Think of it. The average American must work more than twelve 5-day weeks just to pay his tax bill. Yet, with from one-fourth to one-third of all the earnings of all Americans being confiscated by tax collectors the Government still is spending money faster than it collects it. We will have a deficit of $5,000,000,000 or $6,000,000,000 this year.

It is time that the Congress and the country stopped and pondered the question, "Where are we going?"

History is replete with examples of countries that pursued to their financial and economic destruction the same loose fiscal policies our leaders now follow. France is an example. The average French laborer in 1920 received an annual wage of 6,240 francs. At the 1920 exchange value of the franc his earnings of 6,240 French francs were the equivalent of an annual wage of $1,248 in American dollars.

Today, as the result of devaluation and inflation the French worker receives not 6,240 francs as he did in 1920 but his average annual wage is now 250,238 francs or 40 times what it was 30 years ago. If the franc was still valued at 20 cents the Frenchman, today, would have an annual wage equivalent to $50,048. But the French franc is not worth what it was. Its value is only a tiny fraction of what

it once was. The 250,238 francs the Frenchman gets this year will buy little more than did his 6,240 francs in 1920. That is what devaluation can do to a people.

Something very similar to this may happen to us, the American people, unless our Government spends more wisely and economically than it is now doing, unless it balances the budget and lives within its income.

TOO MUCH SPENDING

A brief 3 years ago, our Federal Government was spending about $34,000,000,000 a year. Now, 3 years later, it is spending $42,000,000,000 annually. This is an increase of $8,000,000,000 in the annual cost of Government within a period of 3 years.

Whereas the Republican Eightieth Congress balanced the budget and had a surplus of more than $8,000,000,000 in a single year, the Eighty-first Democratic Congress will have a deficit of five to six billion dollars this year.

The President says the present unbalanced state of the budget is due to the $5,000,000,000 tax reduction voted by the Eightieth Congress. Even if the Republicans had never given the people that $5,000,000,000 tax reduction, the present budget would still be unbalanced as compared to the $8,000,000,000 surplus shown in the last year of the Eightieth Republican Congress.

No; tax reduction by the Republicans did not cause the present unbalanced budget. That unbalanced budget is the direct result that this Congress is now spending $8,000,000,000 more than did the Eightieth Congress.

If the tax reduction voted by the Eightieth Congress was bad, why has not some responsible Democrat proposed to repeal that tax reduction. None has.

ROAD TO RUIN

A continuing unbalanced budget is the road to ruin, to socialism, and to every citizen becoming the servant of the state.

An unbalanced budget inevitably leads to the necessity for more taxes. The higher the citizen's taxes, the less he has to spend on himself and his own family. Eventually, taxes become so high there remains no incentive for investment or for thrift.

When taxes become too high the savers say, "Why save if the purchasing power of my savings constantly shrinks?" The investors say, "Why risk our capital when the Government makes us assume all losses and confiscates most of our profits, if we make any?" When the will to dare and do vanishes, a country ceases to go forward.

The spirit of venture built this country into the richest and most productive in the world. We must keep that spirit alive and not kill it by burdensome and oppressive tax rates.

Yet, there can be no substantial tax reductions while we continue to spend far beyond our tax income.

We can balance the budget only in two ways. We must balance it either by taxing more or spending less. I doubt if there is a single politician in the Congress bold enough to propose to balance the budget by imposing a five or six billion dollar tax increase on the people. Every politician knows that for him to make such a proposal would be political suicide.

We must, therefore, seek to balance the budget in the only other way open to us, and that is by spending less.

DUPLICATION AND WASTE

The Hoover report says whereas there were 300 bureaus and commissions in the Federal Government 20 years ago that there are 1,818 now.

Many of these bureaus do the same work that is being done by other agencies. The General Accounting Office of the Federal Government not so long ago reported that we then had no less than 29 Federal agencies engaged in loaning money, 3 in insuring bank deposits, 34 engaged in acquiring land, 16 in wildlife preservation, 10 in Government financing, 12 in home and community planning, 28 in welfare matters, 4 in bank examinations, 14 in handling our Federal forests, and 65 in gathering statistics.

Surely, no citizen can believe that such a multiplicity of agencies can exist without much overlapping and duplication of work, all of which results in the unnecessary and wasteful spending of taxpayers' money.

Because this duplication is so costly to taxpayers, the appropriations of all departments should be held to a minimum to the end that each department will be compelled to modernize and streamline its operations, eliminate its inefficiencies, and thereby do its job better and at less cost.

The costliness of this duplication of activities is indicated by the fact that in 20 years—Hoover Report—the number of employees on the Federal pay roll increased from 570,000 in 1930 to 2,100,000 by last fall. Also, the wages and salaries of these workers in the same 20 years had grown from about $1,000,000,000 annually to almost $7,000,000,000, a sevenfold increase in 20 years.

HOOVER COMMISSION REPORT

One long step toward returning to a balanced budget would be the immediate adoption of the recommendations on reorganization of the Government made in the Hoover Commission Report.

If the recommendations of the Hoover Commission are adopted, the cost of the Federal Government, now $42,000,000,000 a year, will be reduced by three to five billion dollars annually. Over a 50-year period this will mean a saving of one hundred and fifty to two hundred and fifty billion dollars. Such savings will benefit every taxpaying American family, by allowing them to keep more of their own money to spend on themselves.

The Hoover Report shows many startling examples of Government inefficiency. Here are a few of them. The Hoover Commission investigators found:

That it requires an average of 7 months, under Government red tape, to discharge an incompetent employee from the Federal pay roll. In one case, the Commission found, it took 17 months to discharge an incompetent stenographer;

That in the Veterans' Administration more than 15,000 workers are employed to handle veterans' insurance policies. A study of private insurance companies reveals that these private companies handle a similar number of policies with 3,500 workers;

That the researchers report that the Post Office Department by spending $10,000,000 to install improved equipment and methods in the Nation's post offices could cut Post Office Department expenses by $180,000,000, thereby effecting savings totaling $170,000,000;

That the Internal Revenue Department in 1947 had 500,000,000 income-tax forms printed for the use of the Nation's 49,000,000 income-tax payers, or 11 forms for each taxpayer. Hundreds of millions of these forms, after being printed, were sold for waste paper;

That the Federal Government owns three and one-half typewriters for every Federal worker who uses a typewriter, full or part time;

That the Federal Government buys $6,000,000,000 in supplies every year, yet its inefficiency is such that it seldom takes a discount on any of its bills, as do nearly all private businessmen, because Federal Government red tape is such that it cannot audit its bills within the normal 30- to 60-day discount period.

The Hoover recommendations, however, will not accomplish their greatest benefits unless there is a will on the part of the executive branch of the Government to make them work.

In a government, Gargantuan as our Government now is with 1,818 bureaus and commissions, with more than 2,000,000 employees, and with its operations spread out over the entire world, efficiency at best will never be easy and waste never absent. New examples of waste and inefficiency always will be present awaiting detection before they are corrected.

There, therefore, ought to be a permanent commission, organized along the lines of the Hoover Commission, always to be on the alert searching for inefficiency and waste and to call the attention of Congress and the President to such waste and inefficiency whenever and wherever found.

Such a permanent Little Hoover Commission staffed with expert researchers would pay its cost manyfold in the savings it constantly would make possible.

The Hoover Commission by one quick check of Government operations has unearthed weakness in our executive department, which if corrected, will save taxpayers three to five billion dollars a year. A permanent Little Hoover Commission unquestionably would reveal many additional ways to cut Government costs without diminishing present services of the Government to its citizens.

FIRST LINE OF DEFENSE

Our Nation's first line of defense is not our Navy, Army, or Air Corps. Our first line of defense is a solvent and sound economy here at home. Without a sound and solvent domestic economy we cannot attain that abundant production of weapons and goods without which no successful war can be waged.

The Communists recognize this. Lenin, the father of Russian communism once said, "Someday we will compel the United States of America to spend itself into destruction."

The best way to defeat that dire Lenin prediction is to restore sound fiscal policies to our Government now while there is still time.

If either through apathy or political expedience, we continue to pursue the wasteful and extravagant policies of the past two decades nothing but great and irreparable harm can come to our country. In proof of this truth I need to call but two witnesses, Thomas Jefferson and Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Jefferson said:

I place economy among the first and most important virtues, and public debt as the greatest of dangers to be feared—to preserve our independence we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt.

Roosevelt said—in 1932:

Any government like any family, can for a year spend a little more than it earns. But you and I know that a continuance of that habit means the poorhouse.

Yet, despite these warnings we, our Government, has in 19 years out of the last 21, spent more than our revenues and in 19 of those 21 years has gone further and further into debt. It is time to change our course.

(Mr. MACK of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

THE UNITED STATES COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, the Coast and Geodetic Survey is one of the oldest scientific and technical bureaus of the Federal Government. Its history goes back to the early days of the Republic when President Thomas Jefferson with great foresight obtained authority from the Congress in 1807 to establish an agency for surveying and charting the coast of the United States. This was done in order to promote water-borne commerce between the several States and with foreign countries. Through the years the wisdom of this undertaking has become increasingly evident from the benefits that have accrued to industry and to science, engineering, and other related fields.

The work of this important arm of the Government is not spectacular in a dramatic sense and ofttimes goes unnoticed, yet its activities are bound up, directly or indirectly, with our daily lives. The ships that bring us coffee from Brazil and sugar from Cuba use the nautical charts of the Coast and Geodetic Survey for their safe navigation; the air pilot who carries our mail uses its aeronautical charts to guide him safely to his destination; the surveyor who locates the boundaries of our farms and homesteads uses the markers which the Survey establishes throughout the length and breadth of our land; and the construction engineer who establishes building codes against earthquake hazards uses the information furnished by the Coast and Geodetic Survey to determine the stresses and strains that buildings must withstand.

Besides these peacetime values, the work of the Coast and Geodetic Survey has a definite tie-up with the national defense and its personnel have served with distinction in every national emergency from the Civil War on. When General MacArthur began his reconquest of the Philippine Islands on the 20th of October 1944, he had with him navigational charts of the area on which landings were to be made. These charts were made by the Coast and Geodetic Survey from surveys carried on during the 40 years of our stewardship of the islands. They showed the character of the beaches, the safe channels, and the locations of dangers to navigation, and gave information on the rise and fall of the tide—all of which enabled our ships and landing parties to maneuver with a minimum of hazard.

EARLY HISTORY

When the Coast Survey was first organized, the shore line of our country included only the strip along the Atlantic coast and comprised about 15,000 statute miles. The activities of the Survey grew with the Nation's territorial expansion. The acquisition of new territory along the Pacific coast—later to become the great States of California, Oregon, and Washington—added 8,000 miles to this shore line before the middle of the century. The purchase of Alaska in 1869 added 34,000 miles. The acquisition of the Territory of Hawaii and of other island possessions at the beginning of this century, together with the stewardship which we assumed over the Philippine Islands, further increased the shore line to be surveyed to a total of over 100,000 miles, or nearly four times the distance around the world. Today the jurisdiction of the Coast Survey extends to all the waters of continental United States, Alaska, Guam, the Hawaiian Islands, Puerto Rico, the Canal Zone, and the Virgin Islands.

Bordering this extensive coast line is a belt of over 1,000,000 square miles of coastal waters that require repeated surveys in the interest of water-borne commerce and navigation so that the exchange of the farm products and manufactured goods between the States and with foreign governments can be carried on with a minimum of navigational hazards.

The earlier surveys made at the beginning of the nineteenth century and up until the period of the Civil War were adequate for shallow-draft sailing vessels. With the advent of the ocean-going steam vessel and the construction of larger and deeper-draft ships more detailed surveys were required because the old surveys were completely inadequate. Since the beginning of this century, and following World War I in particular, when new navigational instruments were introduced, it was found that the surveys of only 20 years ago were insufficient to meet the needs of these modern devices. For this reason and because of natural changes along the inlets of the coasts and harbor entrances, resurveys must constantly be made.

HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEYS

Hydrographic surveys which determine the depths of water and the character of the sea bottom have been extended by the Bureau far offshore to furnish information for the mariner. These surveys have located and charted the fishing banks so extensively used by our fishing fleets of New England, the Gulf, and the California coast. Dangers to navigation which have been located offshore have included Georges Shoal, a 15-foot spot in the great fishing area 120 miles east of Cape Cod, and Bishop Rock, over 100 miles off the southern California coast.

The ocean bottom has been investigated so that the submarine features lying off our coasts have come to be known. They have been charted and have proven of much value to the navigator equipped to determine his position by echo sounding when out of sight of land. In its offshore surveys and oceanographic work, the Bureau has pioneered in the development of methods and equipment which have increased the efficiency of these operations at less unit cost than existed under the older methods. These developments have enabled the Bureau to provide greater coverage year by year of our coastal waters with the annual appropriations which have been made by the Congress to extend this valuable work.

MODERN SURVEY EQUIPMENT

The Coast and Geodetic Survey has contributed to the development of sonic-sounding devices specifically in their construction as accurate survey instruments. By means of these instruments the depth of water under the ship can be obtained as the ship proceeds at full speed along a predetermined course on the surface. They have enabled us to know about the character and form of the Continental Shelf and its offshore slope from 100 fathoms, or 600 feet, to 1,000 fathoms. Soundings can be obtained in a matter of a second or two in depths as deep as a mile. Recorders were connected with these sonic sounders so that a continuous profile of the bottom showing the ridges and depressions was noted on a visible graph.

To fix the positions of the submerged features of the ocean bottom, such as mountain peaks, pinnacle rocks, and deep canyons, the Coast and Geodetic Survey developed and perfected the device known as Radio Acoustic Ranging, or RAR. This device utilized sound and radio to determine the position of a ship from known shore stations. It gave greater accuracy than could be obtained by observations on celestial bodies. It also had the advantage of permitting continuous operation of the survey ship day and night through fog and conditions of low visibility. The sono-radio buoy was first constructed in connection with RAR for use as an offshore hydrophone station. The extension of soundings a hundred or more miles from land, as in the case of Georges Bank, required the accurate location of individual soundings obtained by the survey ship. The development of the sono buoy was begun by the Bureau in 1933 and reached its complete efficiency prior to World War II. It was adopted in antisubmarine warfare and its operation was held confidential by the Navy until the close of the war.

The Coast and Geodetic Survey was the first agency making hydrographic

surveys to adapt Shoran to these operations. Shoran, developed by the Signal Corps and used by the Air Force for pinpoint bombing of strategic targets in Europe, replaced radio acoustic ranging in hydrographic operations of the Survey because of its greater adaptability, particularly in the waters surrounding the Aleutian Islands. Its success, limited to distances of 50 to 75 miles—because this device is a line-of-sight method—cleared the way for the electronic position indicator. The latter has been completely developed within the Bureau, without the aid of research funds, by the ingenuity and industry of the Survey's personnel during periods between active ship operations. The device has been tested and used to locate with accuracy the positions of soundings 10 to 300 miles from coastal promontories and island stations.

SURVEYS IN ALASKA

The surveys in the northernmost outpost, Alaska, were begun soon after the purchase of that territory from Russia. The coastal area and its newest waterways were known only to a few explorers and trading vessels. Its vast interior was almost completely unknown. Such charts as existed were in atlas form. They had been compiled by Sarischef under the direction of the Russian explorers Bering, Barinof, and Tebenkoff.

The first surveys were exploratory only. In the 1880's discovery of gold in the vicinity of Juneau brought many vessels into southeast Alaska and resulted in general surveys of that section of the coast. These surveys were reconnaissance in nature because it was impossible to cover the great area to meet the immediate demands. With the beginning of the twentieth century the Coast and Geodetic Survey inaugurated a comprehensive program of surveys which has been continuous in a given area from season to season.

Surveys made of the uncharted waters of southeastern and southwestern Alaska have prevented many wrecks. Only a few years ago the waters of Alaska were dotted with the hulks of ships which were wrecked on unknown rocks. This was true prior to the completion of wire-drag surveys through the inland passage and main channels of the Alaska coast. On the present-day charts there are numerous rocks bearing the names of the ships wrecked upon those rocks. Because the inland passage of Alaska was found to be infested with dangerous submerged rocks a wire-drag sweep was made of the entire passage. Numerous pinnacle rocks were found with this device rising close to the water's surface. One of the most spectaculuar of these finds was the rock, sometimes referred to as the Washington Monument, found in one of the main ship channels of southeast Alaska with a depth of 17 feet over it and rising from surrounding depths of 650 feet.

Surveys in Alaska not only opened up the coastal area to commerce but reduced the marine insurance rates, which prior to inauguration of the surveys had been nearly prohibitive. It was only possible to pay such rates because of the great value, or at least the great incentive for great wealth, to be returned as a result of the finding of gold and the exploitation of fisheries.

In the Aleutian Islands, where survey operations are greatly hampered by the prevalence of fog, rough seas, and bad weather, the work of surveying this exposed region has been steadily progressing, and the former inadequate, exploratory charts are gradually being replaced with modern charts.

The Aleutians are a bleak and barren chain of islands extending 800 miles in a southwesterly direction from the Alaskan peninsula and form the boundary between the Pacific Ocean and the Bering Sea. The area is known as a breeding ground for storms. The high winds, persistent rain, and cold weather, coupled with a rocky shore line and strong ocean currents, have made surveying operations difficult and on several occasions have resulted in casualties among survey personnel. The hydrographic and topographic surveys of the Aleutians are being proscuted by the persistent efforts of the personnel of the survey ships assigned to that area.

In the past decade survey operations of the Coast and Geodetic Survey have moved northward into the Bering Sea; arcs of triangulation, which are fundamental for topographic mapping, have spanned the vast interior of Alaska, and in 1947 a perimeter survey of the Arctic and Bering Sea coasts was initiated. Surveying operations in the Arctic have been of a pioneering nature and many of the problems, dangers, and struggles for survival, so familiar to Arctic explorers, have confronted the field parties.

Except for a few isolated surveys, this area was untouched heretofore because of the difficulties of terrain and the hazards of weather. Very little is known of the depths of water, the character of the sea bottom, or the behavior of tides and currents in this region. Ice conditions and low temperatures introduce many new problems for the surveyor.

In its Arctic operations the Coast and Geodetic Survey has employed a large number of Eskimos. These people, inured to the cold and privations of the Arctic, have been trained to perform all minor survey operations. They are uncanny as guides and on numerous occasions have led detached units back to their base camps through raging snowstorms.

Operations in the Arctic have necessitated the development of entirely new techniques. Instruments not designed for this country have required special lubrication to make them operable and extreme care to prevent icing. Engines in vehicles and boats require preheating before starting. These added requirements together with working in heavy clothing for protection against extremely cold weather, traversing snow and ice, and the handicap caused by short periods of daylight, add up to make surveying operations in the Arctic regions slow and expensive.

GEODETIC CONTROL SURVEYS

As the name of the Coast and Geodetic Survey indicates, it is the Bureau of the Federal Government which makes the geodetic control surveys. The exact latitude, longitude, and elevation above sea level for thousands of points all over the country are marked by brass discs. Observations of astronomy, triangulation, gravity, and leveling in every county and State are computed and adjusted in order to establish one Federal framework for all surveys of the land. It is because of the accuracy of this control that maps covering the United States can be fully coordinated and inconsistencies and future litigation avoided in cadastral and boundary surveys. The network of marked discs is the starting point for all surveys made by other Federal mapping agencies and by State, county, and local surveyors. The Bureau is the only agency that is authorized by the Congress to perform this function.

The earth's curvature must be taken into account when covering large areas for land development projects such as reclamation, flood control, and river valley development. Geodetic surveys serve this purpose. They fix with exactness the locations and elevations of features of the land for planning purposes. They are required for economical and efficient planning studies and the construction phases of flood control, irrigation, drainage, water supply, hydroelectric plants, navigation, and other large-scale engineering works. Geodetic surveys are used in the planning and building of transmission lines, highways, railroads, canals, tunnels, and airports. Without geodetic control, gaps or overlaps can occur between local surveys and errors of considerable magnitude may result. They avoid confusion in land and farm boundaries by furnishing the local surveyor with common points for starting surveys and tying-in stations at the close of his work.

In performing the triangulation of the United States, the surveys were made generally along arcs running east and west and north and south. This provided a network in which the arcs were spaced about 50 miles apart although the marked points along each arc were only 10 to 12 miles apart. It was necessary to set up this network first, just as the steelwork for a large office building must be erected and riveted in place to provide a framework for the construction details to follow. The work of filling the areas between arcs is the present effort of the Bureau. Stations are now to be established at intervals of about 4 miles in agricultural areas and from 2 to 3 miles in metropolitan areas. This close spacing will permit local surveyors to connect their property and boundary line surveys to the Federal control net at convenient intervals.

Leveling lines spaced 100 miles apart were first run across the country from coast to coast and from the Gulf to the Lakes to form a level network of elevations above mean sea level. Later the spacing was reduced to about 50-mile intervals. The present program provides for lines of leveling along highway rights-of-way at an approximate spacing of 6 miles. Bench marks will be lo-

cated at 1-mile intervals along these lines. These bench marks are marked for identification and placed in concrete posts or in prominent building foundations in cities and towns.

Horizontal and vertical control surveys are desirable in urban areas in connection with plans for development of housing facilities, water and sewer lines, streets, location of recreational areas, and public utilities. City control surveys of this type have recently been completed in Cincinnati and Hamilton County, Ohio. Similar control surveys were made with the 11 county, city, and municipal organizations of the east San Francisco Bay region and are now underway in Mahoning County, Ohio. Under these cooperative arrangements the Coast and Geodetic Survey furnishes the technical supervision, the instrumental equipment and portable steel triangulation towers. The expenses of operation and the local survey personnel are provided by the local authorities. These cooperative projects have proved economical and satisfactory to both local and Federal officials. They expand the Federal network with the least cost and give local communities basic information for accurate maps of properties and facilities. Arrangements of this nature are invited to the attention of all county and city officials.

NAUTICAL CHARTS

One of the principal products of the Coast Survey—and the one for which it was originally established—is the nautical chart, which guides the mariner over what is often referred to as the trackless sea. It shows him the hidden dangers and the safe lanes and opens our ports to the armadas of commerce. These navigational charts of the Coast and Geodetic Survey are known for their reliability and accuracy when used by the mariner.

Nautical charts are published on various scales to meet the different needs of navigation—a vessel sailing between two distant ports requires a different type of chart from that which is needed for approaching a coast or entering a harbor.

Improvements in the design of the nautical chart are constantly being made to make them more useful to the navigator. When echo-sounding machines began to be installed on merchant ships and the navigator was able to know the depth under his vessel without slowing down or stopping, the Coast and Geodetic Survey designed a new type of chart for use with such equipment.

AERONAUTICAL CHARTS

Another function of the Coast and Geodetic Survey which is of prime importance to the country in the expansion of aviation is the compilation and production of charts for air navigation. Beginning with the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1926, this Bureau has prepared the charts needed for safe navigation by the air pilot. The types of charts issued are perhaps the finest maps for an over-all coverage of the country, although they are specially prepared for simplicity of detail so that the air pilot may recognize the features of the terrain beneath him as he flies.

Various series of aeronautical charts are designed to show with greatest simplicity the locations of the numerous navigational aids and radio facilities, costing millions of dollars, that we are installing throughout the country in the interest of safety in navigation. The work of the Bureau in promoting air safety is well recognized.

WAR ACTIVITIES

During World War II, the personnel and facilities of the Bureau were utilized in specialized ways toward advancing the war effort.

Of the commissioned officers in the Bureau, 55 percent were transferred to the armed forces—28 percent to the Army and 27 percent to the Navy, including the Marine Corps. Officers transferred to the Army served principally in the Air Forces, the Field Artillery, and the Corps of Engineers. The majority of those in the Navy served on Coast and Geodetic Survey ships which were transferred and on other naval survey ships.

These officers were selected for duty for which their technical training and experience fitted them. They were assigned to training amphibian troops in seamanship and navigation, to artillery schools for development of control survey methods suitable for use in directing mobile artillery fire, to duty as battalion observation officers, and to conducting hydrographic surveys in advance of fleet operations in the Aleutians and in the western Pacific. Some served on engineering construction work with the Civil Engineer Corps, and others were assigned to the Air Forces to participate in a program of world-wide aerial mapping and in the development and application of electronic methods for distance determinations.

It is gratifying to know that these officers acquitted themselves with distinction in their various assignments, receiving special decorations, citations, and letters of commendation.

Six of the major survey ships of the Bureau were transferred to the Navy Department for survey duty with the fleet in offlying areas. These ships were sent into areas in advance of the main portions of the fleet to sound out anchorages and to develop safe channels.

An example of the service rendered by the officers and crews of these survey ships is that of the *Hydrographer*. This ship was transferred to the Navy Department on April 15, 1942. After conversion of the vessel for naval duty and several intermediate assignments, the ship was assigned to the assault force which was preparing the recapture of Attu Island, in the Aleutians. Upon arrival at Massacre Bay, the *Hydrographer* sounded the bay, and the transports moved into anchorage close to the beach. An 18-foot rock was found within the swinging radius of the squadron flagship. A channel into Massacre Bay was surveyed and buoyed, and ships were piloted in by the commanding officer of the *Hydrographer*. After the Attu operation, the *Hydrographer* proceeded to Adak and joined the task force for the Kiska operation, where it made surveys during and after the landing expedition.

The charting facilities of the Bureau were greatly expanded to meet the needs of the armed forces. More than 90 percent of this expanded production was supplied directly to the Army, Navy, and merchant marine. The personnel of the Chart Division was increased over 700 percent, the hours of work lengthened, and the major portion of the equipment and presses placed on a two- or three-shift basis. New methods for rapid reproduction were devised and instituted. Machines were designed, built, and installed to implement the decreasing supply of manpower.

In addition, the Bureau rendered advice to other agencies in cartographic problems. The availability of the original topographic and hydrographic surveys and the experience of the personnel who executed the surveys were of great value for knowledge of the coastal regions, such as the laying of mine fields, training of amphibious troops for invasion landings, and in research related to detecting and combating enemy submarines.

The demand for the regular nautical charts of the Bureau increased from an annual issue of 400,000 in 1940 to over 4,000,000 in 1945. The greatest consumers of these charts were of course the Navy and the merchant marine, these two services alone taking 75 percent of the total issue. The demand for the regular aeronautical charts of the Bureau increased from 464,000 in 1940 to 12,700,000 in 1945.

In addition to the responsibility for the production and distribution of charts of the United States and its possessions, many other special charting and mapping projects involving large portions of the world were undertaken for the military services and other war agencies. Some of these projects were as follows: World aeronautical charts and sectional aeronautical charts for the Army Air Forces; flight charts for air routes; target charts; instrument-approach and landing charts; planning charts; weather-plotting charts; and numerous other types of special charts.

Field work of the Bureau continued but was totally channeled to the requirements of the military services. Large war mapping parties were engaged in photogrammetric mapping of coastal areas. Survey vessels of the Bureau were engaged in charting important harbors and sea lanes to safeguard the movement of troops and supplies to far-flung battle fronts. Early in the war a request was made for the preparation of large-scale charts of Casco Bay, Maine, and adjacent waters, which were to be used as a base for part of the Atlantic fleet and as a rendezvous for vessels engaged in convoy duty. This required extensive new surveys including wire-drag examinations of the area, and resulted in the discovery of a startling number of rocks and reefs dangerous to navigation. The strategic importance of Alaska had been recognized by the Coast and Geodetic Survey long before World War II. A major contribution to the war effort

was the expansion of geodetic and coastal surveys in that Territory. The need is now recognized for further expansion of these surveys in the interest of the national defense.

INTERNATIONAL TECHNICAL COOPERATION

In 1941 the Coast and Geodetic Survey began participation in the international cooperation programs sponsored by the Department of State.

Since the inception of the program in 1941 the Bureau has completed 43 technical missions to Latin-American countries, and a total of 182 foreign nationals received technical training. This total includes 49 trainees from the Philippine Islands and 17 from the Eastern Hemisphere.

The technical cooperation programs executed by the Coast and Geodetic Survey have resulted in specific benefits to the individual trainee, such as position advancement and expansion of greater responsibilities upon return to his country; the adoption, on the part of the participating agency, of the methods and techniques employed by the Bureau; the facilitating of purchases of United States scientific equipment; and the direct contacts between foreign technicians and those of the United States which have furthered good-will relations.

PHILIPPINE REHABILITATION PROGRAM

From 1901 to December 1941 the Coast and Geodetic Survey conducted coastal surveys in Philippine waters and produced the complete series of nautical charts of this archipelago. These had benefited the merchant marine and the Navy and advanced the economy of the country through the protection and aid which this great work afforded for the exchange of products of the islands with the world, particularly with our own country. Under the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 the Coast and Geodetic Survey was assigned the task of continuing surveying and allied operations in the Philippines.

This work is of vital importance to the Philippine Republic because the waterways of the Philippines are the principal arteries of commerce. The availability of modern nautical charts, coast pilots, and tide tables is of prime importance for the development of this commerce. The continued flow of accurate hydrographic, tidal, and magnetic information from these waters is of prime importance to this country from the standpoint of our interest in the development of Philippine industry, through expansion of trade and exchange of its products, as well as for the needs of United States shipping and military requirements for maintaining peace in the Far East.

ATTAINMENTS AND LEADERSHIP

The Coast and Geodetic Survey has earned an unqualified reputation for accuracy and thoroughness by maintaining a high standard of work.

It has maintained a high service morale in spite of difficult tasks.

It has progressively accomplished a larger output of work at lower unit costs in spite of the over-all increase in labor and material costs.

It has maintained world leadership in standards for surveying and design of its instruments and in the development of EPI and radio current equipment.

It has contributed to the collection of scientific data and has accumulated precise data relative to geophysical phenomena.

The work of the Coast and Geodetic Survey is a pioneering effort. Its vessels roam in uncharted seas, its field engineers traverse unexplored territory, frequently suffering the hardships of isolation and exposure.

The reputation of the Bureau, with respect to the functions with which it is charged by the Congress, is internationally acknowledged. Its standards of accuracy and its thorough methods are recognized the world over and its manuals have been translated into foreign languages. Some of its officers hold high positions on international societies and commissions.

FORMER HEAD OF THE BUREAU

Prior to the appointment of the present Director, Rear Adm. Leo Otis Colbert, in 1938, this Bureau had only 12 directors in 131 years of existence. They were Ferdinand Hassler, the author of the plan for the first survey of the coast. Upon Hassler's death in 1843, he was followed by Alexander Dallas Bache, who was succeeded by Benjamin Pierce. He was followed by Carlile P. Patterson, Julius E. Hilgard, Frank M. Thorn, T. C. Mendenhall, William W. Duffield, and Henry S. Prichett. In 1900, Dr. Otto H. Tittman was appointed head of the Survey. He was followed by E. Lester Jones and Rear Adm. Raymond S. Patton.

I come now to the present director, Admiral Colbert, one of the most able and efficient executives in charge of the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey. Under his leadership, the plan and organization of the Bureau has been further developed. We now have a comprehensive program for surveying all coastal waters under the jurisdiction of the United States; of delineating the topographic features of our coastal land areas; and of providing geodetic surveys on an area basis for control of mapping and large-scale engineering projects. Development of new devices and techniques, acquisition of modern survey ships, and a corps of technically trained personnel provide the means for carrying out this program. The activities of this scientific and technical Bureau should be continued for the orderly production of surveys and charts for the safety of navigation at sea and in the air, for the commercial and industrial development of our country, and for aid in the national defense.

At the time your committee was holding hearings in connection with appropriations for this agency for the year 1951, we were informed that Admiral Colbert would soon retire. The entire membership of your committee was unanimous in expressing regret that the country is about to lose the services of this valuable public servant. Because of his outstanding service, I include with these statements a biographical sketch.

REAR ADM. LEO OTIS COLBERT

Rear Adm. Leo Otis Colbert, United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, has had a wide and varied service in the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Born at Cambridge, Mass., in December 1883, he received his early education in the public schools of Boston. He received a degree in civil engineering at Tufts College in 1907, and was awarded the honorary degree of doctor of science by Tufts in 1939.

Entering the service of the Coast and Geodetic Survey on July 1, 1907, his field assignments have included those of navigator, executive officer, and commanding officer of the various Survey ships operating in the coastal waters of the United States, Alaska, and the Philippines.

He was first engaged on wire-drag work—special apparatus utilized to locate submerged pinnacle rocks—on the Atlantic coast, and he later extended the use of this equipment to sweep the inland passage of the Alaskan coastal waters for submerged rocks.

During World War I he was transferred to duty under the Navy Department and served as lieutenant commander on the troop transport U. S. S. *Northern Pacific*, making nine voyages transporting troops through the submarine zone between New York and Brest, France.

He received a certificate as master of steam vessels, unlimited tonnage, any ocean, issued by the United States Steamboat Inspection Service, in April 1920. He was assigned duty in connection with the maintenance and repairs to the ships of the Coast Survey fleet upon his return from war duty.

He was Director of Coast Surveys of the Philippine Islands at Manila from 1923 to 1930. During an earlier assignment to the Philippines between 1911 and 1914, he had been engaged in surveys of Mindanao, Mindoro, Negros, and Palawan Islands and had received his first command in 1912.

In the early thirties, he was engaged in a comprehensive hydrographic survey of Georges Bank, off the coast of Massachusetts, in command of the survey ship *Oceanographer*, formerly the *Corsair*. This survey brought to light for the first time the highly dissected submarine topography of the northeast Atlantic Continental Shelf and required the most advanced methods of offshore surveys for the proper delineation and location of these details.

During his administration as Chief of the Division of Charts in the Department in Washington from 1933 to 1938, there was completed a series of 87 aviation charts and the inauguration of other specialized charts for long-distance flying. The great distribution of these charts is tangible evidence of their popularity for safety in flying. They represent the most accurate navigation charts of the United States and serve many purposes other than those for use of pilots of airplanes. He was also able to produce an increasing number of new basic marine charts and thus made available to the navigator, with the least possible delay, the results of the hydrographic surveys of the Bureau and of the improvements of coastal navigation works by other Federal agencies, principally the Corps of Engineers.

Admiral Colbert has devoted his entire professional career to the Coast and Geodetic Survey. He has served 12 years as Director, and under his management the Bureau has passed through a most important period of its entire existence. He directed with energy and imagination the activities of the Bureau during its greatly expanded war program, as well as the important planning period which took place during the years immediately preceding hostilities when preparations were being made for national defense. The numerous projects initiated under his direction, both field and office, at the specific request of the armed forces and other war agencies involved activities in all branches of the Survey's work.

Admiral Colbert has served as a member of the Mississippi River Commission since 1933. He is a member of the advisory council of the Department of Civil Engineering, Princeton University, of the American Society of Civil Engineers, and of the Society of Naval Architects and Marine Engineers. He is a director of the Society of American Military Engineers, a trustee of Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, and a life trustee of the National Geographic Society.

(Mr. STEFAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT].

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, the Government is presently doing a great disservice to a large segment of the American people. More correctly, I suppose, the blame should be placed on the responsible majority party in this Congress and on the administration. I, of course, refer to the continuing failure of the Ways and Means Committee, the Congress, and the Chief Executive to settle the excise-tax controversy.

The present peacetime imposition of the wartime excises is a bad thing. It has caused a severe drop in business and employment in the enterprises directly affected with corollary losses throughout our economy. It is high time that the Government redeems its promises to end these wartime excise excesses.

However, it is not my purpose here to discuss the merits and demerits of excise-tax reduction. My purpose is to urge a prompt decision. The failure to decide the issue once it was officially opened has probably hurt more than the taxes themselves.

You will recall that the President last December 1949, during the Christmas-shopping season informed the people that excise taxes should be reduced. That hurt. Soon after in his message on the state of the Union he proposed the reduction of certain excises under certain conditions. That hurt. Since then the Ways and Means Committee has had under consideration a tax-revision bill, the main portion of which deals with the possible reduction of excise taxes. From the time committee consideration started right down till now the Nation has been flooded with rumors that the excise tax on this, or that, would be cut 10, 25, or 50 percent, or eliminated entirely. This has really hurt.

We need here only reemphasize what causes the business and employment pains. The simple fact is that many people with dollars to spend have not been buying and are not buying now because they have decided to wait for cheaper prices—prices reduced by at least as much as the expected tax reduction.

It is, of course, obvious that the excise taxes price some percentage of the people out of the market for taxed goods and services. When to this number is added the number who fail to buy or utilize while waiting lower prices the total number, indefinite as it may be, is certainly considerable. Hence, it follows that when to the sales reducing effects of excise taxes you add the worse effects of delayed buying it becomes evident that you are giving business and employment a rough one-two. That just is not right or fair.

And something can be done about it. The Ways and Means Committee should bring an excise tax-reduction bill to the floor just as soon as the appropriation bill is on its way.

The Senate should then make this tax bill the first order of business; pass it and fly it to Key West, or wherever necessary for the President's signature. Then business, labor, and the public would know with a minimum of further paralyzing delay exactly which taxes are cut and which ones are uncut. That would promptly end the rumors, hesitation, and resulting losses.

It was a sad mistake to have, in the first place, talked about excise-tax reduction as a probability until the machinery and schedule was set up to handle the issue in the shortest possible time. But that damage has been done. The thing to do now is to end the continuing damage at once.

If it is true that the votes cannot be mustered to cut the excise taxes for goodness sakes let us let the people know that fact. Let us let them know that they will have to wait a year or more for the commodities they want, if they want tax-reduced prices. Such action will stimulate much buying.

Surely we owe that much to the enterprises we have been increasingly kicking around since the close of the war. And if that in turn will, as it will, produce more revenue from excises surely we should do it for the Government's good. We find ourselves here about to pass the biggest peacetime budget in history; we have no hopes of getting enough tax money to pay for it, and at the same time by the failure to act with dispatch on the excise-tax issue we are reducing the total amount of our revenue, providing the decision is to hold the taxes at their present level.

This question of a prompt decision on excise-tax relief should not be a partisan consideration. Many on both sides of the aisle would welcome the opportunity to vote a measure up or down. But, unfortunately it is in danger of becoming a partisan issue. The Republican minority on the Ways and Means Committee did offer a formal motion to consider the excise-tax question first. They were defeated, according to my information, by a straight party vote. They still desire, for the reason I have emphasized, to at least provide the relief that a decision would provide.

Now the question arises should excise taxes be cut unless there is a corresponding increase in other revenues. That is a fair question. It is one that we could answer right now in the consideration of the pending appropriation bill. There are two ways we could make up for any loss on revenues occasioned by excise-tax reductions; we could squeeze the amount out of the still too fat budget, or we can adjust other taxes to make up the difference. Whether or not we can even consider the first of these two alternatives depends on our votes on the appropriation bill in the weeks just ahead and our willingness, in the event we do lower the budget, to make our position stick despite any possible revision by the upper body.

However, I do not wish to further deviate from my theme. I think that the Government should redeem its promise to the people to eliminate the wartime excises. I think that the resulting stimulus to business, plus plugging tax loopholes, plus some real economies, would make the cut in excise taxes feasible. But I emphasize that the decision, whatever it may be, should be made in record short time.

I repeat that the committee, the Congress, and the powers that be have delayed too long already. While we twiddle and twaddle many of our people are being damaged—seriously hurt. I fully expect that such aid as we do give them will be too little, but there is not the slightest justification for it being too late.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I concur with the gentleman when he says that these excise taxes should be reduced and, in many instances, entirely abolished. But, I do not follow his argument wherein he places the blame for their not being reduced up to now upon the administration, or the majority party now in control of Congress, because the gentleman will easily recall that during the Eightieth Congress the present minority was then in the majority and in control of the Committee on Ways and Means, and that during that Congress there were a number of bills pending before the Committee on Ways and Means to cut excise taxes which the present minority failed to report favorably to the floor of the House.

Mr. CORBETT. Knowing the gentleman's political philosophy, I am certain that he regards these excise taxes as something which is very unwholesome to the people of the country.

Mr. ROONEY. I most certainly do.

Mr. CORBETT. When we go to fix responsibility for this matter, I can recall to the gentleman that the Seventy-ninth Congress, which was dominated by the gentleman's party, made great haste to cut the corporation taxes and left the

excise taxes on. I can also concur that the Eightieth Congress did not cut the excise taxes.

Mr. ROONEY. What did the Eightieth Congress do with reference to corporate taxes and the taxes of people in the higher brackets?

Mr. CORBETT. To the best of my knowledge, the corporate income-tax reduction was the work of the Seventy-ninth Congress. I cannot give the figures on that. Let us get back to the point I wanted to make in this speech. We could argue the responsibility for quite a while, and I think I would win.

Mr. ROONEY. I am sure the gentleman from Pennsylvania and I would still be the good friends we are, even though we disagreed politically.

Mr. CORBETT. The point I want to make very definitely is that from the moment the President issued his statement in favor of excise-tax reduction and from the time he reemphasized it in his message on the state of the Union, and then when the committee began consideration of the bill, the hope that was raised in the minds of people who were about to purchase that taxes and prices would go down have delayed their purchases and hence has been as detrimental to business and employment as the tax itself.

Mr. ROONEY. As to that point, I agree wholeheartedly with the gentleman, but I am confident that before we recess the Eighty-first Congress something substantial will be done about cutting excise taxes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF].

(Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Chairman, a few weeks ago a good many Democrats gathered in an armory not far from here to feast on a dinner of filet mignon and burgundy. They paid $100 each for the privilege. The theory was that they were paying tribute to the founder of their party—Thomas Jefferson. I suspect the person who was most pleased by the half million untaxed dollars that flowed into the Democratic treasury was William Boyle, the Democratic National chairman.

The name of Thomas Jefferson, the patron saint of their party and one of America's greatest men, has been invoked on countless occasions and for countless purposes by our friends on the other side of this House. So I suppose it was not really a novelty for this dinner to be staged in his name. Could he have been present, he would have been thunderstruck. The armory was jam-packed with the disciples of Government waste and extravagance—the disciples of "easy come, easy go." The diners were the leaders in the activities which are rapidly taking the country into bankruptcy and into socialism. They were so pleased with their efforts that they made the dinner a thoroughly congenial and hilarious affair.

As I have said, I do not believe that Thomas Jefferson would have felt comfortable at such a gathering. I do not believe he would have taken pleasure in rubbing elbows with the people whose only interest in the future of the country apparently is in keeping themselves on the Federal pay roll.

Let us not forget that it was Jefferson who warned, "We are ruined if we do not overrule the principle that the more we owe, the more prosperous we shall be." In those few words, Jefferson must have visualized philosophy of the administrations that have ruled this country since 1933. In those few words, Jefferson wrote the most deadly indictment of the Truman administration that I have ever seen.

Jefferson was indeed a wise and far-seeing man. He was able to look clearly into the future for a century and a half. He knew the time would come when the reins of Government might fall into the hands of the reckless and the irresponsible—the people who seemingly care only for the present and nothing for the future.

That dinner audience could have profited by recalling the words of another famous Democrat—Grover Cleveland, also a great man and a great President. Cleveland was the man who said:

> The lessons of paternalism ought to be unlearned, and the better lesson learned that, while people should patriotically and cheerfully support their Government, its functions do not include support of the people.

That is another indictment of the administrations that have been saddled upon the American people since 1933. That is another indictment of those who have been trying to peddle phony paternalism to the American people with the bait that the Government is all-wise and all-wealthy, and should be the "sugar daddy" of every last citizen. They are those who, in the words of Harry Hopkins, believe that the average American is "too dumb to understand" and to take care of himself under any circumstances or conditions, and that the only safe place for the average American is in the arms of an all-powerful Federal Government. They are those who consider themselves the elite and the only persons in this land competent to govern. They are the people who pay lip service to democracy while their efforts are such as to wreck democracy and bring about a Socialist dictatorship.

Many thousands of words were kicked around at the famous Democrats' Jefferson Day dinner, but I am sure that no one of them quoted the wisdom from Cleveland or from Jefferson. That was quite a notable omission. I think the thousands of affluent $100-a-plate diners, and the thousands of people in much less affluent circumstances who listened or watched on radio or television, would have had a much more enlightening evening if some attention had been paid to the warnings of the two great Democrat Presidents.

Now, let us move on from Cleveland's time and up to 1932. That was the year when a candidate for high public office said, "Any government—like any family—can for a year spend a little more than it earns. But you and I know that a continuance of that habit means the poorhouse."

On another occasion that candidate for President also said, "Taxes are paid in the sweat of every man who labors." These and many others of like character were uttered by the same candidate during the campaign, and after the campaign were promptly relegated to the limbo of forgotten things, by the man of all men who should have taken them to his breast and held them there so long as he occupied the highest position in the gift of the American people.

Upon his inauguration, President Franklin D. Roosevelt lost little time in disclosing he was a firm believer of the policy of easy come, easy go. By 1934 he had pushed the deficit up by more than 50 percent, and by 1935 he had more than doubled the annual deficit.

From that point on, there was no turning back for Mr. Roosevelt. He had tasted the elixir of waste and extravagance, and he liked it. By 1939 the national debt was $46,000,000,000, nearly two and one-half times the size of the debt at the time he became President.

Now, let us move ahead to 1943. That was the year when a Democratic Member of the United States Senate arose to level this warning. And I quote:

> It seems that, when public funds are to be expended, no one has any interest in what happens to them, no matter what his responsibilities may be under his oath of office. I dislike to make such a statement, but unless this body and the House of Representatives exercise their prerogative in connection with the purse strings of the Government, much of the money appropriated will be thrown away for no good purpose whatever.

These were brave words, and they were true words. I only wish they had been remembered and meticulously followed, especially since 1945. The man who expressed this warning was Harry S. Truman, then a Senator from Missouri and chairman of the Special War Investigating Committee. At that time Mr. Truman was apparently quite aware of the responsibility of the Congress to exercise a checkrein on the executive departments. At that time Mr. Truman apparently realized that the future of the country depended upon the careful management of our financial resources. At that time Mr. Truman apparently knew that the Congress is the American people's first line of defense against waste and extravagance, and every other form of wild spending.

But once President Truman went to the White House, his ideas seemed to have changed. I am forming this judgment on the basis of his actions as President. Along with millions of other Americans, I had thought that once the war was over, the Government would quickly settle down to a period of less spending, lower taxes, and gradual retirement of the national debt.

But we were wrong. Mr. Truman has shown himself to be a worthy disciple of the easy-come easy-go boys. He is not merely going along with them on their free-handed spending, he is actually running ahead of them and showing

them the way. He bids fair to establish himself as the new champion in the race to spend the country into disaster.

In 1947 and 1948 the country had a pleasant breathing spell from Mr. Truman's spending. The Republican Congress trimmed $9,800,000,000 in spending from the President's budget. It reduced taxes by $4,800,000,000, and it reduced the national debt by $7,000,000,000. Beginning in 1949, when the Democrat Eighty-first Congress took over, President Truman promptly plunged the country back into red ink. We are there now, and we will continue to flounder about there until the Congress or the President pushes the country up on dry land. Mr. Truman has shown he has not the slightest intention in the world of cutting expenses or of balancing the budget, and, therefore, it is the duty of this Congress to act.

In February the President told a reporter that in no sense does he tolerate deficit spending. He also said he hates deficit spending, and it is only a temporary condition brought on by necessities which could not be removed by any genius of statecraft known or available to him.

That talk about deficit spending being only temporary is now so old it is beginning to sprout whiskers. We have heard it since 1933 and every time we hear it, it is expressed as though it were meant to be taken seriously.

I have made a study of Mr. Truman's messages to the Congress and I find that balancing the budget is one of his favorite subjects. Nineteen times he has expressed to the Congress his intention or promise to balance the budget. On 10 additional occasions President Truman has expressed to the Congress his intention or promise to reduce the national debt.

Let me cite a few examples. In his budget message for the fiscal year 1947, President Truman said:

> It is good to move toward a balanced budget.

In his budget message for the fiscal year 1950, the President said:

> I do not consider it prudent * * * for Government finances to be in unbalanced or even in precarious balance.

In the same message he also said:

> A prosperous country cannot afford an unbalanced budget.

In this year's state of the Union message, President Truman said:

> The fiscal policy I am recommending is the quickest and safest way of achieving a balanced budget.

In this year's budget message, Mr. Truman said:

> The financial program which I am recommending * * * is directed at achieving budgetary balance.

In his budget message for the fiscal year 1947, President Truman said:

> It is good to * * * start on the retirement of the debt at a time when the demand for goods is strong.

In his budget message for 1950, President Truman said:

> In prosperous times like the present we should take the necessary steps to reduce the public debt.

President Truman talks a good game of budget balance, but his actions are quite different. His record shows that he does not merely tolerate going into debt, but he is all for it. The best evidence to this effect is in the proposals which President Truman presented to the Congress this past January. He is not at all content with the present rate of Government spending. President Truman presented a program for socializing agriculture, housing, medicine, and many other aspects of American life. If this program were enacted, the Federal Government's spending would double. The country would either double its taxes, or run into debt that much faster. Either way, the result is the same—some form of suicide for the Government. Faced, as we are, with a future most uncertain; not knowing what day a great cataclysm may involve us in we know not what, it is high time that we cease our experimenting in those things which, down the centuries, have been tried time and again, and always ending in failure, to the devastation of the desperately poor of those nations and of the complete wrecking of the civilizations of those days. We want none of this for our people.

President Truman knows that the chief impetus for balancing the budget should come from the White House. Without the President's encouragement, leadership, and consent, it is extremely difficult to trim out the fat of Federal spending. It was done by the Eightieth Congress in 1947 and 1948, and I wish it could be done again. But President Truman is resisting every effort toward making a substantial cut in Government spending. The White House story used to be that we should wait for prosperity before attempting to balance the budget. Now the White House does not say what we should wait for. It probably does not know.

In his January budget message, President Truman had only vague words about when even he thought the budget should be balanced. He said:

> I am confident that the fiscal recommendations provide a solid basis for moving toward budgetary balance in the next few years.

What does "in the next few years" mean? Does it mean another 20 years? The last time the Government was in the black, except for 1947 and 1948, when we Republicans were in control of both Houses of the Congress, was 1930. Does President Truman mean that we should wait for 1970?

Perhaps the answer is that President Truman just does not know the answer himself. He apparently feels that somehow the country will muddle through. He evidently feels that, no matter how deep a hole into which he may drive the country, it will pull itself out by some great stroke of luck. This kind of thinking is irresponsible and there is no place for it, either in the White House or in the Congress. We, the Congress, have been entrusted with managing the fiscal affairs of this Government, and we must live up to our responsibilities The time is now. We cannot procrastinate further.

I wish to recommend some reading for the President. If he has any dull moments under the palm trees in Key West, I commend to his attention the thoughts of some eminent fellow Democrats on Government finance. I suggest that President Truman read the words of Thomas Jefferson I have quoted, the words of President Cleveland, and the words of President Roosevelt. I also wish that President Truman would read the words of President Truman, which I have also quoted. If he does read them and believe them, and take them to heart, surely he will act.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUFF. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I wish to compliment the gentleman from Michigan for a very able and well-thought-out statement. The gentleman has long been a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, an authority on taxation and on the fiscal affairs of the Government. I wish to ask him this question: If the Federal Government in this year and day when the American people have as large an income as they have ever had in the history of this Nation cannot live within its income, balance its budget, and perhaps save something to pay on the great national debt which resulted from two world wars, when can we balance the budget and live within our income?

Mr. WOODRUFF. I may say to the gentleman from Ohio that it appears from our experience of 17 years with the last two Democratic administrations our only hope is a permanent change of parties. In the two short years we Republicans were in power we not only balanced the budget but we reduced taxes and paid $7,000,000,000 on the national debt.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL].

(Mr. NORRELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, the central subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee was appointed by our chairman the gentleman from Missouri, the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON, about March 1, this year. The main task of our central subcommittee was to assemble the proposed supply bills and the reports thereon into one single bill and report and then present the same to the House for consideration. That bill is now being considered by you.

Of course, no authorizations can be included, that is subsequently made by the Congress. This bill does not include other expenditures, such as interest payments on the public debt.

Heretofore very little connection was made of the individual appropriation bill with the other expenditures of the Government, and with the total income of the Government, and whether there would be a balance or deficit at the end of the fiscal year. Congress, in other words, was not presented figures on total receipts and expenditures, and had only limited opportunity to know about the Treasury balances and deficits.

This year the data is before you in this one bill and the report thereon. You

know what is desired to be expended by the several Government agencies, you know what the estimated income of the Government is for the next fiscal year, and you know about what the deficit will be if these appropriations are made. In other words, you have the budget of the United States for the ensuing fiscal year before you.

This is not the first time in the history of our Government that we have had one supply bill covering the entire budget of the United States. In view of this change in appropriations procedure this year, I have made, with the assistance of several of the most able experts available, some degree of research regarding the history of appropriations by the Congress of the United States which might be of interest to the House and to the country and, therefore, with your indulgence, I am going to review as briefly as possible the history of appropriations procedure of our Government.

During the first years of the Republic appropriations for the support of the Government were passed, for the most part, in a single appropriation act. Writing in 1879, James A. Garfield states that in "the main, during the first 40 years of our history, the appropriations were made in one act, entitled 'An act making appropriations for the support of the Government.'"

From the beginning, to be sure, Congress passed each year a number of special appropriation acts making appropriations for miscellaneous purposes, in addition to the main appropriation act for the support of the Government. Down to the end of 1792, for example, according to Alexander Hamilton, Congress passed 2 appropriations acts in 1789, 12 appropriation acts in 1790, 5 appropriation acts in 1791, and 7 appropriation acts in 1792.

The first step toward division of the appropriation acts occurred in 1794, when Congress passed two general acts, one for the support of Government and one for the support of the Military Establishment. One reason for segregating the War Department bill apparently was to expedite the passage of the civil list bill so that Congressmen could receive their salaries. Madison said that Members had been reduced to the most serious difficulties by the delays in the payment of their salaries, and Nicholas added that it was not fair to suppose that every gentleman in the House came to town with enough money in his pocket to meet his expenses. Another reason was to secure ample time to consider military expenditures, free from any pressure to vote the civil list.

The second step toward division occurred in 1799 when Congress passed a separate appropriation act making appropriations for the Navy Department which had been created in 1798. The annals of Congress do not reveal the reasons why a separate appropriation act was passed for the Department of the Navy in 1799, but presumably the explanation is to be found in the establishment of a separate Navy Department the previous year.

Almost a quarter of a century passed thereafter before Congress resumed the process of dividing the general appropriations into separate acts. During the 1820's separate appropriation acts were passed for the first time for fortifications, 1823; pensions, 1826; and rivers and harbors, 1826. Two more appropriation acts originated during the 1830's: One for the Military Academy, 1834; and the Indian Act, 1837. The Post Office Appropriation Act originated in 1844 and the Sundry Civil and the Legislative, Executive, and Judicial Appropriation Acts made their appearances in 1856. In 1880 the Agriculture and District of Columbia Appropriation Acts were adopted. The multiplication of the appropriation acts during the first half of the nineteenth century was a concomitant of the growth of the country, the expansion of the Federal Government, and the increasing and varied financial needs of the Government. Just as Congress was dividing the labor of its legislative business during this period among the newly created standing committees in both Houses, so was the labor of providing for the financial needs of the Government subdivided into several appropriation bills. The following table shows the date of origin of the separate appropriation acts:

Appropriation bills

Present title of act	Date of origin of act	Date of origin of present title
Army	1794	1832
Navy	1799	1799
Fortifications	1823	1823
Pensions	1826	1854
Rivers and Harbors	1826	1871
Military Academy	1834	1836
Indian	1837	1837
Post Office	1844	1845
Sundry Civil	1856	1857
Legislative, Executive, and Judicial	1856	1857
Agriculture	1880	1881
District of Columbia	1880	1881

This table shows that the same gradual process which had distributed the business of the House among more than 40 committees by the year 1880 had also classified the work of its Committee on Appropriations into 13 separate annual bills prepared by its subcommittees.

The Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives was established in 1865, when all the general appropriation bills were confided to its care. Before 1865 the Ways and Means Committee handled both the revenue and the appropriations bills. From 1885 to 1920, jurisdiction over the general appropriation bills was distributed among eight standing committees of the House. Finally, on July 1, 1920, the Committee on Appropriations was given jurisdiction over all appropriations by an amendment to the rules adopted June 1, 1920. Thus, during the last 30 years the Committee on Appropriations has had exclusive jurisdiction over appropriation of the revenue for the support of the Government.

During the 85 years since the Committee on Appropriations was first established the total expenditures of the Federal Government have grown from $536,000,000 in 1865 to more than $40,000,000,000 in 1950. This tremendous growth in the cost of the Government affords some conception of the increase in the work load of the Appropriation Committees of Congress. These committees are now responsible for scrutinizing the financial estimates of an executive establishment which had 1,863 component units as of January 1, 1950 and a total of 1,961,029 employees on the same date. For the performance of this tremendous task the Committee on Appropriations of the House has perforce divided its work among a series of standing subcommittees organized along lines roughly parallel to the organization of the executive departments and agencies. At the present time there are nine of these standing subcommittees, each with five members.

Under this traditional procedure the appropriation process is necessarily piecemeal in nature, each supply bill being separately considered by different subcommittees, without much opportunity for consideration of their interrelationships or of the over-all aspects of expenditure and revenue programs. Each of the appropriation bills has been considered individually at the committee and floor stages. The needs covered by one supply bill have not been measured in proportion to the needs of others. It has been possible for relatively unimportant projects to be provided for in one bill and for relatively important projects to be rejected in another. The Committee on Appropriations has necessarily divided its work among subcommittees whose knowledge and understanding have largely determined the presentation and decision respecting items in the several bills.

Under this procedure, which we have inherited from the past, little over-all consideration of the entire budget picture has been given by the full committee or by the House. This lack of overall control has encouraged deficiency and supplemental appropriations which still further weaken congressional control of expenditures. The Executive has submitted a unified budget to Congress which has heretofore broken it up into bits and pieces. There has been no legislative machinery for obtaining a coordinated over-all view of total income and outgo. Last year, for example, Congress considered and separately passed ten general appropriation bills, three deficiency and two supplemental bills, and five special appropriation bills.

Today, the Committee on Appropriations is reporting for the consideration of the House a consolidated appropriation bill for the first time in more than a century and a half. This bill is made up of separate chapters each of which has been reported by its standing subcommittees after careful consideration of the departmental estimates. We hope that this omnibus bill represents a great forward step in appropriation procedure and that it will result in many advantages both to Congress and the country. Bringing all the general supply bills together into a single measure will give Congress and the country a picture of the total outlays contemplated for the coming fiscal year. Moreover, this pro-

cedure will permit a comparison to be made of these total proposed appropriations with the latest available estimates of total receipts by the Public Treasury for the coming year. By comparing total appropriations and total anticipated receipts the House will be able to decide in its wisdom whether to balance the budget or to create a surplus for debt retirement or to incur an increase in the public debt. The new procedure will focus responsibility upon the Congress for any increase in the national debt and it will offer us a method of financial retrenchment. By means of the omnibus bill Congress will be able to act more intelligently on budget requests. A grand debate will ensue upon the financial state of the Union in which, perhaps for the first time in our history, the House and Senate will be able to make deliberate and rational decisions regarding over-all fiscal policy. Furthermore, this procedure will, I believe, help to offset and counteract the spending pressures of powerful interest groups which are constantly demanding of the Congress that it subsidize this or that program and which tend to identify their special claims with the general welfare. We will now be able for the first time to see the claims of each of these pressure groups in relation to the total national fiscal picture and thus to appraise their relative worth. To be sure, there will probably still be need from time to time for deficiency and supplemental appropriation bills, but we hope that the new omnibus procedure will reduce the number of such measures. It remains to be seen, of course, how the new procedure will actually work in practice, but we believe that its adoption represents a long step forward toward a much-needed reform in congressional appropriation procedures.

The omnibus bill recommends the appropriation of $27,266,403,664. It recommends in addition $1,778,626,500 in contract authorizations. This represents a reduction of $1,385,377,504 from budget estimates of $28,651,781,168 for appropriations, and $1,961,149,500 for contract authorizations.

Total budget estimates for 1951 appropriations amounted to $40,244,532,221. The $11,592,751,053 difference between this amount and the $28,651,781,168 estimated appropriations considered in this bill represents budget estimates of anticipated appropriations for the Senate, foreign aid and mutual defense assistance, 1951 supplementals under existing legislation, proposed legislation, reserve for contingencies, and permanent appropriations—from table in committee report, page 7.

Of this $11,592,751,053 estimated 1951 appropriations not considered in the omnibus bill, $5,949,018,531, including $5,625,000,000 for payment of interest on the public debt, represents permanent appropriations. These are generally beyond reach of the Committee on Appropriations. Of the remaining $5,643,732,522 subject to annual appropriation, the $500,000,000 estimated appropriation for mutual defense assistance is the amount estimated to be required for liquidation of present contract authority. Thus, the committee will have real control over only a little more than five billion, or considerably less than half, of the estimated appropriations not considered in this bill.

The extent and kind of discretion permitted the Committee on Appropriations [illegible] varies widely with respect to different classes of items included in the $28,651,781,168 estimated appropriations considered in the omnibus bill. I call your attention particularly to four categories of appropriation estimates over which the committee has little real control.

1. LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATIONS

No less than $4,513,830,394 of the total budget estimate of 1951 appropriations represents appropriations for liquidation of existing and prior contract authorizations. Of this amount, $3,998,730,394 is included in the $28,651,781,168 appropriation estimates considered in this bill.

Generally speaking, the committee has little real control over these items. It can use its judgment as to the amounts that will actually be required during the fiscal year, but only in the rarest of cases would it be justified in refusing to recommend the amounts necessary to liquidate.

In the Department of Defense alone, $2,277,600,000 of the total estimated appropriations of $13,025,000,000 is for liquidation of contract authorizations. The Atomic Energy Commission estimated that $450,000,000 would be required for that purpose. In the case of the Bureau of Public Roads, $426,000,000 of the total requested appropriations of $455,900,000 represented the agency's estimate of appropriations required to liquidate contract authorizations under the Federal aid, postwar highway-development program.

Obviously the committee was not in a position to make large cuts in this $3,998,730,394 total. As a result of careful examination of estimates in this category, however, to make sure that appropriations requested would actually be needed in 1951, it was able to make a reduction of $83,000,000.

In view of the extent to which incurred liabilities under contract authorizations limit discretionary control of appropriations and expenditures in future years, it is significant that under this bill recommended new contract authorizations for the fiscal year 1951 amount to $1,961,149,500, a reduction of $1,877,408,128 from 1950 contract authorizations.

2. PENSIONS, RETIREMENT FUNDS, AND OTHER FIXED-RATE ITEMS

There are many items in which the amount to be appropriated is rather definitely fixed by law and not subject to material control by the committee. The largest item of this description included in the appropriation estimates is for veterans' pensions. It amounts to $2,237,000,000. An additional $6,830,000 estimated is for the Veterans' Administration's military and naval insurance program, and $31,600,000 for the national service life insurance appropriation.

Other large appropriation estimates in this category include $356,000,000 for the Department of Defense for retired pay; $333,344,000 charged to the Civil Service Commission as the Government's contribution to the retirement fund for civil employees; and $594,000,000 for the Railroad Retirement Board.

Altogether, it is estimated that appropriation requests in this category total over $3,640,000,000—see appended table.

As in the case of appropriations for liquidation of contract authorizations, the committee's discretion is limited largely to scrutinizing the estimates and exercising its judgment as to the amounts that will be required to make the various payments. The rates of payment for these pension, insurance, and retirement items being rather definitely established by law, the committee has very little real control in the matter. Again, however, by careful scrutiny of the basis of the estimates it was able to effect a reduction of $269,491,276 in this category of requests—see appended table, Railroad Retirement Board reduction is included.

3. VETERANS' READJUSTMENT BENEFITS

Payments made to veterans under the various readjustment benefit programs fall in a somewhat different category. Here again, however, so long as the veterans' laws remain as presently written, the committee has relatively little discretion, other than to estimate the amount that will be required to pay the benefits due. If an applicant meets the specified conditions, the rate of payment or allowance is fixed by law. The Government is morally bound to provide whatever funds are required to meet these payments.

The budget estimate for appropriations for veterans' readjustment benefits for the fiscal year 1951 was $2,610,000,000. The committee estimated that $2,505,600,000 would be adequate to pay the benefits due. It therefore recommends a reduction of $104,400,000 in the budget request.

It is interesting to note that of total appropriations of $6,007,615,000 recommended by the President for 1951 for the Veterans' Administration, no less than $5,045,430,000 represents such fixed or relatively uncontrollable items as liquidation of contract authorizations, $160,000,000; pensions and insurance, $2,275,430,000; and readjustment benefits, $2,610,000,000.

4. GRANTS-IN-AID

Approximately $1,663,000,000 of the appropriation estimates considered in this bill represents Federal contributions to the States under major grants-in-aid programs—see appended table. This does not include appropriations for liquidation of contract authorizations in connection with Federal-aid programs, so the items that make up this total do not overlap with any of those included above.

In the case of many of these programs, the law specifies that the Federal Government shall make grants or advances to the States, sometimes up to a stated maximum, upon compliance with prescribed conditions. In such cases, making appropriations is again largely a matter of estimating to what extent the States will apply and meet the prescribed conditions.

The largest item in this category is $1,200,000,000 requested for the Social Security Administration for grants to the States for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, and aid to the blind under titles I, IV, and X of the Social Security Act. I quote from the committee's report—committee print, page 104—relating to this item:

The appropriation is allotted to the States on the basis of specific formulae and no Federal official has any discretion as to the amount paid other than to determine that all beneficiaries under State plans meet the requirements of the Federal law. The committee is powerless to control the amount of the item; the only control is in the formula of the statute itself. In this connection, it was testified that the provisions of H. R. 6000, now pending, dealing with public-assistance grants will, if enacted, increase requirements under this appropriation by approximately $256,000,000.

In a similar category is the request for $188,000,000 for the Bureau of Unemployment Security, now in the Department of Labor, for payments under the unemployment-compensation program. Eighty-three million five hundred thousand dollars is requested for payments under the National School Lunch Act; $27,856,538 for payments to the States by the Extension Service, Department of Agriculture; $10,000,000 by the Forest Service for forest-fire cooperation; and $7,416,208 by the Office of Experiment Stations, Agricultural Research Administration, for payments to the States.

The estimates also include $22,000,000 for payments to the States by the Children's Bureau for maternal and child welfare, and substantial amounts for payments under various programs by the Office of Education, the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, and the Public Health Service—see appended table for further detail. The programs vary considerably with respect to statutory provisions governing payments.

By revising estimates and exercising the most rigid control where control was possible, the committee has succeeded in reducing these estimates by some $45,000,000—see appended table.

The grand total of estimated 1951 appropriations in the four categories described above is almost $12,000,000,000, over 40 percent of the total estimates considered in the omnibus bill. Under existing legislation, and in the light of commitments already made, the committee could do little more than to examine the basis for estimating the amount of funds that would be required. Even so, it has succeeded in effecting total reductions in this class of estimates amounting to approximately $500,000,000.

With respect to the $16,738,769,028 estimated appropriations considered in this bill but not included in the categories enumerated above, the committee has recommended a reduction of $883,052,450.

In order to appreciate the significance of this reduction, it must be realized that while the Committee on Appropriations in a legal sense has relatively wide discretion as to the amounts to be recommended, in a practical sense its discretion was severely limited.

Apart from the fact that essential services cannot be wholly eliminated or reduced to an unduly low level, there are certain appropriations that have to be made to prevent actual economic loss. Consider for example the case of going public-works projects.

Apart from funds required to liquidate prior contract authorizations, a certain minimum level of expenditure is required on going public-works projects just to keep them going. In other words, there is a point below which deferment of elements of programs in progress would bring about a net economic loss, as a result of nonproductive expenditures which would be required to safeguard the projects and, later, to prepare for resumption of work.

Finally, attention is called to the fact that of the $16,738,769,028 estimates in the relatively controllable category, no less than $10,395,075,000 represents the requested appropriations for the Department of Defense. This figure does not include amounts requested for liquidation of contract authorizations and for retired pay. The committee recommends a reduction of $203,332,700 in the total 1951 appropriations for the Department, including a reduction of $14,000,000 in the estimate for retired pay.

Subtracting the controllable Department of Defense estimates from total controllable estimated appropriations amounting to $16,738,769,028, leaves $6,343,694,028 controllable estimates for all of the remaining functions of the Government considered in this bill. The committee has recommended reductions from these estimates amounting to $693,719,750. In other words, aside from Department of Defense estimates, this is a reduction of approximately 11 percent in the controllable estimates included in the omnibus bill. This percentage would be even higher—12 to 13 percent—if even a minimum allowance were made for going public-works projects.

This remaining $6,343,694,028 of what may be considered as controllable estimates in this bill can be broken down into three major items:

First. Permanent salaries as figured by the Bureau of the Budget—not as figured by the United States Civil Service Commission—$3,401,423,510;

Second. Part time and temporary salaries, again as figured by the budget and not the Civil Service Commission, $714,340,481; and

Third. All other purposes, including projects of the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Atomic Energy Commission, and a number of smaller activities, $2,227,930,037—cut $693,719,750.

Gentlemen, the bill can be further reduced by this committee. However, until the Congress repeals or reduces the authorized contributions and activities, or until the receipts of the Government are substantially increased, the budget cannot be balanced.

Now is the time for us to stand up and be counted. The money cannot be spent unless we make the appropriations. Do not say the President is entirely responsible. He cannot appropriate the money. Congress must do that. We should not transfer the responsibility of practicing economy to the President and ask him to reduce the budget. Under the Constitution the job belongs to Congress. Let us discharge our duties and make additional cuts here on the floor of this House.

In the future we also might stop passing new authorization unless of paramount importance. We might review a number of present authorizations and reduce or repeal some of them. Whether we want to or not is really not the question. The question is: We do not have the money.

We must cut as much as possible. Soon we shall reach our debt ceiling if these expenditures are to be continued. The responsibility is ours, on both sides of the aisle.

Categories of appropriation items for 1951 to which reference is made in statement

		1951 estimate	Recommended in bill	Reduction
I. Permanent appropriations (not considered in omnibus bill)		[1] $5,949,018,531		
II. Appropriations for liquidation of contract authorizations:				
Total estimated	[2] $4,513,880,394			
Not considered in omnibus bill:				
Mutual defense assistance	[3] 500,000,000			
Department of State	[4] 5,100,000			
Atomic Energy Commission (revised estimate, H. Doc. 457)	10,000,000			
Considered in omnibus bill		[5] 3,998,730,394	[6] $3,925,730,394	[6] $83,000,000

Footnotes at end of table.

Categories of appropriation items for 1951 to which reference is made in statement—Continued

	1951 estimate	Recommended in bill	Reduction
III. Pensions, insurance, and retirement funds (nonpermanent fixed charges):			
Major items:			
Veterans' Administration:			
Pensions	$2,237,000,000	$2,147,520,000	$89,480,000
Military and naval insurance	6,830,000	6,830,000	
National service life insurance	31,600,000	31,600,000	
Department of Defense: Retired pay	356,000,000	342,000,000	14,000,000
Civil Service Commission: Civil-service retirement and disability fund	333,344,000	305,000,000	28,344,000
Railroad Retirement Board	594,000,000	457,832,724	[6] 136,167,276
Federal Security Administration: Bureau of Employees' Compensation, employees' compensation fund	26,500,000	25,000,000	1,500,000
Treasury Department: Coast Guard—retirement pay	15,575,000	15,575,000	
Philippine War Damage Commission	40,200,000	40,200,000	
Total	3,641,049,000	3,371,557,724	269,491,276
IV. Veterans' readjustment benefits	2,610,000,000	2,505,600,000	104,400,000
V. Grants-in-aid and other advances to the States:			
Major items:			
Federal Security Administration:			
Social Security Administration:			
Bureau of Public Assistance—Grants	1,200,000,000	1,200,000,000	
Children's Bureau—Maternal and child welfare	22,000,000	22,000,000	
Office of Education: Vocational education	23,435,000	19,977,760	3,457,240
Office of Vocational Rehabilitation—Payments	23,000,000	20,600,000	2,400,000
Public Health Service:			
Venereal diseases	14,000,000	14,900,000	+900,000
Tuberculosis	9,600,000	10,000,000	+400,000
Assistance to States, general	26,425,000	16,915,000	9,510,000
Department of Labor: Bureau of Employment Security	188,000,000	178,500,000	9,500,000
Department of Agriculture:			
Agricultural Research Administration—Office of Experiment Stations	7,416,208	7,406,208	10,000
Forest Service—Forest-fire cooperation	10,000,000	9,500,000	500,000
National School Lunch Act	83,500,000	83,500,000	
Extension Service—Payments to States	27,856,538	27,000,000	856,538
Housing and Home Finance Agency: Public Housing Administration, Low-rent contributions	28,000,000	7,500,000	20,500,000
Total, Grants-in-aid items	1,663,232,746	1,617,798,968	45,433,778

[1] See 1951 Budget, appendix 2, pp. 1154–1157, for detail. The budget total for permanent appropriations is given as $5,937,613,204.
[2] For summary, see 1951 Budget, table 3, p. A6. For detailed items, see table 9, pt. B, pp. A96–A98.
[3] Report (committee print), p. 7.
[4] 1951 Budget, p. A98.
[5] These figures are based on a quick check of major items. Three major reductions were noted as follows: Atomic Energy Commission, from estimate of $450,000,000 (amended) to $414,000,000 (report, pp. 203, 235); Public Health Service, hospital construction grants, from $125,000,000 to $100,000,000 (pp. 98, 117); Department of Commerce, Bureau of Public Roads, from $426,000,000 to $405,000,000 (pp. 48, 64).
[6] See report p. 87, which states that this reduction represents offset of a like amount of rescissions proposed by the budget against the amount otherwise for appropriation to the railroad retirement account. See 1951 budget, p. 111.

SUMMARY

	Estimates (considered in omnibus bill)	Recommended	Reduction
1. Appropriations for liquidation of contract authorizations	$3,998,730,394	$3,925,730,394	$83,000,000
2. Pensions, insurance and retirement funds (major items)	3,641,049,000	3,371,557,724	269,491,276
3. Veterans' readjustment benefits	2,610,000,000	2,505,600,000	104,400,000
4. Grants and other advances to States (major items, not included above)	1,663,232,746	1,617,798,968	45,433,778
5. Department of Defense (not included above)	10,395,075,000	10,205,742,300	[1] 189,332,700
6. Permanent salaries	[2] 3,401,423,510	2,707,703,760	693,719,750
7. Part time and temporary	714,340,481	714,340,481	
Subtotal	4,115,763,991		
8. All other purposes	2,227,930,037	2,227,930,037	
Subtotal	6,343,694,028		
Total	28,651,781,168		

[1] Exclusive of $14,000,000 reduction in retired pay estimate, accounted for elsewhere.
[2] Figures obtained from the Bureau of the Budget.

NOTE.—Recommended salary reductions $693,719,750 or about 11 percent of the total as shown in items 7 and 8.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORRELL. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I feel it my duty to speak these few words for the record and to tell the membership of the House that the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL] has been most faithful in his studies on the problems before us, and has shown a splendid devotion to the Committee on Appropriations and has applied himself diligently to this great task.

Mr. NORRELL. I thank the gentleman very, very much.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, permit me to add to what the gentleman from Michigan has so well said. The gentleman from Arkansas is one of the most valued and honored Members of the House, and during the absence of the gentleman from Michigan he served as chairman of the central committee which mobilized and harmonized all the separate chapters into one bill. In doing so he rendered an invaluable service to the committee and to the House and to the country.

Mr. NORRELL. I appreciate the remarks on the part of my chairman very much.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. WHITE] such time as he may require.

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Chairman, I have today introduced a bill to restore the steam plant and other public power features of the Central Valley project of California. I wish to commend the House Appropriations Committee for its action in providing in the pending appropriation bill the full estimate of funds for the construction of irrigation facilities for the Central Valley project. I am at a loss, however, to explain the action of the committee in reducing the estimate for power facilities by $4,450,000. The items deleted in making this reduction are the Delta steam plant, Folsom power facilities, Elverta switchyard, Elverta-Folsom via Roseville 115-kilovolt line, the Keswick-Tracy 115-kilovolt line, the Tracy-Patterson 69-kilovolt transmission line, and the Roseville-Patterson and Vernallis substations.

The district which I represent lies right in the center of the great Central

Valley project of California. Being partly a farmer by profession myself, I am familiar with the need for an assured water supply at all times. Many of my neighbors who are not provided with surface water from canals are required to rely on the underground water supply which is pumped to the surface to meet our irrigation requirements. During periods of drought, such as we experienced a few years ago, the underground water table was depleted to such a level that large quantities of electric power were required to lift the water to the surface where it could be used. These increased power requirements result in an equivalent increase in the cost of pumping water.

During such drought periods the curtailment in power production is very pronounced, due to the high ratio of hydro to steam electric production. This reduction in available power occurs at the very time when additional demands are placed on the power system to provide the necessary energy to operate the vast number of irrigation pumps through out the Central Valley project area. In order to meet the essential needs in the past, severe curtailment in the use of power for all types of loads was put into effect.

For many years the Bureau of Reclamation has recommended the construction of a steam plant on the project to assure a balanced operation between hydroelectric and steam generation to provide maximum assurance of a firm power supply under all conditions of operation. This program has been repeatedly opposed by the officials of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., who have in the past apparently not seen the need for adequate steam capacity in the area. They had not only failed to put into operation adequate steam capacity of their own, but opposed the construction of any steam capacity by the Bureau of Reclamation. Now the company has a program of construction which, when completed within the next few years, will give an almost even balance between hydro production and steam production on their own system. The company officials no doubt have learned that it is good business to properly balance steam and hydroelectric production.

When the Central Valley project was conceived and went through the various stages as a State project and now as the presently authorized Federal project, the need for steam capacity was recognized at all times. What was considered a sound principle during that period is still a sound principle; that is, it is recognized now and has been in the past that a steam plant is an essential component of any hydroelectric system. The action taken last year in providing funds for the Tennessee Valley Authority's steam plant at Johnsonville, Tenn., is certainly an action which bears this out. If it is good business for the utilities and for other areas, it is certainly good business for the Bureau of Reclamation to provide a completely self-sufficient project which is not dependent upon others to assure its proper operation to supply power for its own project pumps and to the preference customers who have preference rights under existing reclamation law. These preference customers will be municipalities, public-utility districts, farmer cooperatives, and others who may utilize vast quantities of electric energy for domestic, commercial, and irrigation pumping purposes. Should these customers sign power-delivery contracts with the Bureau of Reclamation, the number of customers will be limited to the firm capacity of the system operated as an independent hydro system, unless complete dependence can be placed upon the private power company which is operating as a monopoly in the area.

Gentlemen, I can only say this: It is a serious error to defer the construction of the Delta steam plant on the Central Valley project any longer.

Furthermore, the action of the committee eliminated transmission lines and the Elverta switchyard which are essential for the Bureau of Reclamation to interconnect project facilities and to carry out the preference provisions which govern its operations. The city of Roseville has a future delivery power contract signed with the Bureau of Reclamation which had been in effect since July 1945. Now this municipality which has been desirous of obtaining Central Valley project power for so many years has been thwarted in its efforts by the continued successful opposition of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. to the construction of any facilities required to provide service to it. The committee has denied funds for the Elverta-Folsom via Roseville line to serve this load. The line also will go to the Folsom damsite where it can be used to supply project power for construction purposes and save a considerable amount in construction costs. If power is to be supplied by the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. for that purpose, it will be at a substantially higher rate. After it has served its purpose during the construction period it will serve as the outlet for power to be generated at Folsom powerplant.

The Folsom power plant and switchyard were also eliminated. The dam which is under construction by the Corps of Engineers will hold back the water of the American River and the water thus stored will be dropped through the Folsom Power Plant and afterbay power plants to generate much needed power. Action by the committee in delaying these features cannot, in my mind, be understood inasmuch as all generating capacity that can be constructed by both public and private agencies are needed in California to meet the ever increasing demands. The trend in population growth continues to exist and we will be faced with shut-downs in the future as we were during 1948 if adequate provision is not made to supply the future needs.

The committee has also eliminated funds for the construction of a 115-kilovolt line from the Keswick switchyard to the Tracy pumping plant via the Elverta switchyard. This line is essential to provide service to municipalities and irrigation pumping loads as they may develop in the northern and central area of the Central Valley project. Due to the continued opposition of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., preference customers are not assured of being able to obtain this power supply until funds are actually appropriated for the necessary facilities to bring this power within their reach even though a contract may be signed with the Bureau of Reclamation. Failure to appropriate funds for this necessary construction will continue to place municipalities at the mercy of a huge monopolistic power company.

The Tracy-Patterson 69-kilovolt line is designed to provide power for irrigation pumping and municipal uses in the territory south of the Tracy pumping plant. Many applications for power have been on file with the Bureau of Reclamation for a number of years dating as far back as 1939. These people have been promised power for many years, but how long must they wait? Now I do not mean that the Bureau of Reclamation or the Department of the Interior has promised this power, but the Congress itself did through the enactment of preference provisions since 1906, when municipal requirements were given first consideration, has given that promise. Many laws enacted since that time have reiterated this preference to municipalities and have included rural cooperatives and other public bodies. By the continued denial of funds to carry out these provisions, the Congress has placed itself in the position of nullifying the laws that have been in effect over a long period of time.

It has been argued by many that it is essential to cut appropriations to the bone and economize. But let me remind the Members of the House that these funds are reimbursable and will be returned to the United States Government through power revenues. These appropriations are an investment in the future and I need but point out the Northwest as an example of the great benefits that can be derived from adequate distribution of power developed by the Federal Government.

Private and public enterprises can exist side by side and this has been accomplished in many areas, but the continued practice by private enterprise to monopolize the benefits of Federal works that are constructed with the people's money can only lead to the ultimate stagnation of economic development. I do not believe, and I am sure that the majority of the Members of Congress will agree with me, that public expenditures should not be made for only those features of public projects which can benefit a limited group of private individuals. The Government has the responsibility, when it authorizes the initiation of these projects, to carry them through to the ultimate conclusions and provide the necessary facilities such as transmission lines and auxiliary steam plants to carry out the purpose for which the project was authorized by the Congress.

I am today introducing a bill to provide for the construction of the public power features I have mentioned and I earnestly solicit the support of all the Members of the House for that bill.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH].

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, there is an extremely important relationship between the financial power of the United States, the solvency of our Federal Government, and the question of world peace. The time an enemy government would be most likely to decide to attack us would be when we appeared to be having serious financial troubles.

Before developing this major premise, let me quickly review our financial situation. Our Government is now in debt approximately $260,000,000,000. This has been pointed out, not once, but several times during this debate. The interest on that debt alone is more than the total cost of operating the Federal Government during the late thirties. I am informed that the present public debt of the people of the United States is greater than the combined debts of all of the other governments of the world.

The war-debt situation is bad enough, but we are going more deeply in debt at the rate of $16,000,000 a day. In his budget message to Congress this year, the President told us we will have a Treasury deficit of five and a half billions for the current fiscal year. He then stated the estimated deficit for the coming year for which the appropriations in the pending bill are made will be another five and one-tenth billions.

The Government will have to borrow money to meet this deficit. We will have to pay interest on the money we borrow. At the end of the coming fiscal year the interest charges alone on the deficit we are building up will amount to almost $1,000,000 every working day. Think of it. We will soon be paying between $800,000 and $1,000,000 a day just to pay the interest on the deficit we are in the process of creating here and now.

Therefore, I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the financial status of the United States Government is extremely bad and becoming worse every day—yes, every hour. We seem to be deliberately placing ourselves in the position most desired by an enemy, should he wish to attack.

When we speak of the next war, or the cold war, I think we should clearly understand the kind of war we are talking about. The objective of our enemy today is quite different from the historical objectives of war. The idea that to the victor belongs the spoils is hopelessly old-fashioned in our present-day world. Our enemy today is bent on world conquest. He is determined to destroy all free governments and replace them with Communist, totalitarian control. No material gain is actually contemplated.

The war of world conquest now conducted from the Kremlin is the most ambitious and most diabolical war effort in all history.

The success of the Russian campaign is equally amazing. Without firing a shot, without the loss of Russian lives or the expenditure of Russian money, that Government has actually conquered and brought under its control more than 400,000,000 people in less than 5 years. The Russian Government has not, by its own action, ravaged or looted the conquered areas. Just one important thing has disappeared from all of the territory over which the hammer and sickle now flies—freedom.

Russian victory over the United States, whether won in the cold war or in a shooting war, would mean just one thing so far as the people of America are concerned. A Communist victory over us would mean the loss of our individual freedom. It should be noted that the first objective of the Communist dictator is the destruction of our system of free representative government. Our enemy would care little what form of total control appeared here after our free system was done away with. The Kremlin well knows that any other type of totalitarian government can be quickly dealt with by the Communists.

The Communists know they have two possible ways of destroying our freedom. One is the long method of infiltration and destruction from within. This method involves at least two steps; the first is government control under a system called socialism. This step would be followed fairly soon by communism and Russian domination. The other route they might choose for obtaining their objective would have the advantage of speed, destruction, chaos, and would make intermediate steps unnecessary. This plan involves a shooting war. But to the Communist destruction and military success is not enough. Our people must be forced to place themselves under dictatorship for a war emergency. If a military attack on our country failed to do this, the enemy would not achieve his objective. If there is a chance of failing, I do not believe such an attack will be made.

The dangerous situation into which we are heedlessly plunging with our present deficit spending is simply this: If this course continues we must surely, and fairly soon, reach a time when the free government of the United States cannot borrow enough money to finance a shooting war. If war comes and we are in that position, there is only one alternative. The Federal Government must confiscate enough money, material, and labor to fight the war. If and when this should happen, the first step in the Communist objective would be won. Under such circumstances, it would be absolutely necessary for us to abandon our present free system and submit all persons and property to the absolute control of the Central Government for the period of the emergency. It is obvious, I think, that the enemy could prolong such an emergency to any length that suited its purpose.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that this danger I have recited is real. It is not theoretical, nor is it imaginary.

There is only one way that this danger, which exists now and which is being magnified daily under present policies, can be relieved. We must shake ourselves out of the dream world in which we are obviously living. We must tighten our belts, make certain sacrifices in the way of Government services to which we have become accustomed, and which we like. We should cut and curtail to the most drastic limits necessary to balance the budget and begin accumulating a surplus with which to retire at least some of our present astronomical debt.

Unless we do this, if we continue as we are now heading, we are inviting disaster.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I wish to compliment the gentleman on his very original approach to this problem, especially as he recited the interest on the deficit which we are now creating. I should like to ask the gentleman if in his opinion deficit spending not only has the effect which he has outlined but also will affect the value of the American dollar in the commercial markets of the world and destroy its stability and value in that respect?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Yes. I may say to the gentleman from Iowa that by deficit spending we are cheapening the value of the dollar. In other words, we are taking an inflationary course at the same time that we are borrowing and sending $3,000,000,000 to Europe to aid in the economic recovery of those countries. The essential purpose of sending this $3,000,000,000 is to build up their dollar exchange, yet by our inflationary methods we are increasing the dollar deficit of Europe.

Mr. DOLLIVER. In other words, the policy is self-contradictory.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Yes; it goes around in a circle. We borrow to help out, and in borrowing we fail to help; so we cannot possibly expect to cure the dollar deficit by that means.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I compliment the gentleman again on his analysis of the situation.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I shall devote a part of the time allotted to me today to talk about some matters in addition to items in this bill which are also basic to the continued peace, prosperity, and happiness of every American.

When we read this one-package appropriation bill for amendments to be offered under the 5-minute rule I will offer amendments to reduce the bill and at that time I shall have more to say about specific items in the bill, especially those items pertaining to the Department of Interior.

However, at this time I will call attention to the fact that in the 1948 presidential campaign a few professional, political Fair Deal fakers were running loose over the 17 Western States, telling the people that the Eightieth Republican Congress had all but destroyed the reclamation program. Now to put the lie to that gang once and for all, please listen to the words of the Commissioner of Reclamation, Michael W. Straus, himself, when he appeared before the Senate Interior Appropriation Subcommittee on June 13, 1949, after 11 months and 13 days of operations under the bill passed by the Eightieth Congress, with only 17 days yet to go to complete that full fiscal year. Here are Commissioner Straus' own words; they are most enlightening.

You will find them on page 2180, Senate Appropriation Subcommittee hearings for fiscal year 1950, part 2, quote:

By overcoming a myriad of difficulties more water (over 13,000,000 acre-feet) has been delivered to more land (nearly 5,000,000 acres) than in any crop year heretofore. Also, more power (17,500,000,000 kilowatt-hours) has been transmitted from reclamation generators to serve more ultimate consumers (nearly 5,000,000) than in any other calendar year. These energy sales are one-third greater than those in the prior year and bring back revenues that have increased from about twenty-three and one-half to twenty-nine and one-half million dollars.

Likewise greater progress has been made in actually building the new dams, powerhouses, canals, and transmission lines that are new and regenerative national assets than in any like period. On this vast construction program, works contracts amounting to $217,000,000 have been awarded and work accomplished has exceeded $200,000,000 as we constantly come closer to our exacting schedules. But despite this increasing scope and velocity of program, the demands for water and power continue to outstrip our program.

But it was too late, the fakers had already misled a lot of good folks out west where water is liquid gold.

So much for that. Now one of the really important things I want to talk about today is a matter which affects all the people of our Nation and that is the billions we are spending to build these great dams all over America, especially in the West, the Southwest, and more recently in the Southeastern States, all of which begin filling with silt the minute the water starts storing up behind the dam at a rapid rate, and hence before too many years have passed many of those dams will be almost worthless for flood-control purposes, irrigation, and hydro power for which they were intended.

Now what is the solution? Simply this; very few of those dams should be built until we first put into effect sufficient and proper soil and moisture conservation practices on the lands in the entire watershed which drains into those dams. You understand, I am sure, that such a program does not only keep the priceless top soil on the land where it belongs, and out of the streams and dams where it does untold harm, but also such a program is the most effective and least costly flood prevention that can be had. Hence, many, many millions, yes billions, over a period of years, could be saved in controlling disastrous floods which occur annually in most every river, large and small, in the valleys of our Nation.

I am pleased to say that the farmers of many areas, such as in my own section of Iowa, are fully aware of these facts and they are doing something about it. But here we are appropriating hundreds of millions of the taxpayers' dollars in this bill to build a lot more dams before we do what we should do first, as I have advocated from the floor of this House year after year. We took steps to do that very thing in the 1948 session of the Eightieth Congress, for the great Missouri Valley, which covers one-sixth of the entire area of our land, and which we hoped would be a model and was intended to be a model for every other river valley, large and small, over the entire United States of America.

Under the provisions of the 1936 Flood Control Act, early examinations justified the making of a complete survey of the Missouri Valley for remedial measures. This survey, which was authorized by the Eightieth Congress, and was completed in good faith by the Forest Service and the Soil Conservation Service in late 1948, was submitted to the Secretary of Agriculture March 28, 1949, for transmittal to the Public Works Committee of Congress. It was generally concluded that this committee would look favorably on the survey report which called for an appropriation of $1,000,000,000 plus to be expended over a period of 30 years to speed up soil-conservation flood-prevention work on small-stream watercourses in the Missouri Valley.

But instead of the survey being transmitted to the Public Works Committee for action, the front office of the Department of Agriculture at Washington decided to use the survey as a basis of a more comprehensive program, creating a very questionable justification to expand the program to practically all USDA agencies in the valley. To do this, the program raised the appropriation needs from a total of $1,000,000,000 plus as called for in the original survey to about $3,500,000,000 for the new program.

In reality, the Department of Agriculture's valley plan was a trial balloon to see how far the people of the Missouri Valley would be willing to subjugate themselves to obtain the assistance they needed to control effectively soil erosion and bring about upstream flood prevention. The extra $2,500,000,000 was the price. If the people of the Missouri Valley sold their freedom, it would have been but the first step of a Nation-wide movement of political encroachment.

The Missouri plan was a guinea-pig effort by many of the agencies of the Department of Agriculture to solidify their position in the Missouri Valley, create greater thought control over the people, and to make the people subservient to the political desires of a centralized government.

We can be thankful that the people of the Missouri Valley have seen what is behind the USDA front-office maneuvering. If our people had purchased the serfdom the administration's Missouri plan extols, it would have been but the first of political enslavement for people in all of the major river valleys of our Nation. Conform or you get no valley-wide flood-control and soil-conservation aid from the Federal Government is what the plan means.

This important program is yet today bogged down in the pigeon-hole of the Agriculture Committee of the House and held there by the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan.

There has never been a greater need for the people of our Nation to organize to fight all such efforts which would encroach on the rights and liberties of our people for the supposed purpose of valley development. All of us want to develop and conserve the natural resources of our valleys, but there are still ways this can be done which will not destroy the foundation on which our Republic has grown and prospered.

I urged that the people restudy the principles of our Government and make sure that valley development does not in any way destroy these principles.

One way we might uphold these principles is to select a number of guide posts for valley development which all of us can support. Such principles should provide for technical accuracy as well as political and economic freedom. Such guide posts can become a blueprint for valley-wide development with everyone demanding that any valley-wide development proposal first of all adhere to those principles.

In brief, such principles should include:

First. Valley development should be based on a careful evaluation of national and human needs, and should recognize the interdependency of all resources: soil, water, forest, grass, wildlife, recreational, and mineral. This will counter any valley development which might be based on specialized interests. It will also counter many of the proposals of the administration's Missouri plan, most of which was based on guesswork and opportunism.

Second. Successful valley development is dependent upon the full understanding and active participation of the people of the valley. Such development is a joint responsibility of the Nation as a whole through the Federal Government, the several States and their local units of government, and the citizens residing or engaged in farming or business in the valley.

Third. Maximum delegation of responsibilities to local government units give us the best assurance of continued maintenance of such resource programs, as well as their initial sound installation. An example of this is the work of our soil-conservation districts, which not only assures sound approach but excellent maintenance as well.

Fourth. Valley development programs should strengthen, not weaken, the position of local, county, and State governments.

The delay in getting soil-conservation and flood-prevention work underway in the Missouri Valley has become of great concern to many Senators and Congressmen since the Missouri Valley program is considered a model for soil-conservation and flood-prevention work in the other river valleys of the Nation. The Secretary of Agriculture, I hope, will yield to the demand to initiate this soil-conservation and flood-prevention work, so that work can get underway at the earliest possible date, in order that the farmers of America may save billions of dollars of all the taxpayers' money, and at the same time preserve and conserve their own precious topsoil, which they want very much to do and will do with just a little help and encouragement and cooperation from their government—local, State, and National.

Can we preserve free private enterprise for America, the keystone of our liberties? That is the question we face today.

My answer is, "Yes," if we are worthy of it in your sight and it be the will of

God to save us from our own folly at this late hour. Where do we start, you ask? First, we must take stock of our debits and credits in order to ascertain about where America now stands as a going concern, and what is most needed to keep our America in business. History records there are three sure roads to national suicide—bankruptcy, dictatorship, and starvation. Bankruptcy: Is it necessary to remind the American people that every nation in the wide world that has traveled the full length of the wasteful, reckless spending route we are now traveling at breakneck speed has come to utter ruin and tyranny. Look at old Germany. A great people who enjoyed their best times when the wage earner made 50 marks a week, but they, too, followed the siren call of Utopia, by a wasteful, national spending program, which finally brought a bogus, high national income, and inflation. Then the wage earner received an armful of marks each week, but it took almost all of it to buy just a few loaves of bread. Sure we can have a $300,000,000,000 national income. Germany had a billion, trillion mark income, just as Red China has today, and just as American will have unless we stop this mad rush to financial, national suicide.

Think this one over for a minute and please remember it. If everyone in the United States cashed in all his life insurance policies the total would amount to about $44,000,000,000, which is about what it takes to run your Government just for the year 1950. Or, if every farmer in America sold all his farm land, all his farming equipment and all his livestock, the total would amount to around $43,000,000,000. Again this would hardly run your Government a full year. Do these figures mean anything to you? I am sure they do, but not to a lot of fellows in Washington, whom I could name. Facts are those fellows simply do not care so long as they get theirs. Now you may ask, how can we stop it? The answer is, When America thinks and speaks up, America is safe.

So speak up Americans.

Here are some more facts: The white-collar workers, plus the blue-denim workers, plus our retired elderly folks, represent about 60 percent of our consuming public; our farmers, who consume one and one-half times more on an average than the rest of us, represent 30 percent of our consuming public; business and industry, who must add taxes to the prices of their goods or soon go broke, and a few more of us, make up the balance, of around 10 percent. Remember the consumer pays all taxes in the final analysis, so I will leave it to you as to just who is paying our tax bill, and should be most vigorously opposing wasteful spending. Income taxes, withholding taxes, and hidden taxes no end, maybe you can stand it now, but the end is not in sight at this rate of Federal spending.

Private industry, taxpaying industry, is the whipping boy among the great economic planners now in Washington. And they are honeycombing throughout our country, planning and scheming ways to drive free, private, taxpaying industry to the wall. I know what I am talking about, for I have been fighting that gang ever since coming to Congress and have really been in the thick of the fighting for the past 8 years as a member of the Interior Subcommittee on Appropriations.

Dictatorship: I am sure it is not necessary for us to look behind Stalin's iron curtain to know the sad story of follow the leader and his promises of security. All people who have done that now have neither liberties nor security. That we know at least.

Starvation: Thank God, the farmers of America are solving that problem by good soil conservation practices and crop rotation and other scientific farming methods. But there is yet much to be done. Let us never forget that every nation in this world that neglected to take proper care of its priceless topsoil is now at our doors crying for bread.

Also, do not forget that our national income is always about 7 times our farm income, and that for every dollar of farm income the businessman sells $4 worth of goods and labor collects over $4 in wages for each dollar of farm income. All wealth springs from mother earth; she is our only economic generating plant. We must never again turn off that kind of power in America. Remember, also, that we have never had a depression with good farm prices, but always a depression with poor farm prices.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I am pleased to yield to my good colleague from Iowa.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I want to congratulate the gentleman and call attention to the Members of the House that the gentleman's own district is very close to being the pioneer district in the whole United States in soil conservation. I will also ask the gentleman this question if he does not believe that the correct and proper solution of flood control is the development of the soil conservation program, particularly that part of it that builds up the fertility of the land and keeps the water on the land, rather than have it washed into the streams and rivers. It loses as much value as topsoil for the farms if it is in the streams and rivers as if it were in the Gulf of Mexico; is that not right?

Mr. JENSEN. That is exactly right. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I can say that even though the gentleman comes from the capital city of Iowa he has been very active in assisting in every way possible to help the all-important program of soil conservation and every other program which is good for America over the long pull.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I am happy to yield to another one of my able colleagues from the tall corn State, where beautiful nature abounds.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I, too, wish to join in complimenting the gentleman on his very fine statement about soil conservation. I join wholeheartedly in his statements.

Is it not true that the surest way to national destruction is a loose and deficit-spending policy on the part of the Federal Government?

Mr. JENSEN. Indeed. I spoke about that a minute ago, but will now elaborate. I thank the gentleman for asking me that question.

History records as far back as you care to search that the quickest way to commit national suicide is through the bankruptcy route, spending more of the people's money by the Government in control than the people can pay, until such time that they must start the printing presses rolling out the bills. Then we have uncontrolled inflated currencies, and then it is not long, as the gentleman knows, until it takes a basketful of those almost worthless bills to buy a loaf of bread. Certainly we are a long way down that road, and we had better stop. Not just look and listen, but stop. I say stip this silly, wasteful, unnecessary spending spree and save a little at least to use should a real genuine emergency come such as world war III, which is in the making this very minute and which might take an election or an act of God to avoid.

If destruction be our lot, we must ourselves be the author and finisher.

Abe Lincoln said that almost 90 years ago. I believe that admonition to be just as weighty and true today as then.

In recent years, we have seen the extent to which Government has interfered in the lives of its citizens. We have been led into a time of great danger by oppressive taxation, extravagant and wasteful spending by Government, deficit financing, and a staggering national debt. And the end is not yet in sight.

Whose fault is it? We have allowed the cost of Government to grow and grow, year by year, in peacetimes like these until we are consuming nearly one-third of our income just to govern ourselves.

What is the reason? Have the American people lost their capacity for self-government? Must the cost of Government be so great as to endanger our national existence?

Must peacetime taxation placed upon our people be so burdensome as to destroy all incentive for industrial growth and economic progress?

Must the people give up to Government such a large share of their earnings that they are deprived of all opportunity to get ahead?

The greatness of America was not built by Government spending. It was not created in legislative halls. It was not produced by the enactment of laws which led people to believe that they were getting something for nothing.

The greatness of America is ours because of the toil and sweat, and the inventive genius of generations of courageous, industrious, self-reliant Americans. They were willing to work and sacrifice and save to build economic security for themselves, for their families, for their communities, and for their country.

And they did not export jobs as we are doing today under a system of tariff reductions that permit the importation of cheap foreign goods through a so-called reciprocal trade agreement at the discretion of one man which has caused

whole industries in our country to be shut down and our workers thrown out of work. We now have not only a national socialist philosophy at work in our country, but a global concept of this system. This—in spite of the fact that those governments which have tried socialism over a period of years have turned their backs on it.

How else can we recognize the Trojan horse of socialism which is being offered to the American people? We have been told that we can produce a $300,000,000,000 economy, providing jobs for everyone without any large increase in taxes. It sounds good, does it not? And it is good, provided our liberties, as we know them, are not sacrificed in its achievement.

But, we are presented a 5-year plan. Where have we heard of 5-year plans before? Russia has had a series of them. Germany had them. Italy had them. They all ended the same way—starvation, misery, dictatorship, and inflation. Yes, they had a high national income, but it was a bogus income. Their currency was not worth the paper it was written on. A basket full of bills was needed to buy bread. That was not so good. Sure, those folks were all promised Utopia. All that was required was for them to bow to wasteful spending by the leaders. Does that song sound familiar to you?

What else did these three dictatorships have in common? They are all socialistic states. Socialism and communism are sisters under the skin. Remember the official name of Russia is the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

How did all of this start? Let us take a brief look at how the Trojan horse of socialism took over in England and then show the deadly peril here. First they took over all banking, then all electric power; the people were then told, be good or you get neither money nor electric power; the rest was easy. Remember this, few Socialists of modern times will admit that they are Socialists. The large majority of American Socialists abhor the name while doing the deed. They call themselves economic planners, and other high-sounding titles. But their objectives are all the same—the regimentation of the people into robots to obey the commands of the big brains fastened onto the pay rolls of the Government.

In England, the Socialists masking under the name of the Labor Party were a small group at first. They fastened themselves onto the larger Liberal Party and bored from within. They worked slowly and began to take more and more power over the Liberal Party until in this last election the Liberal Party was practically out of existence. They came into power with catch slogans such as "jobs for all," "security from the cradle to the grave" and other vote bait. Then the real planners of the so-called welfare state got to work. I need not go into any details as to what has happened to once mighty England. You know she is bankrupt and living off the dole of the United States, the last and most powerful free enterprise country in the world. How long can we take it? But you say it could not happen here? Listen to this. There is a bill, H. R. 2756, called the Economic Stability Act of 1949. It is part of the 5-year American Socialist plan. It sounds good, does it not? Everyone wants economic stability. But this bill gives the President the right to go into any business with Government funds to compete with any private business. Last year they wanted to put the Government into the steel business. Under this bill, the President can also channel scarce materials and facilities into what he may deem essential production and uses. If the socialist planners feel that your business is not essential, they can put you out of business by simply refusing you materials or plant facilities. You could also be subpenaed in person with your records and books and if you refused, be in contempt of court and suffer the penalty. This bill permits the President to fix prices. I have not time to go into all phases of this bill, but these are a few examples to show you how far down the road to socialism a powerful, well-organized clique is determined to take America.

The Brannan farm bill is another example. High prices to farmers and low prices to consumers also sounds good, but even the author himself or his experts either cannot or dare not estimate the cost to the taxpayers of this one; and my advice to all young men planning to be farmers is to learn accountancy good, to keep the numerous records and reports which are necessary if this plan ever went through, in order to keep himself out of jail, for there is a jail penalty in the 15 pages of penalties written in this bill which would regiment farmers beyond anything Americans ever dreamed would happen here.

The time has come when we must abandon our easy-going attitude toward regimentation and needless and wasteful Government spending. We have been presented this year with the largest peacetime budget in our history, plus the fact that we will have a 1950 fiscal deficit of at least five or six billion dollars.

What are we going to do about it?

We must give the people a clear-cut choice of the issue confronting us today. Let those who are for a Socialist state get into their corner. Those who are for our free-enterprise competitive system get over in our corner. Let us fight it out on clear-cut issues. Anyone who can think and read and who has followed the goings-on in Washington for a long, long time can have no doubt as to where the road ahead will lead, unless we do a quick about face.

We must stand for a republic in which the elected representatives and public officials are servants of the people and not their masters.

Public opinion, when aroused, is yet the strongest force in this land. It is your job to see to it that the people understand the truth—understand that eternal vigilance is still the price of liberty—and that our freedom be preserved.

We must stand up fearlessly against the folly of a domestic program that teaches people to depend upon government for all good things in life, remembering that Lincoln said: "You cannot build character and courage by taking away a man's initiative and independence."

We must constantly warn against the dangers of a Federal policy that deceives the sane of mind and strong of body into thinking that they get something for nothing. And we must ever remember our duty and responsibility as Americans to the aged and infirm, to the widows and orphans, and our disabled veterans who are paying the greatest price for our wars. This we must do and can do unless we spend all America into bankruptcy needlessly.

We must place, where it properly belongs, full responsibility for secret agreements which betrayed free governments into socialistic and communistic enslavement.

We must fight here against the drift into a socialistic pattern of government because that system has brought death and destruction to every country where it has been attempted.

In conclusion I ask, Mr. Chairman, what will it gain America or the world if we commit national suicide by the bankruptcy route? Will the prophecy of that ruthless Communist leader, Lenin, come true, when he said shortly before he died just a few years ago, "Russia will force America to spend herself into bankruptcy, then we will take her over"? I pray God forbid.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I was very much interested a few minutes ago when the gentleman referred to the fact that if what he was talking about continued to go on in America, Government officials will become the masters and the people the servants. In connection with that, I heard the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] this afternoon quote from a former President of the United States, I believe it was President Cleveland, who stated in substance that the purpose of the people is to support the Government and not the purpose of the Government to support the people. My question of the gentleman is, is it not a fact that if we continue the way we are going, with the Government from time to time assuming more and more the role of supporting the people, rather than expecting the people to support it, that it can ultimately lead only to one thing, namely, where the Government becomes the master and the people the servants? And when that time arrives all the freedom and liberty of the American people will be gone.

Mr. JENSEN. Of course the gentleman is exactly right. Too many of the American people have been bitten by this "gimme" bug, expecting the Federal Government, which has no money except what it collects from the people, to loan them or give them what they think they need in order to get along in this great, wonderful, free Nation of ours.

I had not intended to take this much time, but I do want to take a little more time to give you a little idea of things my father and mother went through in order to come to this great free America, so they and their children could enjoy the blessing of this free new America of ours which they had read and dreamed about.

My father was a stable hand on a plantation in Denmark. My mother was a milkmaid on the same plantation. They met and married and four children were born over there in Denmark. They knew about this great free America of ours, it beckoned to them, and in 1880 father came over. He worked a couple of years to earn enough money to send for mother and the four girls. They were poor folk. It was tough going, but they were happy. The day after my mother arrived at her new home near Cedar Rapids, Iowa, she walked a mile and a half and did a washing for a quarter. As time went on nine more Americans arrived, making thirteen children, and they too were happy and free Americans.

Mr. Chairman, I am fully aware that our earliest settlers experienced greater hardship than did my parents, and my parents knew full well that they were the beneficiaries of those rugged pioneers.

The point I want to make is that with all of the struggles my parents went through they so dearly loved America that when anyone would even mention the fact that there might be something wrong with America or the Constitution or the Bill of Rights or George Washington or Thomas Jefferson or Ben Franklin or Abraham Lincoln or any of the rest of these great statesmen—our founding fathers—my parents would become furious. They loved America; they instilled that love in their children's hearts, and they also instilled in our hearts and in our souls the principle that there was no substitute for work and square dealing. I have been raised on those principles, just as you have, my colleagues. I am simply reciting a story which, no doubt, many of you here could duplicate, for the simple purpose of showing how in the last 20 years certain fundamental principle of our way of life have changed to the detriment of peace of mind and the true happiness of our people.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I presume that the gentleman's father and mother never received a dime from the Government of the United States in raising the splendid family of which the gentleman is so able a member, and I presume further that the gentleman was brought up with the idea of thrift and that his whole nature rebels against the thought of the great American Government's overspending itself by $5,000,000,000 in this fiscal year.

Mr. JENSEN. Never a dime did Uncle Sam send them, and the only times my parents saw a Government official was when they saw their postmaster, or in later years, their rural mail carrier, John Willie Cannon; he was Uncle Sam to us.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not take any more time except to say that I pray to God that the American people will, if they have not already, waken to the fact that they live in the only free land which remains in this world today and that we have groups all around us, well organized, who are working day and night, to destroy everything that my parents, and your parents, and you and I hold dear; and because of that we will do something about it, so that your children and my children and generations yet unborn will never have reason to point their finger at one us and say: "You helped to destroy, or you did nothing about preserving, that great free America of yesteryear which was so richly blessed by God in heaven.

Now I must conclude by saying that I am deeply concerned, just as I know most of you must be about the road we are traveling and to plead with every good American in our land to stand up and fight as never before or we shall surely lose the God-given liberties as we know them in America. The pitfalls ahead are now in plain sight for all to see, if we will but open our eyes, look well, and think through.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

(Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

"YES MAN" PSYCHOLOGY IS RUINING OUR NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I know that all of you enjoyed Chairman VINSON's comments on the question of national defense. There is no man in the Congress of the United States who is entitled to more credit for the building of our national defense than is the gentleman from Georgia. His long career here in Congress as a champion for our armed forces properly labels him as a spokesman for those of us who believe that the security of our country can best be protected by an adequate national defense.

To further Chairman VINSON's discussion of national defense, I should like to consume the time allotted me in discussing what I consider one of the most dangerous practices that has ever been permitted to develop. This practice which is commonly referred to as "yes man" psychology concerns information given to congressional committees by spokesmen of our armed services only after it has been screened by the head of their department or by someone in the Defense Establishment. It simply means that congressional committees are not getting first-hand information on the needs and the state of our national defense by those qualified by position and experience.

There are two factors in this "yes man" psychology that brought about this dangerous practice. First, directives issued by the President and heads of departments, and second, the threat of reprisal against those spokesmen for our Defense Establishment who dare to speak their own mind when called upon to do so by various congressional committees.

This practice of telling spokesmen what they can or cannot say before congressional committees had its beginning on November 15, 1946, when President Truman issued a memorandum in which he said:

> I have noticed that on several occasions, certain department and agency officials have shown a tendency to seek from Congress larger appropriations than were contemplated in official budget estimates.

Then the President said this to the Director of the Budget:

> When you notify the heads of the various departments and agencies of the amounts to be included in the 1948 budget for their activities I wish you would include a reminder that I shall expect them and their subordinates to support only the President's estimates in hearings and discussions with Members of Congress.

This "yes man" psychology really came into being in the spring of 1947 when the House Armed Services Committee of which I am a member, behind closed doors and off the record, had to extract from the civilian heads of the Army, Navy, and Air Forces information as to how much money was necessary in their minds for the fiscal year 1949 to give the American people the type of an Army, Navy, and Air Force the civilian heads felt necessary. Very reluctantly, and with red faces, the civilian Secretaries gave the committee the information concerning the following budget requests for 1949.

Budget requests, 1949

[In millions]

	Army	Navy	Air Force
Amount requested	$3,978	$5,310	$4,422
Present request	3,013	3,510	3,054
Difference	965	1,800	1,368

Since 1948 much has been said about the fact that the Bureau of the Budget was requesting appropriations that were far less than the amounts the civilian secretaries felt absolutely necessary. This brought about denials on the part of the administration and others who spoke for the administration.

In addition to these denials it was freely said that spokesmen for the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps could appear before Congress and give any information they were asked for and without any restrictions.

Well, we all know what happened to Admiral Denfeld after being given assurance by the Secretary of the Navy that he was free to testify and to give any information he wished without fear of reprisal.

On the heels of Admiral Denfeld's dismissal we have now the transfer of Rear Adm. Joel T. Boone, chief of the Joint Plans and Action Division, Office of Medical Services, Defense Department who violated this yes-man psychology when he spoke his own mind before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Armed Services.

It is said that there were plans to transfer Admiral Boone beforehand. But from the hearings of the subcommittee, it is learned that the day he left his office to come to Capitol Hill to testify, he was literally told that he should be careful what he said and to keep in mind his fitness report had not yet been submitted. To any fair-minded person, the action in transferring Admiral Boone is nothing more than another act of reprisal.

According to the Associated Press, and I quote:

Both Admiral Sherman and his admirals appeared so reluctant to quarrel with the budget handed them by Defense Secretary Johnson that a House subcommittee held a separate hearing to determine whether they had been gagged. Of course, Secretary of the Navy Matthews denied that they had been.

Anyone who reads the hearings on this bill which concerns naval appropriations will understand that Admiral Sherman, the Chief of Naval Operations, was not satisfied with the budget although his remarks were very guarded and exceedingly discreet.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. I would like to say that as chairman of the subcommittee handling military appropriations that no special hearing was held in regard to any reluctance on the part of witnesses to express themselves freely before the committee. It is true that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL], a member of the subcommittee, did express the feeling that some of the witnesses were reluctant. My own view is—and I think this view would be sustained by an investigation of the record—that the men who testified before our subcommittee testified with every degree of freedom, and I invite the Members of the House to read the testimony of Air Force and naval witnesses in which it is shown that they took violent disagreement with certain budget estimates, and not in any case did any witness for any of the national defense departments refuse to answer any questions asked them. It is true that generally speaking they did not volunteer to advocate expenditures over the budget. However, I think they almost did advocate expenditures over the budget voluntarily, but generally speaking if a Member said, "What is your own personal view?" those views, I think, were given in complete freedom, and I want to say for Admiral Sherman that if there has been an abler man in Navy uniform on Capitol Hill in recent years, I have not seen him. I think he is a remarkable man and I think he gave us his best judgment, and if you read his testimony, you can see that he was speaking from out of his heart and as an American patriot. I believe we need men of this type in positions of military responsibility. If the Members will just read the hearings, they will see at once that it was not a "yes man" proposition. The men expressed their views.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I read the hearings, and it is not my intention to be critical of Admiral Sherman. I know him to be a very gallant and capable naval officer, yet the quotes that appeared in the press since the hearings indicate definitely that he guarded his words very carefully.

The country as a whole is fed up with this yes-man psychology and the newspapers of the country editorially have this to say about screened information.

From the March 2, 1950, issue of the Christian Science Monitor we read:

Purposed or not, the effect is to impose a gag on the services and to nullify the investigative powers of the representatives of the people.

The Washington Evening Star on March 3, 1950, had this to say regarding the shoddy treatment of Admiral Denfeld in an editorial titled "For Free and Honest Testimony":

Many persons inside and outside the Pentagon will agree with the committee's finding that the summary dismissal of Admiral Denfeld from his top-level Navy post was a blow against representative government, in that it tends to intimidate witnesses and hence discourages the rendering of free and honest testimony to the Congress.

Continuing, the editorial says:

If the effect should be lasting—and it is difficult to eradicate so intangible a reaction—Congress and the American people cannot be sure of learning the true state of our military strength. Congress has a right to receive, and defense authorities have an obligation to give free and honest facts and opinions on the Nation's security, however distasteful or embarrassing the testimony may be to someone at the Pentagon.

In regard to the transfer of Admiral Joel T. Boone, the Washington Evening Star on March 9, 1950, commented as follows:

But ordinary courtesy, to say nothing of the cause of good service relations, would have justified more considerate treatment of these key officers in a matter so vitally concerning their services. * * * Coming so close in the wake of the Denfeld ouster, however, the unfortunate effect will be to create a yes-man psychology at the Pentagon hat is not good for national defense.

I know that every Member of this House realizes what is going on. The issue is simply whether or not our country's Defense Establishment is to be controlled by us who are the elected representatives of the people or by a small clique of political appointees.

In my opinion the Congress of the United States should take action to eliminate this yes-man psychology and make certain that we get nothing but first-hand information on our national defense and not screened information. Congress is also entitled to correct information but under the present policy, we do not know whether the spokesman is telling the full story, or what he has been ordered to come up and tell us.

I agree with the Washington Evening Star that yes-man psychology at the Pentagon is not good for national defense.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is it not true also that Admiral Sherman, when he made his request for the Navy, made many of the same requests Admiral Denfeld had already made? Those requests had been frowned upon. The sacrifice of Admiral Denfeld and the outraged feelings of the country at his removal and the weakening of the Navy were responsible for the Navy's getting as much as it is.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is true. We hear much talk about submarine warfare. Admiral Denfeld is a highly qualified and experienced submarine officer. While Chief of Naval Operations he launched the present submarine campaign that is being conducted in the way of planning and schooling at Key West, Fla. A lot of the credit for the submarine program belongs to Admiral Denfeld.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ].

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, let me first congratulate the chairman of the great Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], and the committee in the adoption of the one-package procedure of making appropriations. This is indeed a great step forward. Under that procedure, with well-informed public opinion behind us in the consideration of the bill, great savings will be made.

More important, indeed most important, the savings which will be made and the economies thereby obtained, will be the result of careful consideration and deliberation in the Committee of the Whole House and will more truly represent the will of the Congress itself, rather than the will of the committee. It is well to effect economies, it is imperative that economies be effected, but those economies should be the result of careful planning and consideration and not the result of a wielding of the ax indiscriminately. The procedure now being followed will lead to the elimination of unwise cuts and, I hope, the adoption of wiser reductions.

The distinguished chairman of this committee and the ranking member of the committee in affording us the opportunity for unlimited debate before taking up the bill chapter by chapter have rendered a great public service. This gives us the opportunity of pointing out items where, in the words of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] yesterday, the action of the committee if not revised may result in our being penny-wise and pound-foolish.

I take this time now to discuss one such reduction so that it may be given careful consideration between now and the time when that particular item will come up for discussion and consideration in the reading of the bill. The money involved is very small comparatively speaking, but the principle involved is of the utmost importance to the Congress, to my State, and, in fact, to the entire Nation. It involves a question of policy of the utmost significance and importance in our dealings with the Indian problem.

In order that it may be better understood let me first give you a little of the background. With the appointment of Dr. Nichols as Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and with the selection of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS] as chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs, a new direction was given to the policy respecting our solution of the administration of Indian Affairs, a policy which has for its goal the ultimate integration of the health services of the Indians with the health

services of the various States, and following that the integration of other services such as those in the field of education, soil conservation, and so forth. This is a goal in line with the recommendations of the Hoover Commission, on which Dr. Nichols rendered a great service in the task force dealing with the administration of Indian affairs.

As part and parcel of that new policy very definite steps have been taken in various parts of the country toward enlisting the cooperation of the States, counties, and non-Indian communities. In New Mexico we are fortunate in having two able, unselfish, and public-spirited citizens in position to formulate and implement that policy. One of those is William Bropy who served as Commissioner and had started pointing the Indian policy toward that goal when he unfortunately was stricken by illness which kept him bedridden for over a year. He has now recovered and as attorney for the United Pueblos Indian Agency at Albuquerque, has given his full cooperation to another young man, Mr. Eric Hagberg, the superintendent of that agency, who thoroughly believes in working himself out of a job as he often says in his many addresses before civic and service clubs in his efforts to enlist cooperation by the State and its communities. He advocates the taking advantage of every opportunity for steps, small though they may be, leading toward the complete amalgamation and integration of Indian services with the services of the State and the community, and relieving the Indian Office from the responsibility of maintaining and operating such services.

In line with that policy he has been able to enlist the support and cooperation of the people in my State to a degree never before attained.

Two years ago Albuquerque and the county of Bernalillo took the lead in obtaining enactment by the State legislature of an act authorizing counties and municipalities to levy property taxes for the operation of hospitals, and also providing for cooperation with the Federal Government in the matter of hospitals by joint action.

The United Pueblos Indian Agency had a tract of useless barren land on a small portion of which is located the Indian Tuberculosis Sanatorium. Though the county could have obtained by donation any number of sites, they negotiated with Mr. Hagberg for the acquisition of a part of that lot on which to build the county hospital right next to the Indian sanatorium. A bill was enacted and passed making that authority available. In the meantime the county had floated $1,000,000 worth of bonds which were sold in 1948 and the money is now on deposit in the Albuquerque banks. The county is negotiating for other contributions from the city, the State, and other agencies, so as to make this hospital as up to date and adequate as possible.

In the same spirit and pursuant to the same policy Mr. Hagberg, Mr. Brophy, and other public-spirited citizens invited the county officials to negotiate for a combined county-city and Indian hospital.

After weeks of negotiations an agreement was reached which would make it possible for the county to build a 225- or 250-bed hospital instead of one-half that size through cooperation of the Indian Service by way of contributions for the construction of the hospital.

It should be said right here that the Indian Service desperately needs such a hospital for the care of the Pueblos under its jurisdiction, and one which may be also available for the two Apache tribes in addition to the 19 or 20 Pueblos. This arrangement would make it possible for the construction of one substantial hospital institution instead of two small and inadequate plants.

The bill providing for this combined enterprise was drafted and sent to the Indian Office in Washington for approval. Again it was subjected to careful scrutiny and study by the Indian Office and introduced in both the House and the Senate. Thereafter it was submitted to the Bureau of the Budget and there again subjected to careful consideration. The Bureau of the Budget offered certain amendments somewhat onerous to the county-city authorities and more advantageous to the Federal Government. Those recommendations were adopted by the Public Lands Committee of the House, which studied the bill and unanimously reported it out. The bill was enacted and the President in signing the bill took the unusual step of making a public statement, from which I quote, as follows:

> I wish to express my full approval of the basic objective of this legislation, which is to encourage the integration of hospital facilities for the care of Indians and non-Indians in the same community.

This proposal does fall into the category of new enterprises, and it is in a sense a new precedent in the administration of Indian affairs, but it is a precedent which has the approval of all those in the Nation who are anxious to get away from the everlasting wasteful and inadequate attempt on the part of the Indian Service to construct, carry on, and operate hospitals for the sick and needy Indian population.

Since it is a new function, and in line with postponing new expenditures wherever possible, and because the subcommittee was not sufficiently familiar, I am sure, with all the implications, it postponed action by eliminating it from the appropriations approved and requested by the Bureau of the Budget. I am happy to learn that members of the Subcommittee on Appropriations handling these items are giving the matter new and careful study, and I am as certain as I can be that by doing so they will convince themselves of the wisdom and desirability of amending the bill so as to include the $1,500,000 authorized for this hospital. They will inevitably come to the conclusion that this is not a postponement, but that the action of the committee if not reversed on the floor will constitute not a postponement but a nullification of the action of the legislative committee and of the Congress in this matter, and this is the thing that is tragic about it.

The county authorities have over a million dollars on hand lying in the bank on which they are paying interest to the bondholders. In reliance on this understanding with the Indian Service, and with the Congress I should say, they have postponed their much needed construction of a county hospital until now. Unless these moneys are made available they will be compelled to proceed with their own little hospital, which cannot be as adequate and economical as a larger one, and eventually the Indian Service will have to built its own hospital which canont be as adequate and economical as the one joint hospital here proposed. That being the case, the action of the legislative committee and of the Congress in passing this bill will go for naught, because once the county has constructed its own little hospital the bill will be of no use to them or to the Indian Service.

What is more, a blow will have been dealt to this farsighted and intelligent policy which cannot be carried on except by enlisting the cooperation of State, county, and community agencies at the right moment, and by living up to those policy agreements entered into between them.

Let me quote from a statement made by the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL] at the time the authorization bill was under consideration, which I consider most significant and which ought to be heeded, and heeded now. In the consideration of the bill, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL] said:

> Mr. MARSHALL. I would like to say, also, Mr. Chairman, for the record, that one of the greatest handicaps for the Indian Bureau working out some of these cooperative arrangements, I think, is a lack of getting through appropriations on time. It makes it very difficult to work out these cooperative arrangements with local people when appropriations are delayed and uncertain. I think that is quite a handicap to the Indian Bureau in that regard, and I wish that some sort of a plan might be promoted to give local people a little better assurance in the future as to what we will do in here, so far as appropriations are concerned.

Let me also quote from a letter addressed by my colleague, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. MILES] to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs on March 21. He said:

> The action of the Appropriations Committee will have the effect of nullifying this effort which had the careful consideration of the legislative committee. The county which has had its money ready for 2 years will be compelled to proceed to build its own smaller hospital, which will not be adequate to care for the Indian population of the surrounding pueblos. I have thought it wise to call this to the attention of the members of our committee since it is of such vital importance not only to me as Representative from New Mexico but to the policy which the Indian Affairs Subcommittee has been gradually establishing and which is in line with recommendations of the Hoover Commission. This is a policy which meets with the approval of all thinking people who are anxious to bring about the end of segregation of Indians in health and educational services.

At the proper time during the reading of the bill under the 5-minute rule, an amendment will be offered to restore this small item of $1,500,000 as the Federal contribution of the Government to-

ward the building of this combined hospital.

The construction of this hospital in the long run will save far more than the initial contribution. It will give the Indians an adequate hospital, fully equipped, with expert staffing and supervision. It will make available to them the expert medical advice and research available in Albuquerque.

Furthermore, under the amendment suggested by the Bureau of the Budget and adopted by the committee and the Congress, the authority to contribute toward the operation and maintenance of the beds used by the Indians will expire in 1954. At that time, a complete report will be issued, with 2 or 3 years' actual experience behind us, and in the light of that report a new authorization will be adopted for the operation and maintenance of those beds. If the contributions are inadequate they may be increased in fairness to everybody, and if they have been liberal, including the construction contribution, they will be trimmed. The county authorities and the businessmen and public-spirited citizens who have been working toward the construction of this hospital, in agreeing to this requirement placed their faith and trust in the good sense of Congress. So certain are they and all of us that this experiment will be so significant and so advantageous to the Indian Service that we have no fear as to future action of the Indian Service and the Congress in this respect.

However, if this appropriation is not granted now we will have been penny-wise and pound-foolish. If we do not provide the funds for this purpose now, we will have effectively nullified the law authorizing it. If we do that it will be an affront to the Committee on Indian Affairs which worked out and reported that bill, and an affront to the House and to the Congress and to the President who placed the stamp of their approval on this act. Furthermore, we will have forevermore discouraged the States, counties, and white communities from entering into the same arrangements in the future and we will have taken a retrogressive step in the direction of forever compelling the segregation of the Indians.

I sincerely hope that the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] and the members of the subcommittee, will be able to see their way clear to accept the amendment when it is offered after the Easter holidays.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER].

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Chairman, the most important single issue confronting the second session of the Eighty-first Congress is the question of public expenditures. The American people are appalled to learn that after the passage of the appropriations for the fiscal year of 1950, the Federal Government was overspending its estimated income by about $6,000,000,000. The constituents of every Member are alarmed that in a period of peacetime prosperity, the Federal outgo exceeds the income by so huge an amount.

There is an instinctive and very proper revulsion against deficit spending. In wartime, it is true, borrowing to meet huge expenses may be unavoidable. But with a heavy tax burden weighing upon the taxpayers, taking nearly a third of the national income, and the shooting war over for 5 years, it seems absurd that the Government should still be going in the hole. Such a situation reflects directly upon the Congress, and specifically upon the House of Representatives, where all revenue bills must originate according to the Constitution, and where appropriation bills also originate.

The responsibility for balancing the budget and cutting appropriations rests squarely upon the majority party in the Congress. They are in control of the committees which formulate the legislation and the spending. The majority is in charge of the kind of legislation that reaches the floor of the House for consideration.

Of course an important factor in the whole situation is the effect of deficit spending on the value of the dollar. History is replete with economic disasters resulting from wasteful spending and loose fiscal policy. Overspending is a major disservice to the people of our country. It is not only a contradiction of the long and well-established principles of thrift, but it destroys the value of the American dollar in a completely insidious and concealed way.

Deficit spending is the surest path to disastrous inflation. No other means is so effective in draining away the purchasing power of the people. Indeed, our own economy has undergone this very process in the last 10 years. The value of the dollar if considered as 100 cents in 1939, now has a purchasing power of less than 60 cents. This is the direct result of monetary inflation.

It not only destroys money values, but inflation also robs the farmer, the pensioner, the person employed with a fixed and regular income. It also destroys the standing and stability of the American economy and currency as related to international affairs. Today the American dollar is recognized as the soundest currency of our times. It will not be so for long, unless this House puts the financial affairs of this country in order. Currencies of great stability often have been destroyed by the improvidence and carelessness of those charged with the responsibility of maintaining its stability. Examples of such destruction are too recent in world history to require elaboration.

What is the answer to the problem? It may be said that our Appropriation Committee has worked to reduce the budget in drafting this omnibus bill. But it is apparent that the objective—a balanced budget—has not been attained. So the job is to curtail these expenditures further. There is no other answer.

It is and will be a painful process. It will hurt some segments of our people who desire sums of Federal money for worthy objectives. But it is a task that must be done—it is imperative that the budget be balanced.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON].

(Mr. HESELTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I have taken this time for two purposes: First, I notice the provision on page 193 of the bill authorizing the Department of Agriculture to pay out of section 32 funds transportation and handling charges on surplus commodities owned by the Department or any of its instrumentalities or agencies for the purpose of distribution to public-welfare agencies.

It is my understanding that this particular amendment was sponsored by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] and I certainly want to commend him for undertaking this work. I believe that he is entitled to the gratitude of literally thousands of people who may benefit, and I believe will benefit from this constructive procedure. I wish to ask him a couple of questions in connection with it. Does not the gentleman believe that we might well give consideration, since we now have in the recently enacted agricultural bill certain wider language and a larger number of groups, to whom this distribution should be made, that we might consider an amendment which would broaden the provisions of his amendment so as to include, for instance, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and our private nonprofit institutions, such as hospitals, orphanages, schools, penal and mental institutions as well as possibly private welfare organizations, for the assistance of needy persons outside of the United States? I have in mind in that connection the excellent work that is being done by many of our private organizations. For instance, if we could provide some of this for the starving Chinese, one organization is equipped to distribute it and would do it immediately through their missionaries who are located behind the iron curtain. It would have a tremendously good psychological effect as far as we are concerned.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. First of all, may I say to the gentleman that I thank him for the kindly reference he has made to what I was able to accomplish in the subcommittee. He will also recall that as early as last January and even earlier, both the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentleman from Minnesota were working along these lines trying to figure out how to get this food to the people who needed it and how to prevent our entire price-support program from suffering because of the stigma being cast upon it as a result of the deterioration of the perishable-food stocks held by the Commodity Credit Corporation. I asked the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan, when he appeared before us on January 12: "Why can you not pay the freight and handling charges on these perishable commodities to points where they can be distributed?" I had in mind, for example, that

we could give a few dozen eggs each month to the thousands in every State on old-age assistance. We could help them to stretch their paltry average budget of $44 a month by allotting to them also such surplus foods as butter, fruits, and potatoes. We could help people with low income to give their children an adequate diet by distributing this good food instead of permitting it to spoil. Mr. Brannan, in reply, maintained he did not have the authority to pay freight and handling charges upon these surplus perishables.

I may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that the Committee on Appropriations, of course, has no basic reason or right to legislate, but I did convince my subcommittee and the chairman of that subcommittee, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], very kindly agreed with me, that it would be only right to place such a provision in our bill in order to call to the attention of the Congress this most serious problem. The opponents of our farm-price-support programs have seized upon the potato and egg surpluses as an excuse to try to wreck our entire program. They do not stop to realize that the entire price-support program has not cost the taxpayers over $100,000,000 yearly since 1940, but on the other hand has done much to hold up our national income.

May I say to the gentleman in direct answer to his question: Yes, I think my amendment needs broadening considerably. A month ago I said on the floor that I personally would be very glad to withdraw my amendment and cooperate in any possible way to help in getting this job done. It makes no difference to me as to whose amendment it is. What I do want is to see this huge quantity of food distributed to people who need it.

At this time I want to commend the gentleman for his insistence during the past 3 months in seeing that something is done toward curing this stigma to our farm price support program and at the same time helping thousands of children in his district get enough to eat.

Mr. HESELTON. I thank the gentleman and I shall place in the RECORD this evening two forms of amendments which I know the gentleman will study. I would appreciate any suggestions he may care to make as to their wisdom. If he feels that either can be improved upon I will try to do that. If he feels they are a constructive approach toward accomplishing what he and I have in mind I would appreciate his support of one of them.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman realizes, of course, that whatever we do is subject to a point of order here on the floor.

Mr. HESELTON. I realize that.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. But I cannot conceive, may I say to the gentleman, that any Member of the House of Representatives will assume the responsibility of getting up here and objecting to a provision in this bill which attempts to make available these tremendous quantities of surplus perishable products to the people in America who need that food.

Mr. HESELTON. That will be a tremendous responsibility for any individual Member to take and I hope we will not be confronted with that situation.

I now include the text of the first amendment which I have prepared:

At line 21, after the citation (7 U. S. C. 612 (c)), strike out the balance of the sentence and insert "and out of funds made available to the Commodity Credit Corporation transportation and handling charges on surplus commodities owned by the Department or any of its instrumentalities or agencies for the purpose of distribution in the order of priority set forth: First, to school-lunch programs, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and Federal, State, and local tax-supported institutions, such as hospitals, orphanages, schools, penal and mental institutions, and public-welfare organizations for the assistance of needy Indians and other needy persons; second, to private welfare organizations for the assistance of needy persons within the United States; third, to private welfare organizations for the assistance of needy persons outside the United States; fourth, to inter governmental or international nonprofit welfare agencies, for assistance to needy persons outside the United States."

You will note that this uses the identical language of the omnibus appropriation bill, provides for payments out of funds made available to the Commodity Credit Corporation and then sets forth four categories of recipients, being those mentioned in the recent conference report as to the disposition of surplus potatoes.

Finally, I submit a further amendment which seeks to combine the language of the conference report on the disposition of surplus potatoes, of section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 and then provides, as has been done in other proposed legislation, for the Secretary to make a determination that such commodities are in ample supply over the necessary reserves and then a provision for the payment out of the equivalent of 6 months' storage charges to cover the cost of transportation, with the proviso suggested by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] when we last discussed this matter:

Page 193, line 18, strike out lines 18 through 24 inclusive, and insert "In order to prevent the waste of food commodities acquired through price-support operations which are found to be in danger of loss through deterioration or spoilage before they can be disposed of in normal domestic channels without impairment of the price-support program, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Commodity Credit Corporation are authorized and directed to make available such commodities as follows in the order of priority set forth: First, to school-lunch programs, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and Federal, State, and local tax-supported institutions, such as hospitals, orphanages, schools, penal and mental institutions, and public-welfare organizations for the assistance of needy Indians and other needy persons; second, to private-welfare organizations for the assistance of needy persons within the United States; third, to private-welfare organizations for the assistance of needy persons outside the United States; fourth, to intergovernmental or international nonprofit welfare agencies, for assistance to needy persons outside the United States. The Secretary of Agriculture shall first determine that such commodities are in ample supply over and above such reserves as may be required and deemed in the public interest. The Secretary of Agriculture and the Corporation shall make any such commodities available at no cost at point of use within the United States or at shipside at port of embarkation. The Secretary and the Corporation may pay as against handling and transportation costs in making delivery up to the equivalent of 6 months' storage costs on any such commodities turned over: *Provided*, That no transportation or handling charges shall be incurred by the Commodity Credit Corporation or Department of Agriculture if in so doing it would lower the total amount of agricultural commodities acquired by any institution or organization through the normal channels of trade and commerce."

I think it might be useful to have a tabulation of data developed from the report of the Commodity Credit Corporation as of December 31, 1949, and in the hearings of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations on which the gentleman from Minnesota is such an able and persuasive a member.

Item for immediate use	Quantities and units	Cost	Carrying charges fiscal 1949 [1]	Carrying charges first half of fiscal 1950 [1]
Butter	98,675,801 pounds	$61,003,323.06	$37,143	$832,778
Cheese	23,935,057 pounds	8,030,266.80		173,277
Dried milk	259,801,803 pounds	33,003,319.68	559,712	1,472,899
Prunes	49,985,455 pounds	5,006,203.64	416,315	1,208,459
Raisins	22,972,380 pounds	2,210,133.26	318,457	612,942
Edible dried beans	4,850,795 hundredweight	42,859,926.40	1,108,233	1,578,449
Rice	431,820 hundredweight	2,936,252.60	1,419	602,837
Dried eggs	76,433,954 pounds	98,645,444.68	1,272,918	1,089,537
Turkeys	725,480 pounds	309,173.80	495	2,681
Canned Mexican meat	49,445,878 pounds	12,468,074.26	No data	No data
Potatoes	2,199 hundredweight	2,864.14	35,358,631	1,654,567
Dried peas	2,048 hundredweight	10,306.32	10,100	563,455
Soybeans	3,028,865 bushels	7,497,729.94	1,907,585	993,247
	90,981 bushels	251,848.90		
Total			40,091,008	[2] 10,785,128

[1] Pt. 5, Hearings before Subcommittee, Appropriations, Agriculture, p. 1419.
[2] $1,797,521 per month or $59,917 per day.

Commodity	Quantities and units	Cost	Carrying charges, fiscal 1949	Carrying charges, fiscal 1950 through Dec. 31, 1949
Peanuts, farmers' stock	70,594,445 pounds	$7,440,793.50	$866,735	$211,561
Peanuts, shelled	2,131,420 pounds	314,041.88	1,850,543	615,077
Soybeans	3,119,846 bushels	7,749,578.84	1,907,585	993,247
Wheat flour	18,470,000 pounds	822,853.62		
Grain sorghum	6,331,299 hundredweight	17,739,460.92	8,768,114	3,145,399
Potato starch	10,632,658 pounds	630,095.76	116,392	31,808
Fats and oils:				
Linseed oil	418,298,054 pounds	118,228,415.79	2,229,004	1,090,041
Menhaden fish oil	138,560 pounds	10,587.16		
Peanut oil	318,065 pounds	39,599.10		
Soybean oil	15,969,620 pounds	1,613,480.15	1,907,585	993,247
Total	434,715,299 pounds	119,892,082.20	4,136,589	2,083,288
Barley	24,641,329 bushels	25,108,620.97	5,764,525	6,169,952
Corn	76,137,725 bushels	116,887,643.88	2,335,826	17,050,439
Oats	11,258,146 bushels	9,596,728.32	1,752,424	1,640,696
Rye	1,613,259 bushels	2,774,578.26	154,324	332,261
Wheat	168,994,882 bushels	414,035,457.41	67,254,089	37,508,624
Total	282,645,341 bushels	568,403,028.84	77,261,188	72,701,972

I believe it will be helpful also to have here a significant portion of the testimony by Ralph S. Trigg, president of the Corporation before the House Agriculture Committee on March 30. I placed the full statement in the RECORD of that date but this part has an important bearing on this subject, dealing as it does with perishable and semiperishable commodities and showing sharp increases in certain of them during January. I call your particular attention to the comparable figures for dried eggs, dried milk, cheese, peanuts, linseed oil, corn, oats, and wheat:

In addition to the distinction between commodities held as loan security and those which are in inventory, another break-down is fundamental in an understanding of surplus-disposal problems. I refer to the difference between storable commodities, which can be kept indefinitely, and the so-called perishables or semiperishables, which must be disposed of in a relatively short time to avoid deterioration or spoilage. The disposal problems for the latter are of course much more immediate and acute.

With this in mind, a look at the break-down between storables and perishables is revealing. In the first place, commodities held as loan security are obviously in the storable class, and 87 percent of the total investment in this group is accounted for by wheat, corn, cotton, and tobacco.

The complete listing of loan advances is as follows:

Corn, 563,745,949 bushels	$768,551,342
Wheat, 324,825,430 bushels	645,036,238
Cotton, upland, 2,638,022 bales	373,536,838
Tobacco, 365,251,157 pounds	145,833,335
Grain sorghum, 42,161,480 hundredweight	94,978,593
Beans, dry edible, 7,145,415 hundredweight	49,254,351
Flaxseed, 9,079,608 bushels	33,640,325
Barley, 27,314,643 bushels	29,792,917
Soybeans, 10,513,484 bushels	22,171,777
Oats, 29,988,676 bushels	19,985,278
Peanuts, 148,232,242 pounds	14,625,376
Rosin, 178,989,169 pounds	12,190,480
Potatoes, 11,175,385 hundredweight	7,829,373
Rice, 1,536,244 hundredweight	6,585,914
Peas, dry edible, 750,343 hundredweight	2,308,535
Turpentine, 2,981,709 gallons	1,225,187
Rye, 823,371 bushels	989,369
Cotton, American Egyptian, 2,667 bales	772,923
Cottonseed, 7,234 tons	357,775
Lespedeza seed, 1,201,000 pounds	$144,089
Total	2,229,810,015

Turning to the commodities which are in inventory, we find a somewhat similar pattern. Of the $1,806,365,438 total cost value of inventory holding on February 28, wheat, corn, and other feed grains, and cotton accounted for $1,278,818,849, or 70 percent. The rest—$527,546,589—covers the semiperishable group and some special commodities such as linseed oil and wool, with the semiperishables themselves accounting for less than $300,000,000. This is obviously the area of immediate problems as far as inventory holdings are concerned.

The complete listing of commodities in inventory, with cost values, is as follows:

Cotton, upland, 3,646,272 bales	$613,353,057
Wheat, 144,853,295 bushels	358,042,121
Corn, 167,582,777 bushels	255,733,783
Linseed oil, 421,577,441 pounds	119,549,121
Eggs, dried, 79,317,979 pounds	101,361,973
Flaxseed, 12,801,153 bushels	81,278,225
Butter, 92,796,753 pounds	57,670,108
Beans, dry edible, 4,865,985 hundredweight	43,025,268
Milk, dried, 294,252,026 pounds	37,532,538
Barley, 25,079,381 bushels	36,064,035
Wool, 35,427,479 pounds	27,688,394
Rosin, 210,837,798 pounds	17,145,215
Cottonseed, 199,478 tons	10,327,809
Oats, 11,255,782 bushels	9,772,260
Cheese, 24,805,653 pounds	8,396,935
Peanuts, farmers' stock, 56,058,463 pounds	5,914,897
Peanuts, shelled, 18,679,120 pounds	2,780,289
Grain sorghum, 2,073,245 hundredweight	5,853,594
Soybeans, 2,005,507 bushels	5,055,644
Prunes, 35,326,345 pounds	3,593,150
Raisins, 9,876,690 pounds	937,061
Turkeys, 3,380,079 pounds	1,366,923
Minor items	3,923,038
Total	1,806,365,438

It will be noted that potatoes, the crop which has posed the most serious current disposal problems, do not show up in this CCC inventory listing. This is because the Government does not buy potatoes to store. It distributes all price-support potato purchases immediately, through whatever diversion outlets are available. The same procedure has been followed with some other crops, principally limited seasonal purchases of fresh vegetables and fruits for immediate school-lunch or welfare distribution. Disposal questions for this group are closely related to those for the holdings of nonstorables.

While pointing out that the immediate questions of disposition center in the nonstorable commodities, and that those of this group which are in inventory or under current purchase operations constitute the real surpluses, I do not wish to leave the impression that there are no serious problems with regard to large CCC holdings of cotton, wheat, corn, and other storable crops. A lot of money is tied up in price-support operations for these crops now, and more undoubtedly will be before we are able to strike a production balance.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to turn to another and a more personal matter involving a reduction in the bill for projects in my district. I want to preface my statement by saying that I deeply appreciate the consideration that was given to these projects by the subcommittee which handled this matter. I want to say, too, that I have discussed the matter of a reduction with responsible officials in the two communities involved and have advised them that, in my opinion, it is an equitable reduction in terms of the reduction applied across the board and that I did not think in fairness to the committee which was undertaking to produce some results so far as sound economy is concerned or in fairness to them I should make any effort to have these sums replaced in the bill by any amendment. These officials and the people they represent are deeply anxious about our fiscal situation. I know I speak for them when I say they are ready to share any fair reduction which can help us in trying to avoid a deficit and in balancing the budget.

That is my present intention. However, I would like to get the record a bit clearer and I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee if it is not true, on page 255 of the committee report, that the amount involved in Adams and North Adams for flood control work is $350,000 each, and that is to be compared with the recommendation of the budget of $500,000 each.

Mr. KERR. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HESELTON. That was my understanding.

I want to call attention to the fact, on page 380 of the hearings on the Civil Function Department of the Army, that there is a list of estimated costs, and as against this $350,000 in Adams the 1951 estimated cost is $4,600,000, and as against the $350,000 in North Adams in 1951 the estimated cost is $13,170,000, so that obviously there is going to be quite a continuing period of time during which this construction will have to be undertaken.

I asked the engineers to advise me as closely as they could as to what the effect would be on both of these projects, and I would like to make this statement at this time primarily because I want the people in my district to know what will not be undertaken in next fiscal year, and to call to the attention of the committee one particularly significant point as to the Adams project.

I am advised that the reduction in funds made by the House will not permit construction of the concrete walls and

levees along a 200-foot length of the main stream and one check dam which was proposed for fiscal year 1951. The check dam is necessary to prevent erosion in the channel and possible damage to permanent works and in lieu thereof it will be necessary to construct a temporary dam closure at an increased project cost of about $10,000. Completion of the project will be delayed for 1 year with the attendant increase in Government cost and continued lack of protection to the area.

In the North Adams project, the reduction in funds made by the House will prevent construction of the concrete paved chute for an additional distance of 400 feet proposed for fiscal year 1951. This will upset the planned schedule of construction operations.

I know that the subcommittee will have these facts in mind next year when we will go into the substantial phase of construction on these two projects.

In the meantime, we can and will pray that these communities shall be spared from floods or high water until the work can be completed at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I wish to call attention to a program being conducted in my native city of Boston aimed at reducing the tragic loss of life and property due to fire. The most harrowing assignment I can think of is that of the fireman who must grope his way to a crib and remove the charred flesh of what a few minutes before was a little child. A child whose little body was horribly burned in a fire that might easily have been prevented.

Today we can pick up the newspapers and read such captions as these: "Mother and three children burned to death in fire." "Family of six children die in flames." "Flash fire wipes out family of nine." "A fire of small damage today took the lives of a mother and two children." "Twenty-two children die in Maine fires the first 2 months of this year." Those are actual stories. And they continue day after day.

I believe that if we give deserved recognition to the program now in operation that similar programs can be adopted throughout the Nation and will go far to reduce this unnecessary slaughter of innocent children. This program is being conducted by the Boston Board of Fire Underwriters, one of the oldest and most effective insurance organizations in the United States, and in cooperation with the Boston schools and the Boston Fire Department. I am particularly interested in the man in charge of this program because he has been a lifelong friend of mine, Herbert L. McNary. His late uncle served in the Congress, representing in this body the district I now have the honor of serving. He represented his people in an outstanding manner.

The program is one of fire-prevention education. I used the word "education" advisedly. To the best of my knowledge this program is the first to recognize that man, himself, is the No. 1 fire hazard. That we must have more than fire protection, which, in substance, is controlling and reducing damage after a fire has started; more than fire prevention, which again in substance is the enactment of protective laws and the administration of these laws and regulations. We must reach man himself.

We are handicapped by the obvious fact that fire has been our friend as well as our enemy since the beginning of time. Only within relatively modern times have we looked upon the ravages of fire as anything else but an act of God. Man's efforts to fight fire dates back only to the early days of our Nation. Even then, to protect one's home against fire one had to join a company and put a special marker on the door. If the wrong apparatus responded the home was permitted to burn.

Even today fire is in the nature of a spectacle, the greatest free show on earth. We are dulled to indifference by the sight of apparatus speeding by or excited to the extent of giving chase according to our natures. But our concern over the potential loss of life is seldom evoked. A fire to most of us is always something that happens to someone else.

When we do concern ourselves with the great fire waste, we are inclined to do so on a natural basis and to concentrate our interest in a Fire-Prevention Week. Both have great limitations. More than almost any other potential threat to life and property fire is a local, community problem. And the problem of fighting fire requires a year-around attention.

Visualizing the need for a year-around action and the wisdom of concentrating on a community, the Boston Board of Fire Underwriters a year ago adopted an intensive fire-prevention campaign. Generally it follows four patterns:

First. Government: This means attention to the enactment of beneficial legislation and the administration of existing laws and regulations.

Second. Business and industry level: This means improving fire protection and providing fire prevention education to factories and mercantile establishments.

Third. Civic and other organizations: This means carrying the fire-prevention education programs directly to the adult.

Fourth. Youth programs. Concentration of effort on this last phase—the youth programs—is the basis of the program I am discussing at this time. Unfortunately, we as a nation, have been so far behind in fire-prevention education that we are almost forced to consider our present adult population as a lost generation. We hear the statement made that carelessness is responsible for 90 percent of all fires. This so-called carelessness results from what people do or fail to do because of habits formed in the home over the years. If we are to reach these adults at all it can best be done through the children. But more important, by providing to the children now the education their elders did not receive we are educating the adults of tomorrow.

This program in Boston, therefore, has three objectives. It catches children at an age when they can form good habits and acquire those instinctive reactions to fire hazards that will serve them later in life. It trains and instructs the children now with the result that they participate in the actual correction of thousands of existing hazards. In addition, through the children, we have the most effective means of reaching the adults.

In my State of Massachusetts as well as in many other States one- and two-family dwellings are specifically exempt from official inspections by firemen and other dwelling units are limited to inspection on complaint only. I do not criticize such laws because there are other factors involved and we need to adhere to the principle that "a man's home is his castle." But it is a fact, too often demonstrated, that a fire in a single home can become a conflagration that wipes out a community.

We must find some means of getting fire-prevention knowledge and fire-hazard correction into these homes. It should be done by the occupants themselves. This is the most effective means of safeguarding the home. And the way to reach the occupants is through the children.

In Boston right after the start of the school year and coincident with Fire Prevention Week, home-inspection blanks, sufficient in number to account for every home in the city, are provided by the Boston Board of Fire Underwriters and distributed through the schools. These are returned completed in great numbers.

Shortly thereafter in all elementary grades the pupils receive on a regular basis about once a month a compact list of fire-hazard warnings that are current at the time such as burning leaves hazards in October, home-heating hazards in November and Christmas hazards in December. These are prepared in a very effective manner and brought home to the parents.

This and other work in lower grades points up to the special program conducted in the sixth grade, which in many schools is the top grade before moving on to a junior high school. In some instances the fifth and seventh grades are combined. But experience has shown that the age group at this stage is the most alert, capable, and responsive for assimilating fire-hazard knowledge and conducting fire-prevention programs.

Trained firemen in uniform provide instruction on periodic visits. On each visit material supplied by the Boston Board of Fire Underwriters is provided. Included is a manual listing the many types of fire hazards to be found in the home.

The high point of the program is reached when a period of 2 to 3 weeks is set for a home and neighborhood inspection drive. Slips are provided on which the hazards corrected are noted and explained. These slips are countersigned by the parent or occupant. The cooperation of the public has been excellent. These boys and girls, and I might say, especially the girls who, in later years will be the homemakers, do a marvelous job. It is not unusual for some to make well over 100 individual corrections. Even at an average of 10 corrections made by each boy or girl this means 10,000 corrected hazards per 1,000 pupils. Five corrected hazards entitles a boy or

girl to an inspector's badge. Gold badges for higher rank are awarded on competitive basis.

There are many other features of the program, such as examinations, fire-prevention compositions, and art work all included in regular classwork. The programs require no additional work of teachers. Instructions are given by firemen, material is provided by the Boston Board of Fire Underwriters, and the handling, distribution, and tallying of material is done by the school children.

Already there has been a marked improvement. For years, in Boston, there had been a stead increase in number of fires and alarms. The building fires per 1,000 population for Boston was one of the highest of all large cities. Already there has been a marked decrease in number of fires, especially in dwellings, and Boston showed the best improvement in 1948 in the building fires per thousand population index of any of the large cities. Even more important, there has been a sharp decrease in the number of deaths due to fire, especially involving children.

In the opinion of qualified fire-prevention experts this program is the most effective means of combating loss of life and property from fire in the homes. I sincerely recommend this program for your consideration in your own districts. I am certain that detailed information will gladly be furnished to any interested party by addressing a request to Herbert L. McNary, executive manager, Boston Board of Fire Underwriters, 89 Broad Street, Boston 10, Mass.

The fear of fires is a constant one existing in our minds. Any constructive proposal and effort to reduce the occurence of fires is a matter of interest to all communities throughout our country. This plan in operation in Boston has produced real results. It also is a character-building program.

(Mr. MCCORMACK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

(Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, in this week's issue of the National Tribune, the editor, Capt. Edward K. Inman, has written an editorial concerning the recent cut-backs in Veterans' Administration personnel and the veterans' hospital-bed situation that is worthy of reproduction in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I know that his sentiments, as expressed in the editorial, are shared by most of you, but it is vitally necessary to do more than feel strongly about this subject. While it is true that cut-backs were made by the Congress it is our duty to those who served for us to act and act promptly to insure that medical service and treatment of our veterans are not impaired by ill-considered reduction programs.

It is not the fault of the Congress, but the administration that the cut-backs in personnel in the Veterans' Administration, and the cut-backs in the construction of the 16,000-bed hospital program have been made, and the elimination and the consolidation of the Army and the Navy hospitals, which has resulted in a great shortage of beds. I think the Members all feel that it should be our duty to insist that the program as planned and authorized and appropriated for by the Congress progress in order that the veterans may have adequate hospitalization.

Captain Inman said in part:

More and more of our elected representatives seem to be recognizing that cut-backs in Veterans' Administration personnel, for the sake of economy alone, the closing of Army hospitals for the same reason, and the earlier orders to vacate in part the VA hospital construction program are all having a disastrous effect on the Nation's obligation to care for its disabled veterans. Protests to the President on the part of legislators and by leaders of veterans' organizations are falling upon deaf ears.

Although I am reliably informed that General Gray will ask the budget for money to continue some of the personnel in the Veterans' Administration hospitals, yet we do not know what the budget of the President will do about that.

The tremendous influx of patients of World War II has made it very difficult to find beds in existing facilities. We know that the end result is that so-called emergency beds are being crowded into sun porches in existing hospitals. Additional ones are being eliminated for want of medical personnel who will not sign up with the VA because jobs would be insecure. Food and sanitation are worsening, and service to the sick and wounded is becoming deplorably bad.

Complaints are coming in to this veterans' spokesman from all over the country. In New York City, for instance, a big center of veteran population, it is asserted that neither ambulance nor bed is longer available in emergency. In Texas, older veterans are being compelled to vacate their beds so that younger ones may be admitted. In Indianapolis recently a very sick and very old veteran was sent home to relatives on a stretcher so that his spot could be filled by another on the waiting list. And so it goes in almost every locality.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the Congress will again insist that this money be reappropriated. It is necessary to appropriate for the cut-backs in personnel. It is not necessary to reappropriate for the construction of facilities for 16,000 beds, because the Appropriations Committee in its wisdom authorized and appropriated that money over 2 years ago. The Congress did not order the closing of Army and Navy hospitals.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. How does the gentlewoman think the Congress is going to get anywhere with its so-called one-package bill approach on appropriations if 2 or 3 months before the end of the fiscal year administrators downtown will say to the country that they have erred grievously and made mistakes involving hundreds of millions of dollars? Where are we going to get with our one-bill approach that is supposed to tell the people about the income and outgo and let the people know where they stand insofar as the expenses of Government are concerned?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. We certainly will not get very far, especially as in the case of the Veterans' Administration, when it did not ask for adequate money. The will of Congress is constantly being thwarted by the administration. I think the only thing that will cure the situation is the tremendous revolt among the people of the country. They feel that we sent the veterans to war and that we should care for them. That is their wish, and they want enough money appropriated and wisely spent for them. They want the administration to be fair to the veterans and to the Congress.

The complete editorial in the National Tribune by Mr. Edward Inman is as follows:

On the floors of Congress these days more and more of our elected Representatives seem to be recognizing that cut-backs in Veterans' Administration personnel, for the sake of economy alone, the closing of Army hospitals for the same reason and the earlier orders to vacate in part the VA hospital construction program are all having a disastrous effect on the Nation's obligation to care for its disabled veterans. Protests to the President on the part of legislators and by leaders of veterans' organizations are falling upon deaf ears. It appears to us that those men and women in the Congress, whose duty it is to assure adequate care to the country's disabled servicemen, must take the bit in their teeth and assume their responsibility whether or not it is pleasing to the administration now in power.

We have discussed on numerous occasions in this column the need to do something and what makes necessary immediate action. Over a year ago, and despite the fact that a huge influx of World War II veterans made enlargement of existing facilities essential, Executive orders were issued to reduce veterans' hospital building by 16,000 beds. More recently an Army reduction of 10,000 beds in service hospitals created a more critical condition because three-quarters of them were under contract for the use of Veterans' Administration patients. Normal building does not begin to take care of the load. The end result is that so-called emergency beds are being crowded into sun porches in existing hospitals; additional ones are being eliminating for want of medical personnel who will not sign up with the VA because jobs would be insecure; food and sanitation are worsening, and service to the sick and wounded is becoming deplorably bad. In addition to these conditions that are alone a blight upon the good name of our Government, dangerously ill patients are being moved out of the hospitals and are being sent home to die.

Complaints are coming in to this veterans' spokesman from all over the country. In New York City, for instance, a big center of veteran population, it is asserted that neither ambulance nor bed is longer available in emergency. In Texas, older veterans are being compelled to vacate their beds so that younger ones may be admitted. In Indianapolis recently a very sick and very old veteran was sent home to relatives on a stretcher so that his spot could be filled by another on the waiting list. And so it goes in almost every locality. Thousands of men, who served their homeland in time of war, are denied medical care, all in the name of doubtful economy, while new means are being found constantly to pour billions of dollars down the sink-holes of the world in the names of charity and the advancement of

backward areas. The word comes through, as it did from the manager of an Illinois hospital a short time ago, needy veterans must give up their beds because it is felt maximum benefits have been had and further treatment "would delay admission of others who are in need of active hospitalization." The long and short of it is that the people, through their responsible representatives, are running out on the men and women to whom they owe their very salvation.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Chairman, I have received letters and telegrams from directors of hospitals in the State of Connecticut, who are seriously concerned over the action of the House Appropriations Committee in reducing the amounts granted for hospital construction and expansion from $150,000,000 to $75,000,000.

Such action, if endorsed by this House, would be a clear breach of faith. Only last year this Congress authorized the larger figure—believing it to be both wise and necessary. Certainly it was the responsibility of the hospital authorities to predicate their future program upon the amount which would be available. Connecticut was to have distributed $1,012,000 for this purpose, and grants were so allotted. If the committee action is upheld the Connecticut share will dwindle to $506,000, I am informed.

This is truly wasteful economy as we are depriving the sick and disabled of proper care and prolonging their absence from occupational pursuits. A sick person neither works nor pays taxes to support the Government. We would be derelict in our public duty were we to now reduce the amount authorized for this purpose. I do not propose to deprive the sick of proper medical care in the name of economy. Should Congress violate its previous action we will go further down the road to socialized medicine as the American people will not tolerate inadequate hospital care.

The funds appropriated by the Government are matched by public or private subscription, and arbitrary action now will do irremedial damage to this manner of financing hospital construction and expansion.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VELDE].

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to take this opportunity to commend and congratulate the Department of Justice and the United States attorney, the presiding judge, and the jury in the trial of Harry Renton Bridges, which resulted in a verdict of guilty yesterday.

This was a long and tedious trial, during which passion and prejudice flared up frequently. The fairness exhibited by Government witnesses, the prosecuting attorney, and the trial judge was typical of our American system of jurisprudence. It goes without saying, of course, that the Federal Bureau of Investigation deserves a large part of the credit for the results of this trial. I happened to be a part of the FBI force which investigated the Harry Bridges case in San Francisco. While the nature of my work in San Francisco made it impossible for me to act as a witness in this case, I am well aware of the fact that the jury's verdict of guilty is well grounded and substantiated by the actual facts. As in other cases involving Communists, the trial judge could not, and, of course, did not, admit evidence secured by the FBI through highly confidential and technical sources. If the jury could have heard Harry Bridges speak as I and hundreds of other FBI agents have heard him at Communist Party meetings and other Red gatherings on the west coast, they would know for a certainty that Harry Bridges perjured himself in connection with his obtaining United States citizenship in 1945.

It is regrettable that much similar information on Communist activities in this country cannot be made available to the American juries and the American people generally, due to restrictions in our laws and the guaranties of our Constitution. The long history of Bridges' connection with communism will, I hope, someday be fully disclosed. It is a perfect example of the treachery and intrigue Stalin's forces are engaging in here in the United States.

The verdict of the San Francisco jury in the Bridges case recalls to our minds that there are still many equally dangerous subversives in the United States who are operating and spreading their filthy propaganda and yet remain untouched by our laws. These subversive forces are still in the very heart of our Government and, unless our law-enforcement agencies become more active and aggressive, may eventually become the tool by which Soviet Russia will establish her Communist dictatorship here in this country. The very thought is abhorrent to all of us who love our freedom and liberty, but is nevertheless realistic. Whether we realize it or not, there is a present and immediate danger to our country from Communist aggression from within.

I urge the President of the United States, who ultimately is in charge of our law-enforcement policy, to forget his political prejudice, to wake up to the real threat to our country, to be an American statesman instead of a political ward heeler, and take up the battle against the threat of communism wherever its treacherous tentacles can be found, and do it now before it is too late.

It has occurred to me that Members of Congress may be interested in reading a brief history of Harry Renton Bridges, so I include in the RECORD at this point a statement concerning his life and activities.

Harry Renton Bridges was born at Melbourne, Australia, on July 28, 1900. He first entered the United States from that country. At the time of his deportation, Bridges was president of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union.

Harry Bridges first entered the United States in 1920. On May 7, 1920, he registered as an alien in the United States Department of Labor. Shortly after his arrival in the country, he went to work as a longshoreman in San Francisco, Calif., at which port he had entered the country. Shortly thereafter he went to New Orleans, La., where, on July 13, 1931, he filed his first papers for application for American citizenship. He failed, however, to perfect his citizenship within the 7 years required by law. On August 9, 1928, less than a month after the expiration of his first period of application, he again filed his first citizenship papers. This declaration was made before the clerk in the United States District Court of the Northern District of California. Again Bridges failed to perfect his citizenship within the required 7 years.

On May 2, 1946, Bridges filed a Form A–2213, which is entitled "Preliminary Form for Declaration of Intention." It might be stated that on all of these forms Bridges made misstatements as to his exact marital status and the number of children he claimed to have had.

In a release dated March 1938, the Department of Labor stated briefly that Bridges had first been charged with communism in 1934 and that an investigation was made at that time and a report was filed on February 2, 1935, but that no action was taken until the fall of 1937, when certain persons filed new complaints against Bridges in the Seattle district of the Immigration and Naturalization Service which was then operating under the Department of Labor. An investigation of these new charges was made during the winter of 1937 and on March 5, 1938, Bridges was served with a warrant and was given a preliminary examination at the Baltimore office of the Immigration and Naturalization Service. As a result of this hearing, Bridges was held for a hearing on deportation charges.

During the summer of 1939 a deportation hearing involving Harry Bridges was held before James M. Landis, who at the time was dean of the Harvard Law School. On December 28, 1938, Dean Landis turned in his verdict, in which he said:

> The evidence, therefore, establishes neither that Harry R. Bridges is a member of, nor affiliated with, the Communist Party of the United States of America.

On February 14, 1941, Harry Bridges was again arrested and held for deportation on a charge that after entering the United States he had been a member of, or affiliated with, an organization, association, society, or group that believes in, advocates, or teaches the overthrow by force or violence of the Government of the United States. From March 3, 1941, through June 12, 1941, hearings were held in connection with this second deportation charge.

On May 28, 1942, Hon. Francis Biddle, Attorney General of the United States, in a deportation proceeding entitled "Re Bridges" made a finding that the Communist Party is an organization that advocates the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States. On the same date an order of deportation was made by the Attorney General against Bridges. On January 30, 1945, the Supreme Court agreed to hear arguments on the Bridges case. On April 2, 1945, the Court reviewed the facts of the Bridges case. On June 19, 1945, the Supreme Court ruled 5 to 3 that the deportation order issued against Harry Bridges was illegal. Justices Douglas, Black, Reed, Murphy, and Rutledge voted for Bridges. Justices Rob-

erts, Frankfurter, and Stone dissented. Justice Jackson did not participate.

On September 19, 1945, Harry Bridges became a naturalized citizen of the United States in San Francisco, Calif.

On May 25, 1949, Harry Bridges was indicted by the Federal grand jury in San Francisco, Calif., on charges of conspiracy and perjury in connection with his obtaining citizenship. On April 4, 1950, as a result of these charges, Harry Bridges was convicted in Federal court in San Francisco, Calif.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. PRIEST, having assumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the general appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1951 be concluded when the House adjourns tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the general appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1951 have right of way over all other privileged business under the rules until disposition, with the exception of conference reports.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. CHRISTOPHER (at the request of Mr. CANNON) was given permission to address the House for 1 hour on Wednesday, April 19, 1950, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

REHABILITATION OF NAVAJO AND HOPI TRIBES OF INDIANS

Mr. MORRIS submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (S. 2734) to promote the rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Tribes of Indians and a better utilization of the resources of the Navajo and Hopi Indian Reservations, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1892)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2734) to promote the rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Tribes of Indians and a better utilization of the resources of the Navajo and Hopi Indian Reservations, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House numbered 2 and 3, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Omit the matter proposed to be stricken out by said amendment; insert the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment; and on page 8, line 11, of the Senate engrossed bill strike out "(1)"; and on page 8, line 22, of the Senate engrossed bill, beginning with the comma strike out through the word "Indians" in line 25; and the House agree to the same.

TOBY MORRIS,
JOHN R. MURDOCK,
COMPTON I. WHITE, Idaho,
WILLIAM LEMKE,
WESLEY A. D'EWART,
Managers on the Part of the House.

ERNEST W. MCFARLAND,
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
ZALES N. ECTON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (S. 2734) to promote the rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Tribes of Indians and a better utilization of the resources of the Navajo and Hopi Reservations, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to amendments of the House Nos. 1, 2 and 3, and agree that certain language at the end of Section 9 be stricken so that section 9 shall read as follows:

"SEC. 9. Beginning with the quarter commencing July 1, 1950, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay quarterly to each State (from sums made available for making payments to the States under sections 3 (a), 403 (a), and 1003 (a) of the Social Security Act) an amount, in addition to the amounts prescribed to be paid to such State under such sections, equal to 80 per centum of (1) the total amounts of contributions by the State toward expenditures during the preceding quarter by the State, under the State plans approved under the Social Security Act for old age assistance, aid to dependent children, and aid to the needy blind, to Navajo and Hopi Indians residing within the boundaries of the State on reservations or on allotted or trust lands, with respect to whom payments are made to the State by the United States under sections 3 (a), 403 (a), and 1003 (a), respectively, of the Social Security Act, not counting so much of such expenditure to any individual for any month as exceeds the limitations prescribed in such sections."

Amendment 1: The Senate, in receding from its disagreement to amendment No. 1 of the House, reached the agreement with the conferees of the House for striking certain language at the end of section 9 which has the effect of attaining the desired purposes of section 9.

Section 9 as amended by amendment No. 1 of the House provides that the payment by the Secretary of the Treasury to each State, under section 3 (a), 403 (a), and 1003 (a) of the Social Security Act, shall be (1) increased by 80 percent of the States' share of the total assistance payment made to the Navajo and Hopi Indians and (2) reduced by the total amounts paid to each State by the United States under section 3 (a), 403 (a), and 1003 (a) of the Social Security Act with respect to such Indians. To illustrate the effect of this provision, the payment of $50 to an individual Indian is assumed. A break-down of the payments under such assumption is as follows:

1. Total payment, $50.
2. Regular Federal share, $30.
3. Regular State share, $20.
4. Additional Federal contribution 80 percent of ($20–$30) or 80 percent of $10, $8.

It may be readily seen that the effect of this section is nullified. In fact, the section has the effect of producing an absurd result. Under its most favorable interpretation the States would be entitled to no additional Federal contribution.

The agreement, however, by the conferees to strike the language at the end of section 9 cures the above-noted defect.

The stricken language is as follows: "reduced by (2) the total amounts paid to such State by the United States for such quarter under sections 3 (a), 403 (a), and 1003 (a) of the Social Security Act with respect to such Indians."

To illustrate the effect of section 9 as agreed to by the conferees, the payment of $50 to an individual Indian is assumed. A break-down of the payments under such assumption is as follows:

1. Total payment, $50.
2. Regular Federal share, $30.
3. Regular State share, $20.
4. Additional Federal contribution (80 percent of $20), $16.
5. Total Federal contributions, 30 plus $16, $46 or 92 percent of payment.

Amendment 2: A perfecting amendment which is self-explanatory.

Amendment 3: A perfecting amendment which is self-explanatory.

TOBY MORRIS,
JOHN R. MURDOCK,
COMPTON I. WHITE,
WILLIAM LEMKE,
WESLEY A. D'EWART,
Managers on the Part of the House.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report and statement on the bill S. 2446.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRIEST). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

(The conference report and statement appears in the Appendix of today's RECORD.)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WERDEL (at the request of Mr. TABER) was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

Mr. BOYKIN (at the request of Mr. MORRIS) was given permission to extend his remarks and include certain telegrams and an article contained in a recent issue of the Saturday Evening Post, entitled "We'll Never Make Them Do It Our Way," notwithstanding the fact that the estimate of the Public Printer is that the cost will be $266.50.

Mr. WICKERSHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a bill which he introduced today relating to grain bugs in wheat and some letters from certain committees.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a speech made by Mr. Joseph C. Duggan, and a memorandum prepared for him by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress.

Mr. PATTERSON (at the request of Mr. CANFIELD) was given permission to extend his remarks immediately following the remarks made by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mr. ENGLE of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in two instances, in one to include a letter and resolution from the Board of Selectmen of Watertown, Mass., and in the other a letter from William Foster, Deputy Administrator of ECA.

REREFERENCE OF BILL

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 743) for the relief of Mrs. Margaret D. Surhan, and that the bill be rereferred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL] is recognized for 15 minutes.

RENT CONTROLS

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, if rent control is ended with one quick blow at the end of June, what will happen to millions of American families who cannot pay more rent without cutting expenditures for other necessities?

Congress could answer with accuracy only if it had a report from every American family in those remaining rent-control areas where available housing does not meet demand. I submit that these reports would prove the need for a continuation of rent controls.

For presentation to Congress, I wish every Seattle tenant, for instance, could and would answer the following questions:

First. If rent control is ended, what do you expect to happen to your rent?

Second. Can you afford an increased rent?

Third. What part of your income now goes to rent?

Fourth. How much of an increase could you pay before changing your present living arrangements?

Fifth. If the increases are greater than you can afford, how would you change your living arrangements:

(a) Would you double up with other persons or other families?

(b) Would you try to find cheaper quarters?

(c) Would you buy a home?

(d) Would you take in roomers or boarders?

Sixth. If you could not change your living arrangements, would you meet the increased rentals:

(a) By having additional family members seek employment?

(b) By reducing expenditures for other items, if so what items?

(c) By forfeiting goods being paid for on the installment plan?

(d) By substituting credit and installment for cash purchases?

(e) By reducing savings?

(f) By going into debt?

(g) By going on relief?

With answers to these questions from Seattle, or any other representative area, the Congress would have at least an approximation of the answers to national questions such as these which decontrol would raise:

How many families will be standing on the streets—eviction cases—looking for a roof overhead?

How many families will have savings they can draw upon to make up the increases?

What will increased rents mean to the livelihood of the butcher, the baker, the clothier, the farmer, the doctor, and all the other producers and suppliers of life's necessities, when this decrease in purchasing power begins to take effect?

These questions ought to be fully considered, lest we make hasty and unwise decisions. It is easy enough for the Members to stand here and debate the pros and cons of rent-control legislation on a high legal and technical plane. I'm think of the family that will wake up the morning of July 1 and find a notice from the landlord that the rent has been raised.

And let us not fool ourselves that rents will stay put without controls. The Bureau of Labor Statistics made a recent survey of rents in the decontrolled city of Dallas, Tex. The results showed that 59 percent of all tenants had rent increases and their increases averaged 36 percent.

I remember reading a letter from a Dallas mother soon after decontrol. Her rent was just about doubled. What happened to the rest of the family budget? Some of the rent money was taken out of the small sum that went for the children's school supplies, including their clothes and shoes and lunch money. The cleaning man got less business, even though the family wanted to be properly dressed for churchgoing. This mother could not afford train fare to be at the side of a stricken relative in another city.

This Dallas mother was bitter—and she had a right to be. Her city was a "big man's town," as she described it, and the penthouse dwellers who ran the city did not care very much about the plight of the small renter.

Bear in mind, further, that the families with the largest numbers of children will suffer the most. Available studies show that the largest families are bunched in the lower income range. More children to feed and clothe means less for each one—and still less when the rent-taker gets more.

One-fourth of all the families in the country have annual incomes of less than $2,000. If rent controls go quickly and prematurely, these families will pay more rent. But they will eat less, wear poorer clothes, cut down on other essentials—and the economy will suffer with them.

The Bureau survey I cited above showed that 71 percent of the Dallas families with incomes of less than $2,000 a year reported rent increases after decontrol, and their increases averaged 47 percent. It is true that when you average these increases with the units which had no increases, the over-all increase in the city's rent bill was not as great, but I call attention to the fact that this survey was conducted soon after rent controls had been removed and that many additional tenants received notices of increases to become effective after the date of the survey.

Some months ago the organized landlords of Cook County, Ill., which embraces the city of Chicago, carried their case for rent increases—for the second time—to the United States Emergency Court of Appeals. They pointed to evidence which they said justified a 71.5 percent increase. They insisted that the court order a 45 percent increase now, and that they were willing to take the balance after rent control was removed.

What would such increases mean to the millions of families I have been talking about? Our middle and low income families are already struggling to make ends meet. When food and clothing prices jumped up, they took cheaper cuts of meat, and made their old clothing do another year. But if their rents soar, they have no other choice except to beat the pavements in search of a meaner dwelling.

Let us review the housing and rent control situation briefly. Congress approved such control originally due to a national emergency. The war effort caused a vast movement of people to industrial centers. Housing facilities were strained to the breaking point and rents threatened to soar skyward. Wherever the impact of the war effort presented such a threat, rent control was established.

The housing shortage increased by leaps and bounds during the war years when we lacked materials or manpower to build new houses. Add to these housing pressures the tremendous increase in families which accompanies every war.

Just what is the situation today? New housing has gone up since the war, but we are still at least 2,000,000 units short of the increase in families. Since 1940, about 5,000,000 new units have been produced, but there are 7,000,000 more families.

When the building industry began to tackle this enormous housing shortage, it turned first to the production of high-price houses for home ownership and sale. Sights were set high, so high that they overlooked the needs of the average family. A small percentage of the housing units were built for rent, and these at rents which the average family cannot afford.

It does not take a brochure of statistics to prove that rentals for newly built two-bedroom units usually start at about $90 per month. This is common knowledge, and we also know that the average income of the American family cannot begin to measure up to such housing costs.

ness of the House under the rule until disposition. The order made was until final disposition. I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD and Journal be corrected to conform with the proceedings on the floor of the House yesterday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MAGEE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois (at the request of Mr. MITCHELL) was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. MITCHELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. THOMPSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. BOYKIN (at the request of Mr. ANDREWS) was given permission to extend his remarks and include a statement by Mr. W. I. McElroy, of Mobile, Ala.

Mr. JACOBS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the magazine America.

Mr. BIEMILLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and to include certain speeches and newspaper articles, and to extend his remarks in another instance and include an article by Dr. Edward E. Witt, the head of the department of economics of the University of Wisconsin entitled "The Role of Unions in Contemporary Society," notwithstanding the fact that it is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $287.

Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. DONOHUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. RABAUT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article from the Detroit News wherein Cardinal Edward Mooney, archbishop of Detroit, explains the stand of the Catholic Church on the school-aid bill.

Mr. LYNCH (at the request of Mr. COOPER) was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include excerpts.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HUBER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. EBERHARTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks notwithstanding that it exceeded two pages of the RECORD and, according to the Public Printer, will cost $191.34 to print.

Mr. WOLVERTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include newspaper articles and also quotations from hearings.

Mr. FENTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he will make in Committee this afternoon on the appropriation bill and include certain excerpts.

Mr. SCRIVNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks on the subject Socialized Medicine.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter.

Mr. TALLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in four instances, to include in one a resolution adopted by the New York State Legislature, and in the other three editorials.

Mr. STOCKMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial by David Lawrence.

Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include in one an editorial.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in five instances and include in each extraneous matter.

Mr. HAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances.

Mr. HESELTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include in each extraneous matter.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include an editorial by George Rothwell Brown.

Mr. GWINN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, one entitled "Our Freedom of Religion Threatened," and the other "Shall the People's Congress Be Ignored?"

Mr. TOLLEFSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter in each.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. MICHENER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington (at the request of Mr. MANSFIELD) was given permission to extend his remarks and include a column by Peter Edson relative to the passing of Gen. Muir S. Fairchild.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. LEMKE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include certain tables.

GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1951

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] had consumed 4 hours and 37 minutes and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] had consumed 5 hours and 36 minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARRISON].

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, for several days, now, we have been considering a bill to spend more than $27,000,000,000 of the taxpayers' money and to authorize contracts costing nearly two billions in addition.

This year, at least, we are more able to see what we are doing. Most Federal costs—with foreign aid a major exception—have been placed before us in a single general appropriation bill.

And the Committee on Appropriations has demonstrated in its report on the bill an awareness of the very serious financial situation to which our National Government has come. It does not require the analysis of an economist to make plain that a Nation traveling a road of deficit financing in time of prosperity is bent for bankruptcy.

We have been told that the Committee on Appropriations has done the most that can be done at this time toward holding down on this unconscionable deficit. We have heard that the costs of past wars and of our efforts to prevent another calamity represent such a large proportion of the Federal charges that only relatively modest reductions can be made if we are to avoid crippling Government services.

This simply is not true. We have spent ourselves into new deficits through the mounting costs of domestic programs in the name of public welfare. There is no need to juggle figures to prove this. Line up the figures for the 1947 fiscal year and the budget proposals for the 1951 fiscal year in such areas as housing, health, security and welfare. They will establish quickly and clearly that it is the welfare-state idea that is responsible.

The increases in costs linked to the welfare-state concept total an amount virtually equal to the predicted deficit.

The Committee on Appropriations has reduced the President's proposed cash outlay for the next fiscal year by a little more than one and a third billion dollars. As it stands, the bill would provide approximately $832,000,000 less than appropriated for the current fiscal year for the items covered. Contract authority has been cut $182,000,000 from the Presi-

dent's figures, and it is about one and four-fifths of a billion less than the contract clearance given for this fiscal year.

Nearly half a billion dollars of the committee's reduction in cash allowances, however, means nothing at all. Nothing, that is, except a difference of opinion as to how much will be required to meet certain obligations to which the Federal Government already is committed. In other words, if the costs amount to more than the committee estimates, they will have to be paid anyway.

But there are some genuine savings in the bill as reported. And, already we have evidence in this debate of the economy in general but not in particular philosophy.

Already, the lobbies are at work—the lobbyists from the executive departments and the pressure groups from outside Government. The piteous wails of false economy assail our ears from all sides. Everyone is for economy, but no one wants to get hurt. We are told that the committee has erred grievously with respect to this item or that—that a program will be damaged irreparably—that the Nation will suffer much more by saving this money than by spending it.

The executive department is full of programs—expensive plans for leading the American people by the hand—planning their day-by-day existence. The programs grow and multiply. There seems to be no serious thought of fewer programs, even with the vitality of our governmental economy being drained away on deficit excursions.

This pattern is familiar. It has obtained through many years. In some sessions of Congress there has been more talk of economy than in others. Rarely, however, has a serious attempt been made actually to lop off a substantial amount from the ever-mounting bill for running the Nation.

This lip service to economy has not been regarded with alarm in the past. The Nation has been able to stay in business, despite the increasing tax burden and even Federal deficits.

But these are different times. And, if we do not recognize promptly how drastically different they are, we are going to be jolted from our placidness one of these days and find ourselves under the rubble of the economic system we have come to regard as sound beyond question.

It has always been a case with us of more money where the last came from—a higher tax, or a new one, to meet an enlarged Federal budget. As a nation, we always have been able to carry ourselves well financially. But now we also are carrying, either directly or indirectly, most of the non-Communist world.

And communism, wearing a cynical grin, is standing there watching us and thinking: "That can't go on forever. They'll fall on their faces. We can wait. That's the day we'll take charge."

We still are able to get by, it is true. For the first time in our history, however, there is a clear and present danger that the elasticity of our national economy is approaching overextension. Yes, we are getting by; but how much longer can we avoid drastic action to provide our financial structure an adequate safety margin?

Let us look at the economic situation today. We are getting by—barely—because our national income has been swollen by inflationary forces. Our people have had the money; they have been able to pick up the check for the Federal Government's unabashed spending spree.

We are faced with the prospect of ending the fiscal year June 30 with a Federal deficit. If costs of Government are not cut, or taxes increased, that deficit, it is estimated, will near the $6,000,000,000 mark in the next fiscal year.

The talk of economy increases, and yet, in the face of the chilling truths, we do not take any vigorous action to save ourselves. The spending and thé waste continue.

It is easy to say we can vote more taxes if conditions become obviously critical. But this is to forget that we already are in the area of diminishing return in Federal taxation. A substantial new boost in levies well could be the factor which would nudge us into a deflationary sinkhole. As with the overburdened camel, private business could sink to its knees under the new imposts.

The alternative, of course, is deficit financing. The people still are buying their Government's bonds. And it is sensible that they do so. There is no sounder investment. But we must recognize that a complex artificial structure supports these obligations, which now exceed $250,000,000,000, exclusive of the paper issued by Government corporations.

The market for Government bonds is not a free market. Much of the purchasing is assured by Federal Reserve Board regulations which tell a bank what types of investment it may make.

Now Government obligations can be placed readily among private investors, but how many billions more could they afford to take? What would be the result if a depression forced widespread liquidation of such investments in the desperate need for cash? Would the inconceivable come to pass? Would obligations of the United States Government become a drudge on the financial market?

I say this no longer is inconceivable. Should it occur, the printing press—devaluation of the currency with its almost inevitable concomitant of economic chaos—would be the final desperate choice offered us.

The issue is clear enough, but seemingly, we persist in turning our eyes away. It is either more taxes, deficit financing, or economy.

A lone hopeful sign is the apparent increase in serious concern about our economic plight. But economy remains in the talking stage. We have not begun to save money in this Eighty-first Congress. We continued to nudge the cost of National Government upward—a few millions here, a few millions there, until another billion mark is passed, and another.

Bureaucrats have a standard operating procedure in dealing with appropriation cuts. It has served them well for years, and it will continue to do so until the Nation's financial situation forces us to forthright action—and I say that situation exists now. When a reduction is voted, do these agency heads and their underlings seriously try to increase efficiency in their operations—to eliminate some of the purposeless paper work, to discharge some of the drones who are drumming desk tops on Washington headquarters?

Certainly not. They eliminate an important service usually closing down facilities in the States. Then when the complaints roll in, they say, "Tell Congress your troubles, they cut our money." Members of Congress then are deluged with angry communications. Before long, the agency has more money than ever, despite the fact honest economy would have enabled it to provide the services actually needed and wanted by the public on even less money than the reduced appropriation.

We know there is waste in the Federal Government, but few of us, even in Congress, have the facilities to track down sufficient evidence to make a tangible case. This has been done, however, in an exhaustive manner by the Hoover Commission. We have seen how millions are frittered away through duplication of services, duplication of procurement, duplication of accounting systems. We have seen such inexcusable bungling and wastage of tax money as the Army asking and getting funds to repair more tanks than it had on hand and to outfit thousands more soldiers than were on duty.

The consolidating and streamlining of elements of the executive branch affords one means of achieving important savings. Thousands of Government employees could be discharged without loss of essential services. No Federal worker has a vested right in a lifetime job. The people of the Nation as a whole are under no obligation, legal or moral, to continue indefinitely paying the salaries of a horde of paper shufflers in Washington. In any business operation, including Government, the efficient worker who provides a useful service never needs to fear for his own security. But, for too many years, we have been supporting employees who are excess baggage—who have no function meriting public financing.

Our Federal Government is busy making surveys of interest to minute segments of our population. It is employing thousands of workers to prepare exhaustive reports on obscure topics. Hundreds of these projects which, in sum, cost millions of dollars each year, could be eliminated. They could be provided by the States, local communities, or private organizations to those groups interested. There is no sense in the requirement that our citizens as a group pay for multifarious operations in which few of them have any interest.

There is no denying the fact we are living in an armed camp in the world today. We must spend billions on armed might in our effort to preserve democracy against Communist threats.

If a stable peace could be achieved, we could afford to consider which deferred projects of the Federal Govern-

ment still warranted expenditure of public funds. And, more important, we could reduce taxes and stimulate our free-enterprise system.

But, until that enduring tranquillity is realized, we simply cannot afford so much Government at home. We must take care of our own needs largely on an individual or localized basis and hold Federal Government to a minimum. In doing so, we must deny ourselves many things that seem necessities—new dams and bridges, great reclamation projects, all sorts of extensive construction.

This is a world emergency that seems destined to go on for some time. We need to conserve our economic strength, lest the Communists outstay us. Certainly, this is no time to embark on new Federal adventures in public housing or medicine, even if we should decide the public interest ultimately required further governmental activity in these fields—and this certainly still is in an area of doubt.

The Federal Government already is engaged in 57 different kinds of grants-in-aid programs for the States. These cost more than $2,000,000,000 a year. This is another class of Federal expenditure which has been labeled "untouchable." I think it is mislabeled.

Some of these grants-in-aid programs are worth while. But if we are going to avoid the grave dangers of higher taxation or deficit financing, even these must be placed under searching scrutiny.

In some way, we must convince the people of this country that the new dams, new post offices and other delights, while needed, must be denied until we emerge from this shadowland between war and peace.

Congress must represent the people, Senators and Representatives must be responsive to the wishes of their constituents. If they are not, they fail in their responsibility to representative Government. But I do not believe the citizens of the United States, when acquainted with the facts, will instruct us to vote them into national bankruptcy.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON].

(Mr. JACKSON of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, throughout this session of Congress, and in this debate, there has been much talk of cutting Government expenditures, balancing the budget, and promoting a sound fiscal policy. There has also been a great deal of talk about eliminating waste.

This is as it should be. But I think we should all have a clear idea of what a sound, long-range fiscal policy consists of, and we should also realize that all waste does not lie in Government. The most colossal wastes of all lie in depression and unemployment.

I inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD on Tuesday an article appearing in United States News and World Report. Its headline reads:

Despite good times, nearly 5,000,000 are out of work and the number is growing. Unemployment is beginning to look permanent. Trouble is growth of the labor force. Jobs cannot open up fast enough to keep abreast at present business levels.

Unemployment is not an economic disease that hits suddenly, like a heart attack. It is like a creeping paralysis. It grows quietly for a few months, then it stops. Then it moves ahead again. We feel a temporary alarm when we see that in February unemployment rose to 4,700,000. We are lulled into inaction again because in March it went down by a half million.

We forget that, as sure as the baseball season will open this month, in May and June our schools and colleges will release their biggest graduating classes in history—over a million and a half new job seekers will flood the labor market.

Like it or not, America is faced with the fact that its population grows by about two and one-half million every year—and that every year there are nearly a million new job seekers.

Like it or not, America's economic body must grow or submit to this creeping paralysis of unemployment.

We talk about waste in government. Every person that is unnecessarily out of work could produce about $3,000 worth of goods and services. If unemployment hits the five million mark—which it will this June—you can figure that we are wasting about $9,000,000,000 every year—assuming that even in so-called full employment there are about 2,000,000 people officially unemployed. I am not even counting the toll of human despair, misery, and poverty involved in widespread unemployment.

In these prosperous times we forget that in 1939 we still had 9,500,000 people out of work. We forget that a third of our entire Federal budget—as much as we now spend on our Defense Establishment—went to relief purposes. Three billion dollars for relief alone.

This may seem somewhat far afield from our appropriations bill, but I assure you, as a member of the Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations, that it is not. For if we are to make the economic body of America grow we must make sure that we are replacing the muscle and bone that is used up in its everyday functioning, and that we are helping to build more muscle and bone for its future growth. In short, America's economy cannot expand unless her resources are preserved and expanded.

That has been one of our primary considerations in the Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations. We have considered most of the Interior expenditures as investments in our resources—in the future of our economy. We have weighed carefully the short-run savings to be gained from a budget cut against the possible long-run cost to our Nation through the elimination of a certain resource-building program.

We have asked ourselves two questions—not only "Can we afford to make these expenditures?"—but also "Can we afford not to make them?"

Any sensible businessman makes sure that he is making ample provision to put back into his plant what he takes out of it in wear and tear every year. If he wants his plant to grow, he sets aside an additional amount.

Therefore, I believe that part of a sound fiscal policy for America involves taking a long-range view of the cost of expenditures versus the cost of budget cuts. It involves putting back into America's economy what we take out of it—and building toward an expanding America.

Indiscriminate budget cutting may well be penny wise and pound foolish. I hope that every Member of this House will ask himself both questions—"Can we afford not to spend?" as well as "Can we afford to spend?"

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, it was not my intention at this stage in the general debate on the appropriation bill to address myself to that bill. As a member of the Subcommittee on State, Justice, and Commerce Departments, I would wait until that subcommittee's chapter was before the Committee. However, after listening for a few minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Washington, who just preceded me, and bringing to the attention of the Committee the fact that I have the honor of representing a district in the great State of Pennsylvania, which is the center of the hard-coal industry, I find it necessary to bring to the attention of the Committee that there exists there a desperate and acute unemployed problem. That problem is not the result of any mine strike. I am speaking of the hard-coal industry. We were not out on strike. We have been working, but there exists there certain economic problems. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], who just preceded me, described it well when he referred to unemployment as a marked economic waste. Economy as well as physics abhors any sort of vacuum. The desperate unemployment percentage that exists in the hard-coal fields of Pennsylvania is that kind of economic vacuum—is that kind of economic waste.

Mr. Chairman, the statisticians of the Department of Commerce and of the Department of Labor advise me that when the percentage of unemployment reaches to the mark of 10 that it is desperate and alarming and calls for immediate attention and solution. May I point out to this Committee that there exists in my congressional district at this time not merely a percentage of 10, but I have 25,000 unemployed men between the ages of 17 and 50—25,000, mark you, out of 400,000 people. There exists no place in this country such a desperate and acute economic problem.

I yield to my distinguished colleague from the great city of Scranton.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Chairman, at this time I wish to state to the House that unemployment in Lackawanna County is 27,000.

Mr. FLOOD. May I say that the gentleman from Pennsylvania who just preceded me, Mr. O'NEILL, is from an adjacent anthracite coal district to mine.

I now yield to my distinguished colleague and neighbor from another hard-coal district in Pennsylvania, Mr. FENTON.

Mr. FENTON. I appreciate this opportunity, I may say to my colleague. I certainly concur in everything he has said regarding the unemployment situation in Pennsylvania. My district, as the gentleman has stated, borders on his. We have, I think, in the neighborhood of some 25,000 people unemployed. I am sure the gentleman is aware that when I was a member of the subcommittee on which he now serves, I called it to the attention of the Commerce Department, the State Department, and all Departments of the Government even remotely connected with it, called to their attention the sad plight we find ourselves in, and I have been assured by them, time and time again, including the assistant to the President of the United States, Mr. Steelman, that they would do everything in their power to help remedy the situation.

Mr. FLOOD. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution. The gentleman is now a member of the Interior Department subcommittee of the great Committee on Appropriations under the leadership of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]. I am sure that that great subcommittee with its distinguished chairman is doing everything reasonably possible to be of aid to this area of America's economy.

Mr. Chairman, may I add that since I have been a Member of this House—and the same thing is true of my colleagues from the hard-coal fields and the great metropolitan and industrial areas of Pennsylvania—we have voted consistently to aid and support the development of programs of agricultural subsidies. My great misfortune is that I do not have on this floor 150 or 250 Members who have in their districts anthracite coal. If I did, then I would have anthracite subsidies. I would have at least some proper recognition that hard coal is a material, important, and vital contributor to the soundness of America's economy. But we of the hard coal, the anthracite coal are only a handful, we are no powerful bloc of votes in the House cutting across party lines; we seem to be pretty much alone with our problem and with no sign of aid.

I shall introduce later legislation to strike boldly at the unemployment problem generally and further legislation to call for Federal aid to the anthracite industry and the finest Americans in the country—the mine workers. The Federal Government must help; the State of Pennsylvania cannot or will not. Anthracite coal must be stock-piled as an essential to national security and welfare. Work must be assured to our mine workers. This Nation must have the same concern for the miner and his family and the businessmen of the mining areas that it has for the farmer and the rural businessman; and the anthracite areas are going to get help if I have to raise my voice and temper and persistence to equal that of the collective sound and fury of the farm bloc. I frankly ask the help of the farm bloc, give us work and we will eat your food and pay dollars for it. We do not want and will not take charity, we want work, jobs, work, jobs, work, jobs, in the mines and factories of a new and prosperous anthracite area of this, our Nation, too.

Let me point out that the minute the hard-coal miner goes on strike, you are up in arms, you raise your hands to high heaven, you decry the loss of anthracite coal and state that the country is going to perdition, "let us put them in jail or put them in uniform or drive them to work," so you talk, "do something to get anthracite coal, they are destroying America." So you say when there is no coal available.

Well, we have a record of patriotism and production and economy that is hard to be equaled in the rural areas or in any other areas of America. We have been faithful in our support of you, the great and powerful and majestic farm bloc, without exception. But we have some rights. We are Americans, too, and we are in a desperate plight there. We have the right to demand your help—we do not come hat in hand as beggars—do not ever forget that.

I consulted every man in this House whom I felt might know how we could amend the mining bills to have anthracite coal declared a stock-pile item. That could not be done. We could not have anthracite coal placed on the list of essentials for stock-piling. That, they advised me, could not be done. I did not try, as some of you, to amend for various reasons the great ECA bill and make it a matter of law that we should buy anthracite coal and send it to Europe whether they want it or not.

I come from a district where the vast majority of the people and population are of first and second generation, Europeans from the great races of Latin and Slav Europe, and as desperate as they are in their own economy they support my position in supporting ECA and in encouraging this Government, and complimenting it, on what has been done. In their desperation they will do that. These people are not petty—these are great Americans—they know the European problem—they sacrifice to aid others in need.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. Having visited the anthracite region in Pennsylvania, I have the deepest and sincerest sympathy with the sorrowful and the tragic plight in which the gentleman's constituents find themselves at this hour. I may say that the lead and zinc miners down in the Tri-State area of southwest Missouri, southeastern Kansas, and northeastern Oklahoma are in the same predicament. To me it is utter folly that we should vote billions abroad while we neglect our own people here as home. I think the gentleman has made a fair statement and I know every word he has spoken is true.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I concur with my friend except I cannot accept that part of his contribution which uses the word "folly." It is not folly to do what this Congress and this Nation have done to aid and succor Europe in our great fight and theirs against the encroachment of atheistic communism. The ECA bill is that kind of a bill. It is a security measure, not a relief measure. But I do concur with the distinguished gentleman from Missouri when he refers to the miners of America. I speak for the anthracite coal miners, he brings to my attention lead and zinc, my friends the gentlemen from Pennsylvania [Mr. O'NEILL and Mr. FENTON] join with me in holding a brief for anthracite coal. There are men from Pennsylvania who can speak more eloquently than I for soft coal. But we are bringing to your attention the desperate plight of the anthracite coal fields with reference expressly to unemployment. This has nothing to do alone with coal. There is an economic cancer there that you must help us destroy. Mr. Chairman, we of the coal fields have a right to this attention—I have confidence this House will not say us nay.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JACOBS].

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, the other day the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] pointed out that the hospital appropriation had been cut from $150,000,000 to $75,000,000. He stated that it was his purpose to offer an amendment to the appropriation bill to restore the figure to $150,000,000 as a humanitarian measure in the establishment of hospital facilities to take care of the sick. In the absence of convincing argument to the contrary, I intend to support his amendment, but I rise today to bring to the attention of the House a method by which they can recoup the $75,000,000 that we would add to the $75,000,000 now in the bill simply by enacting a just law.

I want to bring to the attention of the House a problem, and that is the problem of deserted children in this country. There are about 1,000,000 children and mothers that have been deserted by fathers who have taken refuge in other States and who have practical immunity behind State lines. It is a problem that the State courts and the prosecuting attorneys have been utterly unable to cope with, and from the correspondence I have had with State welfare departments I have estimated that approximately $125,000,000 to $150,000,000 is taken out of public treasuries every year to support the children of absconding fathers who have even less decency than that possessed by the lower animals who at least take care of their young until

they are self-supporting. That is a problem, and a problem that States have been unable to cope with, and there is only one solution that I can think of, and that is to empower the Federal judges, the Federal courts, to bring before the court any individual who resides in a Federal district and who has children in another State, and empower the Federal judge to say to this individual, "You pay the support order back home by such and such a time or else I will punish you for contempt of court." There is no other solution to a vast majority of the cases that I can think of.

My friend and colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] has a bill which he introduced here to make it a crime to travel interstate with the intent and purpose of avoiding the obligation to support children. I think that that is a good bill. I introduced a bill to provide for the commitment proceedings to enforce the obligation. Both of these bills were introduced last year. Unfortunately, it seems that the Congress has a great deal of time to spend in regard to legislation that attracts the interest of a large number of people who happen to be organized. I note that it is a crime to steal a $25 jalopy and cross the State line with it. The Federal Government will go after you immediately. But an individual who will not recognize even the obligation that the beasts of the field recognize can steal the birthright of his children and cross the State line and remain relatively immune to any law. I presume the great difference there is that the finance companies are probably organized, and the deserted children are not.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACOBS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. I should like to compliment the gentleman from Indiana on initiating this discharge petition on this proposed legislation. I can assure the members of the Committee on the Judiciary that no affront was meant by the initiation of this discharge petition. It is hoped by this method we can get a tremendous interest on the part of people throughout the United States in an attempt to get legislation that will meet the problem, so that we will not have abandoned children throughout our States and communities who cannot be protected other than by aid to dependent children, at a cost to the Federal Government, the State government, and the local governing units.

I again wish to compliment the gentleman from Indiana. I hope our colleagues will sign the petition so that we can get this legislation to the floor of the House.

Mr. JACOBS. I thank the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACOBS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. I want to commend the gentleman. As he knows, I have introduced a companion bill. The gentleman is absolutely right that something should be done concerning the "galloping pappys" who are running all over the country leaving behind them children to be supported by others. It is a matter in which every State ought to be interested because of the expense connected with it and the injustice done to children, robbing them of their opportunities for education and forcing on them malnutrition and broken homes. It is a moral problem which deserves the serious consideration of this legislative body.

Mr. JACOBS. I thank the gentleman.

May I say that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] has been very much interested in this matter? He and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED], and I have been talking about this matter for some time. It seems that we are not able to get very much action on it. What the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] said is correct. We mean no affront to the Committee on the Judiciary. However, the fact remains that the legislation has been in the hopper since last year. We had a brief hearing on it. The legislative representative of the American Legion testified in favor of it. I am informed that it has been endorsed by the Association of Juvenile Court Judges.

In fact, of all the correspondence I have had from judges, prosecuting attorneys, editorial comment throughout the country, and others, only two people have raised any objection to this legislation. One was a woman in Chicago who wrote me that her husband had abandoned her and she had raised her own children, and since she had done it, she did not see why other people should not have to do the same thing. The other objection was from the Department of Justice, who said it was afraid it might invade States' rights.

I do not know what States' rights they are talking about, unless it is the right of the State to tax the citizen who stays at home and takes care of his family to support the family of the fellow who has deserted his.

So I say to you, I think this is good legislation, and I hope all of you will give serious consideration to signing discharge petition 28 so that we can bring the legislation out on the floor of the House and vote on it.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I am today introducing a bill called "The Budgetary Practices Reorganization Act." Its purpose is to focus Congressional and public attention on the most significant aspect of the Federal budget. What is needed now is an end to the negative and irrelevant approaches, of which we have heard so much.

For example, this year's public discussion of the appropriations bill, like those of so many previous years, has been featured by the chant of "economy, economy, economy." This recurrent refrain has been heard from one end of the country to the other. We have been assailed with cries for "another billion dollar cut in appropriations," for "a 20 percent across-the-board" cut in the appropriation for every agency. And to the uninitiated—if there are left on this issue—it sounds fine.

But suppose you take the trouble to ask the next questions, "Where are the cuts to be made?" and "Who is to do the cutting?" You are then told the cuts are to be made "everywhere" and the "President" is to make the cuts. This is sheer political mumbo-jumbo. Perhaps there are some agencies that are getting more money than they need. Any business the size of the Federal establishment has problems of efficient and economical operations. But to talk about using a budgetary guillotine on every agency to the same degree is arrant nonsense and it is time we said so.

The Appropriations Committee, which has done a superb job under great handicaps says bluntly on page 8 of its report that the economy hawkers yell "in such general terms as to be practically useless in effecting budget reductions. They discuss large reduction in broad areas of the budget without at any point naming appropriation accounts which should be reduced or giving specific data as to programs which could be curtailed."

Passing the buck to the President makes no sense since he does not have the power to reduce or eliminate items from the budget. It sounds good to urge that we attach a rider in requiring him to slash everything. But again it does not mean much when you get down to cases. If he tried to make the same cut in veterans' benefits, defense appropriations, farm subsidies, social security administrative costs, overhead costs of mortgage insurance, rivers and harbors projects—in each instance there would be vigorous opposition to the cut, and in most of them, the opposition could make a persuasive case. That case, incidentally, would certainly be put most strongly by many of those who now shout for economy. And in many instances, they would be right—these slashes might cripple Federal programs which are essential to the Nation's military security and economic prosperity.

Let there be no misunderstanding. I am as much concerned about efficiency in government as anyone. With the other members of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, I have strongly supported President Truman's proposals to implement the recommendations of the Hoover Commission.

On the basis of these recommendations, we have already begun to make substantial improvements in the efficient and economic functioning of our Government, to increase the service which Americans get for their tax dollars.

But there is a great difference between that kind of approach and the unthinking and generalized outcry for "economy, economy, economy" regardless of the consequences. Those who take this unthinking approach like to cloak themselves with talk about "let us do it the way a successful business does it." Now, as a practicing attorney, I have had some experience with the way business is done by some of its most competent leaders. And there are some

analogies that can be drawn from business enterprise, but one must be careful in choosing them. No business firm has to spend 70 percent of its total budget on paying for past wars and the prevention of future ones. The bill which I have introduced today proposes the use of business accounting procedure in handling capital investment, and long-range budget planning.

We are using hopelessly outmoded and inadequate budgetary procedures which just will not do the job any more, procedures which no business today uses. It makes no sense to try to tailor today's $40,0000,000,000 Federal budget to fit the pattern drawn up in the 1921 Budgetary and Accounting Act. The Federal budget today has a direct and continuing impact on every phase of our economy and, in fact, on the international economy. It is time we remodeled our budgetary practice so that it becomes a usable tool for sound management, instead of a dragging ball and chain.

The purpose of this bill is to begin the remodeling job by eliminating the following defects in the present budgetary practices of the Federal Government:

First. The lack of a clear congressional policy on the Federal budget;

Second. The hit-or-miss, short-range character of budget estimates;

Third. The insertion of uneconomical or wasteful items in appropriation bills;

Fourth. The failure of the traditional budget to give a true picture of the flow of money between the Government and the people;

Fifth. The unbusinesslike failure to distinguish between operating and investment expenditures; and

Sixth. The inefficient methods used in financing a large-scale investment.

The six sections of the bill provide practical remedies for these defects. First, there is a clear statement of congressional policy in achieving a balanced budget in an expanding economy. Second, the Congress and the executive branch are authorized to plan tax and spending policies over a longer period of time. Third, the President is given the power to veto individual items in appropriation bills.

Incidentally, this power will have to be inserted in each year's appropriation bills. In this connection, I was glad to note the day before yesterday that our colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] introduced a bill to achieve this particular purpose. His measure proposes another way of achieving this same objective. Fourth, this bill provides for a consolidated cash budget which would really show the flow of money between the Government and the people. That flow is, after all, what has the most immediate consequences for every business in America. Fifth, it is proposed to establish an investment budget within the over-all budget.

Of course when you come to define what goes into investment budget, you get many suggestions. I hope that the committee in examining the purposes of this bill will carefully analyze and carefully define just what should go into the investment budget.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. In just a moment.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I would like to point out an omission.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. An omission?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. That is the word I used.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I have not finished my statement. Perhaps after I have finished I will have covered it.

Sixth and last, the bill provides for a longer range, more efficient approach to the financing of large-scale investment projects.

I am including below the text of the bill along with a section by section analysis. I intend to ask for comments and suggestions from business, Government, farm, labor, and consumer leaders, as well as fiscal policy experts. It is my hope that all Members of Congress, regardless of party, will give serious consideration to this proposal. I know that all of us want to make the Federal budget what it ought to be—an effective instrument which contributes to a stable national prosperity at high levels of employment.

TEXT OF BUDGETARY PRACTICES REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1950

A bill to supplement the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 by providing for a balanced budget in an expanding economy, long-range budget estimates, a Presidential-item veto, a consolidated cash budget, an investment budget, and 4-year appropriations for major investment programs

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the Budgetary Practices Reorganization Act of 1950.

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. In order that Federal budgetary practices can most effectively contribute toward national strength and security and toward sustained economic expansion under a free competitive-enterprise system, it is the policy of the Congress that (a) both the expenditures and the tax policy of the Federal Government be measured in terms of their effects upon the whole economy, and (b) the major objective of fiscal policy of the Federal Government be to balance the budget and provide for the orderly reduction of the national debt under conditions of maximum employment, production, and purchasing power, with the realization that this objective is unattainable when economic activity is seriously declining or when the use of resources of plant, manpower, and materials are at a low level and that the reduction of budget deficits or the increasing of surpluses should therefore not be attempted by measures that would lower the level of economic activity and the employment of our productive resources.

LONG-RANGE ESTIMATES

SEC. 2. The Annual Economic Reports of the President or the Economic Reviews of the Council of Economic Advisers, or both, shall set forth in broad outline a 4-year estimate of desirable levels of Federal expenditures and receipts related to such total national product and income over these years as would be consistent with maximum employment, production, and purchasing power. The minimum goals by 1955 shall be: A national output of $300,000,000,000 valued at current prices; and, at that level of output, the raising of sufficient revenues annually to balance the budget and to provide a surplus for the systematic reduction of the national debt.

PRESIDENTIAL ITEM VETO

SEC. 3. (a) Every appropriation bill reported to the House of Representatives or the Senate shall contain a section which shall read as follows:

"When this bill shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate and shall have been presented to the President for his approval, the President shall have power to disapprove any item or items contained in this bill, in the same manner and subject to the same limitations as he may, under article 1 of section 7 of the Constitution of the United States, disapprove as a whole any bill which shall have been presented to him for his approval. The provisions of such section 7 which relate to reconsideration shall also apply to any item or items so disapproved to the same extent as they apply to a bill that has been disapproved by the President."

(b) Subsection (a) of this section is enacted by the Congress as an exercise of the rule-making power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such it shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, respectively; such rule shall supersede other rules only to the extent that it is inconsistent therewith; and such subsection is enacted with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rule (so far as relating to the procedure in such House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House.

A CONSOLIDATED CASH BUDGET

SEC. 4. The estimates transmitted to the Congress in accordance with sections 201 and 203 of the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921, as amended, shall be based upon a presentation in summary and detail of the total flow of cash payments between the public and the Federal Government.

AN INVESTMENT BUDGET

SEC. 5. In transmitting to the Congress the estimates called for in section 201 of the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921, as amended, the President shall, to the extent and in such detail as may be feasible, (a) separate operating expenditures from capital, developmental, recoverable, and other investment expenditures, and (b) estimate in detail capital, developmental, recoverable, and other investment expenditure by agencies and/or purposes for the four ensuing years.

FOUR-YEAR PROGRAMS FOR INVESTMENT EXPENDITURES

SEC. 6. Any appropriation to finance a major program involving capital, developmental, recoverable, or other investment expenditures, with the exception of any such appropriation for raising and supporting armies as is limited to 2 years by section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution, may be available for use over a period of four fiscal years.

BUDGETARY PRACTICES REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1950—SECTION BY SECTION ANALYSIS—DECLARATION OF POLICY

The first section recognizes that both expenditures and tax policy must be measured in terms of their effects upon the whole economy. A clear congressional policy is set out for obtaining a balanced budget in an expanding economy. This is in line with the recent statement of the Research and Policy Committee of the Committee on Economic Development.

The budgetary problem—

Says the CED—

is how to manage the budget so as to promote national security and general welfare most effectively. This is a problem involving both sides of the budget; both spending and taxing vitally affect our security and welfare. (Tax and Expenditure Policy for 1950, p. 1.)

In other words, this statement of policy clearly rejects the idea that we can have a sensible management of our fiscal affairs if each item of appropriation is looked upon separately rather than as part of a total expenditure program or if expenditures and revenues are looked upon separately rather than as part of the total budgetary program.

More important, section 1 states that the major objective of fiscal policy must be to "balance the budget and provide for the orderly reduction of the national debt under conditions of maximum employment, production, and purchasing power."

This is also in line with the CED's belief that the best solution for our budgetary problem is to "provide for a moderate budget surplus to be realized under conditions that make a surplus possible and desirable, namely, conditions of high employment"—Tax and Expenditure Policy for 1950, pages 2–3.

The policy statement also spells out the fact that both a budget surplus and a budget balance are impossible under conditions of seriously declining economic activity or substantial unemployment. It thus emphasizes the point of view that an effective orientation toward a balanced budget and a reduction in the national debt is possible only as part of a broad program creating an environment favorable to sustained economic expansion.

LONG-RANGE BUDGET ESTIMATES

Section 2 provides additional machinery needed to carry out the policy of a balanced budget in an expanding economy.

Under present budgetary practices, no Member of Congress can really tell where the budget proposed for the following fiscal year is leading us. No one can tell whether the appropriations called for in the following fiscal year will lead in subsequent years toward a larger or smaller role for the Federal Government in the total economic picture. Moreover, since budget estimates are prepared for only one fiscal year, the officials in the executive branch themselves, while in a better position to see the picture than Members of Congress, seldom take a good long look ahead.

Under the provisions of section 2, the executive branch would be required to look ahead. Hundreds of executive officials who participate in the budget-making process would be required to consider where their present programs are leading. The President would be required to present to the Congress, in broad outline, a 4-year estimate of desirable levels of Federal expenditures and receipts related to the total economic picture.

This section also provides that the minimum goal within which our budget policy should be developed is to achieve a total national output of $300,000,000,000, valued at current prices, by 1955. The goal is also to raise sufficient revenues at that level of output to balance the budget and to provide a surplus for the systematic reduction of the national debt. If we adopt this policy and these procedures and apply them both effectively, we can reach the goal of a balanced budget and a budget surplus long before 1955. How quickly we reach this goal depends upon how effectively we develop a program for economic health and expansion. Provisions of this section and of the rest of this bill are an integral part of such a program.

ITEM VETO FOR THE PRESIDENT

Section 3 gives the President power to exercise his constitutional power of veto over uneconomical or wasteful items inserted in appropriation bills.

One of the most wasteful practices in the Federal Government is the insertion in appropriation bills of individual items that cannot be justified as legitimately serving the public interest. Sometimes this is done by legislative riders. Sometimes it is done through the most objectionable forms of logrolling. No matter how it is done, it serves to squander priceless resources and give people the unjustifiable impression that Members of Congress are more interested in slipping their hands into the pork barrel for local projects than they are in serving the national interest.

The reason that so many of these little items get enacted and the reason that they add up to such large totals is that the President is unable to veto individual items in an appropriation bill. He is faced with the choice of either doing nothing about individual items such as these or of vetoing a total measure and thus holding up operations for many other projects and activities that are vitally necessary. He is invariably forced, therefore, to do nothing.

A number of years ago, the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] proposed that this problem should be handled by giving item veto powers to the President.

Now that we suddenly confront fabulous appropriation totals—

Stated the Senator from Michigan—

it seems more than ever necessary that the Presidential veto should be afforded some degree of that same discretion and selectivity with respect to the component parts of an appropriation bill which the Congress itself enjoys when it formulates and passes these bills. * * * The Governors of at least 40 out of 48 States have the privilege of the item veto, and I have yet to hear of a single instance in which its use has been contrary to the public interest. * * * I know of no reason why the President of the United States should not have similar opportunity to deal effectively with Federal appropriation bills. * * * Furthermore, an economy-minded President may easily be quite helpless in dealing with appropriations if he is confined to a blanket "yes" or "no" to the lump-sum appropriation totals in the gigantic annual supply bills which now confront the country, and if he is forbidden to send back specific items for congressional review.

Today when the Appropriations Committees in both Houses are planning to bring forth for the first time an omnibus appropriation bill providing appropriations for the operations of the entire Government, item veto power by the President becomes indispensable. Without it the multi-billion-dollar omnibus appropriation bill may become a super pork-barrel measure that will frustrate all hopes of governmental economy.

When the Senator from Michigan first proposed an item veto, he suggested that it be done through constitutional amendment.

President Roosevelt, however, pointed out that the same objective could be obtained by the insertion of a properly worded clause in every appropriation bill.

The Senator from Michigan accepted President Roosevelt's recommendation and suggested the insertion of appropriate language in appropriation bills. However, nothing was done to carry out this proposal.

Section 3 of the proposed bill consists basically of the language drafted by the Senator from Michigan upon the advice of President Roosevelt.

There is only one difference. The Senator from Michigan offered his language as an amendment to be offered from the floor of the Senate to individual measures. The proposed bill, however, requires that every appropriation bill reported to the floor in the House and in the Senate contain the necessary language.

A CONSOLIDATED CASH BUDGET

Section 4 requires the Government's budget to give a true picture of the flow of money between the Government and the people. As the Committee for Economic Development has pointed out, the traditional budget figures on expenditures and revenues do not give the real picture of the impact of the budget upon the economy—Tax and Expenditure Policy for 1950, appendix B, pages 38–47.

While most Government activities are reflected in the traditional budget, the traditional budget figures do not give the story on the trust-fund operations involved in unemployment insurance, old-age and survivors insurance, and veterans life insurance. These trust-fund receipts are usually larger than trust-fund expenditures. Hence, when the trust-fund accounts and other items are considered as part of the total budgetary operations of the Federal Government, it becomes apparent that the cash position of the Federal Government is somewhat more favorable than might otherwise be thought.

For the fiscal year 1951, for example, if one looks at the total receipts from and payments to the public, it becomes evident that the estimated budget deficit is only $2,700,000,000. This is about half the deficit estimated under traditional budget concepts.

These facts may be dug out of various tables appearing in the back of the budget message. However, they are not given the central importance that they deserve.

It is for this reason that the CED decided to "recommend use of the cash consolidated budget in making over-all budget policy." Section 4 carries out the CED recomendation by requiring a more central presentation in the budget message of the total flow of cash payments

between the public and the Federal Government.

This section would not, however, preclude the use of the present budgetary computations for administrative control purposes.

AN INVESTMENT BUDGET

Section 5 provides for a businesslike distinction between operating and investment expenditures.

No business could operate intelligently if it handled its budget like the Federal Government does. Every business concern makes a clear distinction in its fiscal operations between operating expenses, and capital, developmental, recoverable, and other investment expenditures.

It was for this reason that one of the central recommendations of the Hoover Commission was as follows:

We recommend that the budget estimates of all operating departments and agencies of the Government should be divided into two primary categories—current operating expenditures and capital outlays. (Budget and Accounting, Recommendation No. 3, p. 16.)

Section 5 carries out this recommendation of the Hoover Commission. It also requires that investment expenditures be estimated in detail for a 4-year period. The provisions of section 2 require merely a broad outline of 4-year estimates of expenditures and receipts. This section requires a more detailed approach to investment operations, similar to that which is found in the budget statements of any successful private business concern.

This section, however, sets up an investment budget rather than a capital budget. A capital budget would require an annual appraisal of all the capital assets of the Federal Government. The utility of such an operation would be more than counterbalanced by the tremendous amount of time it would involve.

FOUR-YEAR PROGRAMS FOR INVESTMENT EXPENDITURES

Section 6 provides, at present, that appropriations for most large-scale Government construction projects are handled on an annual basis. This makes for untold waste and inefficiency. It prevents businesslike operations and hamstrings forward commitments. It impedes large-scale operations. If the major private construction companies in America were forced to operate under similar terms, it would not be long before they would all be out of business or in the bankruptcy courts.

The section meets this problem by authorizing 4-year appropriations for major investment programs.

This section is in line with the thinking of one of the greatest budget directors this country has ever had, the late Harold D. Smith.

In an address delivered before the Municipal Finance Officers Association on June 19, 1944, Budget Director Smith made the following statement:

The budget should contain provisions which permit immediate adjustment to changing economic conditions with which fiscal policy must cope. Flexibility in timing can, for example, be accomplished if the Legislature appropriates funds for certain construction and developmental programs for an extended period, say, of 5 years. Timing of the program can then be adjusted by the Executive in accord with economic necessities. (The Budget as an Instrument of Legislative Control and Executive Management.)

Section 6 carries out Harold Smith's proposal—except for the fact that the period provided for is 4 years instead of 5 years.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I want to compliment the gentleman from New York for the suggestion which he has made. I think it has a great deal of merit. As I understand what he has just said, it is his purpose to present to the Congress and to the American people the true picture of the budget as it actually exists. Furthermore, in that picture the gentleman would really show, for example, that investments made under the Interior Appropriation Subcommittee would not be considered as liabilities but as investments which would be repaid to the Federal Government, and, therefore, should not be considered wholly and purely as expenditures and shown as such.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. That is exactly right. One of the examples of the kind of so-called expenditure that I think ought to be listed as an investment is the money lent by the Federal National Mortgage Association, a Government corporation, which acquires mortgages of the FHA and the Veterans' Administration. The Federal National Mortgage Association, or "Fannie May," as it is usually called, has been given a credit by the Congress of over $2,500,000,000. "Fannie May" will get its money back, and is now making a profit through interest on these mortgages. It is not an expense to the Federal Government, because the money will be repaid to the Federal Government. Nonetheless, it is listed as part of our national deficit, and it is listed on the deficit side of our budget.

I now yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I should like to say to the gentleman that the proposal he makes is not new.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I agree with that.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. It has always been very interesting to everyone who hears it for the first time, and at first glance, especially to those who may not be entirely familiar with accounting procedure, would seem to be the proper procedure. I was going to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that he omitted the very important item of contingent liabilities. Unless that were added to his list of things that are set up in a Government budget, it would be just as deceptive as the gentleman feels the present budget to be deceptive.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I should be delighted to have an amendment offered at the time hearings are held on the bill.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

[Mr. MICHENER addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. MICHENER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

VETERANS' HOSPITAL FIASCO

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, two subjects are now widely discussed in every city, town, and village in the United States—baseball and the tragic crippling of hospital service for our disabled veterans.

Tying these two subjects together and using baseball parlance, now filling the air, it is quite apparent that the taxpayer is to be caught in a "squeeze play" between the Veterans' Administration's ordered discharge of thousands of employees and the demand of veterans, veterans organizations and the public for continued adequate hospital care for the disabled.

A review of the facts will enable the press and the public to see what is happening and who is at fault.

One thing is sure—Congress is not to blame for this fiasco. If the Veterans' Administration did not have sufficient funds to carry on its operations it is only because they were not requested.

Government departments, as you all know, begin preparation of their budget requests long months before they are presented to Congress by the President, in his budget message.

The Veterans' Administrator, therefore, knew, as early as September or October 1948, what amount would be recommended for medical and hospital services for fiscal 1950, which began July 1, 1949.

Early in 1949 the full request of $566,666,400 was presented to the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Independent Offices. The VA is not so sacrosanct that one cannot assume that it is not governed by the same motives as other agencies, and naturally had asked for more—possibly 10 percent more—than it expected to get. Nevertheless, this subcommittee approved and the House passed appropriations for the entire amount requested—$566,666,400.

Mr. Chairman, I may say in passing that on page 35 of the report on the independent offices appropriation bill for 1950 the committee said:

The total cost of the medical program is $566,666,400. The committee has not reduced this sum by one penny and directs the Administrator not to reduce it.

As early as May 1949, after House action, the Administrator knew he would have at least what he had asked for. Before the fiscal year 1950 began he knew how much he would have to run on.

Upon the request of the Veterans' Administration, Public Law 349, Eighty-first Congress, calling for increased pay for doctors, dentists, and nurses was passed by the Congress and approved by the President on October 12, 1949. Other VA employees were given pay increases by Public Law 429—Classifica-

tion Act. I understand that when these acts became effective the Bureau of the Budget, the right arm of the President, advised all agencies to absorb the increases and that deficiencies for this purpose would not be entertained. Most agencies complied in whole or substantial part. The Veterans' Administration apparently complied partially, but no steps were taken to trim pay rolls to conform to available cash. As a matter of fact, I am reliably informed that the VA, instead of decreasing, increased the number of employees thereafter.

Beginning in November, the release of a small number of employees and the nonfilling of vacancies as they occurred would have enabled the Veterans' Administration to carry on its hospital service without any appreciable diminution.

If Administrator Gray's fiscal or budget officer is worth his salt, he should have—and I believe he did—advised the Administrator last fall of this needed immediate pay-roll reduction.

As a matter of fact, a few days ago Mr. Gray admitted—March 27—that this need of reduction had been called to his attention months ago, but, as he said, "not as definitely as he told me a couple of weeks ago."

A good, alert administrator, keeping himself advised, should have realized, long before Mr. Gray did, that he had one of three things to do—trim a small number immediately; wait and slash off a large crippling number later, or ask for more money.

Why no action was taken until the drastic paralyzing order of March 3 calling for the discharge of 4,766 hospital personnel, is difficult to understand.

Mr. Gray was before the Independent Offices Subcommittee of Appropriations in January asking for funds for 1951. Although he now claims to be short for this year about $14,000,000; although he plans to open new hospitals, which, of course, will require additional employees, his request was for but $574,744,249, only $8,000,000 more than requested for these same purposes for 1950. At that time he gave no hint that he was going to run short or that drastic reductions would be needed or made. A little later, and possibly a third time, Mr. Gray appeared before the Independent Offices Subcommittee seeking supplemental or deficiency funds.

In an interview he claimed that on this later occasion he had sought more funds for hospitals, but the record—see hearings, urgent deficiency, 1950—shows Mr. Gray was requesting $800,000,000 additional for "education and training" "loan guaranty," and "unemployment compensation." If he could foresee these needs what kept him from foreseeing the need for more money for the hospitals? Again he gave no hint that drastic personnel cuts in the hospitals were to be made.

But, finally, and suddenly, in the hospitals on March 3, he announced the much-discussed reduction-in-force order.

Now, over a month later, there is still no deficiency appropriation requested. I am informed that as late as a week ago he had not submitted any such estimate to the Bureau of the Budget. Whether he has in the last few days, I do not know. At least, none has yet been presented to the House for consideration.

Mr. Gray undoubtedly knows that the Appropriations Subcommittee and the Congress have always been liberal in the funds for our disabled—especially those in our hospitals.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat, no blame can be justly placed on Congress for the tragic conditions brought about by this ruthless edict, for which the disabled veterans of America and Veterans' Administration employees, including doctors, dentists, nurses, and attendants, were not prepared.

The blame rests squarely on Mr. Gray. He admitted that in a conference a few days ago. He admitted mistakes had been made, that he as Administrator had made them and he was responsible for them, and that only 60 days before he awoke to the realization that he had to "skin back." He admitted a mistake had been made in not seeing the situation and cutting back a smaller number of employees months ago instead of making a big cut now.

Mr. Chairman, as a result of his delay in his action, veterans are suffering from lack of care needed for their recovery and well-being.

Mr. Chairman, it is Administrator Gray's next move. It is quite apparent that as the result of this mismanagement, this maladministration, at a time when the taxpayer can ill-afford more Federal spending, Administrator Gray undoubtedly will soon call upon him through Congress to appropriate more millions to supplement his 1950 funds.

Good administration would have prevented both these dire calamities from which the veterans and the taxpayer must suffer.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RHODES].

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order and revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, the Senate has confirmed the appointment of Mr. Allan K. Grim of Kutztown, Berks County, Pa., as United States judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

I have known Mr. Grim for many years. He is of sterling character. He is a man of integrity and sound judgment, and possesses all the high qualities needed to fulfill the important post to which he has been appointed by President Truman.

Senator FRANCIS J. MYERS in nominating Mr. Grim for a Federal judgeship has given recognition to a man of outstanding character and great ability. Senator MYERS has also given favorable consideration to the Thirteenth District of Pennsylvania in submitting Mr. Grim's name to the President.

I am proud of the small part which I have played in bringing to the Federal court a man who is beloved by his fellow citizens regardless of political faith or walk of life and who will, I am sure, distinguish himself in his new role as a Federal judge.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, is the gentleman going to speak about oleo?

Mr. RIVERS. No, I am not.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RIVERS addressed the Committee. His remarks appear in the Appendix of today's RECORD].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS].

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, the House of Representatives is now debating and will shortly vote upon various amendments to H. R. 7786, a bill making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951. If passed in its present form this bill will appropriate the largest sum ever before appropriated by the Congress in one bill.

An effort will be made by amendments to reduce the suggested appropriations provided for in the bill wherever and whenever possible.

The people of this country are staggering under a debt of $260,000,000,000. The Federal Government has never before exacted such a heavy toll in taxation from our people. One way of decreasing taxes is to eliminate unnecessary appropriations and expenditures of money. Another method of reducing taxes is to see to it that the property of the United States when offered for sale brings its actual value. The Federal Government today is the owner of billions of dollars worth of real estate, consisting of apartment buildings and of individual dwellings. Some of this property has heretofore been sold and other dwelling houses owned by the Government will shortly be sold.

In the sale of these properties there should be no favoritism. But one rule and supreme purpose should govern the actions of public officials in the sale of property owned by all the people of this country, and that is, to see that when it is put up for sale it brings its honest, real value.

From the attitude and acts of some of our public officials who are charged with the duty of selling real estate on which the Government has erected dwelling houses and which are the property of the United States, we are driven to the conclusion that these public officials

feel that an open season has been declared upon the taxpayers of this country. I am not just generalizing. I propose now to be specific. I will now give you a concrete example of what happens to the taxpayers of this country when certain officials of the Public Housing Administration sell dwelling houses belonging to the Federal Government.

Prior to the entry of this country in the last World War, the Public Housing Administration with Federal funds purchased a large tract of land in Blount County, Tenn., lying adjacent to Maryville, the county seat, and to the city of Alcoa where is situated the largest aluminum plant in the world. On this large tract of land which is well situated and admirably adapted for a town site the FHA constructed a modern town and gave it the name of Eagleton Village. On this town site the FHA constructed 250 single detached frame dwelling units consisting of 12 one-bedroom units; 150 two-bedroom units, 88 three-bedroom units; 1 community building—masonry; 2 sewerage pumping stations.

In addition to the land on which these dwellings, the community building and the two sewerage pumping stations were constructed, the Government owned at the time of the sale of these properties two-bedroom units, 88 three-bedroom the town site. The Government invested in this land, these installations, and dwellings $1,000,000.

The property was appraised in May 1948, as an entirety at a valuation of $645,529.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENNINGS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. How much did they skin the Government out of on this deal?

Mr. JENNINGS. Well, at least half a million dollars.

No valuation was made of the project for sale as individual units, although the physical layout is adapted to the sale of individual units at a minimum expense. At that time, the dwellings were and are now occupied by veterans and by employees of the Aluminum Co. of America which owns the plant at Alcoa. And at that time hundreds of veterans and people who are employed in industry desired to purchase the kind of dwellings which the Government owned in this village.

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION ACTION

The officials of the Public Housing Administration requested a commitment from the Federal Housing Administration of the establishment of a valuation of these properties and a mortgage commitment thereon. The FHA valued the properties at $502,620 with a mortgage commitment of $443,000, based on entirety only; that is, upon the theory that the Public Housing Administration proposed to sell the property as an entirety, the purchaser to get title to the entire village, the community building, the two sewerage pumps and the three parcels of land which had not been built upon. The property was sold as an entirety as a rental proposition.

Accordingly, the property was advertised for sale as an entirety and on November 3, 1949, bids were opened and the property was sold. The bid of $525,400 by H. D. Epstein, of Philadelphia, was accepted, it being the high bid.

THE HISTORY OF THE TRANSACTION

Before the property was advertised for sale and before the sale was conducted and the bid of Epstein accepted by the Public Housing Administration, an official in the central office of the Public Housing Administration made a report to John P. Broome, director of region IV, in which he pointed out to Broome that it was to the advantage of the United States Government, the owner of Eagleton Village and its facilities, that the property should be valued on a basis of individual units, that is, that each dwelling house and each parcel of unused land should be valued separately, because on this basis of sale the property would bring its real value. It was also pointed out by this official in the central office of the Public Housing Administration that the decision of the regional office to sell these 250 dwelling units, the community building, the two sewerage pump stations and the three parcels of excess land as a whole would result in a loss to the Government of probably 50 percent of the real value of the property.

The official who made these recommendations of the proper and fair method of selling these properties instructed and urged the persons who were about to make the sale of said properties "to explore all possible means of correcting the sewerage deficiency before the property was offered for sale as an entirety.

In other words, the official who made these recommendations and issued these instructions urged his associates in the Public Housing Administration to negotiate a renewal of the contract which the Public Housing Administration had with the city of Alcoa to continue to operate the two sewerage pump stations owned by the Government in Eagleton Village so that the purchasers of these dwellings, in the event they were sold separately, would be assured that the sewerage from the respective homes would be disposed of through the sewerage system of the city of Alcoa.

These recommendations and instructions of the official making them were ignored by the regional officials who claimed that sewerage service could not be provided for individual properties if sold in that manner. This insistence of the person who had evidently entered into a plan with the person who purchased the properties to sell them as a whole was specious and without any foundation in fact. So settled was the purpose of those who conducted this sale at a loss to the Government of $500,000 that they made no answer whatever to the official who gave these instructions and set out the facts that the proper way to sell these properties was to sell the dwellings as individual units.

On January 12, 1949, the official who furnished this information and gave these directions with respect to the proper manner to sell these properties in order to have them bring their real value dictated a follow-up memorandum to the officials charged with the duty of selling these properties. But these instructions were not sent by him because Mr. Broome stated to him that everything possible had been done and that the property would have to be sold as a whole, notwithstanding that if it was sold in that manner it would not bring its real worth.

Then, on March 1, 1949, Mr. Satterfield, of the Atlanta field office, sent a communication to Mr. Broome, area director in charge of the sale of the Eagleton properties, stating that—

First. A sale of the sewer system to an operating company was very remote. This statement was absolutely untrue, as I will demonstrate in just a moment.

Second. There was no interest on the part of occupants in individual sales. This statement was likewise untrue.

Third. There was no interest in the purchase of the project as a whole by a mutual organization. Mr. Satterfield then repeated his insistence that there was no likelihood of disposing of Eagleton Village and its public facilities and the three tracts of land owned by the Government in individual units and stated his intention of immediately offering the project as a whole by competitive bid.

THE SCHEME TO SELL AND CONSUMMATE THE SALE OF THESE PROPERTIES DESPITE AND OVER THE PROTEST OF A VIGILANT AND HONEST PUBLIC OFFICIAL WAS THEN CONSUMMATED AT A LOSS TO THE GOVERNMENT OF HALF A MILLION DOLLARS

Following acceptance of bid made by H. D. Epstein, the successful bidder, he was able to make satisfactory arrangements for sewerage service and has received a release agreement from FHA so that the properties may be resold by the purchaser on an individual basis. Information from FHA indicates that their valuation of the depreciated reproductive cost of the structures well exceed $1,000,000. This indicates a potential $500,000 profit from resale by the purchaser, on an individual basis.

This tremendous loss to the Government is traceable to incompetence of the PHA regional and field offices, who failed to interpret correctly the demand in the market and were unable and unwilling to accomplish a simple solution of a sewerage problem in over a year's effort. This problem was solved by the successful bidder, Epstein, in a matter of a few weeks, thereby profiting to the extent of the difference in value between the property if considered as an indivisible entirety and the value of the 250 separate structures as individual homes.

I utterly refuted the claim of the Public Housing officials that unless the property was sold as a whole the owners of these dwellings could not have the benefit of the disposal of their sewerage under the contract that had theretofore existed between the Government and the city of Alcoa.

On March 21 I wrote the following letter to A. B. Smith, city manager of Alcoa, Tenn.:

Mr. A. B. SMITH,
City Manager, Alcoa, Tenn.

MY DEAR MR. SMITH: I have been advised by those interested in the sale of the Eagleton Village to H. D. Epstein, of Philadelphia, that since his purchase of this property he has negotiated a contract with

the city of Alcoa or with some other agency in Blount County to operate the sewerage disposal plants through which the sewerage from Eagleton Village is disposed of.

I will appreciate it if you will inform me if this is true and if this contract is not with the city of Alcoa, with whom or with what agency was it made.

Thanking you for this assistance and with best wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

JOHN JENNINGS, Jr.

To this letter Mr. Smith replied to me on March 23, as follows:

CITY OF ALCOA,
Alcoa, Tenn., March 23, 1950.

Hon. JOHN JENNINGS, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This will reply to your letter of March 21, with reference to contract for the handling of sewerage from Eagleton Village through a disposal plant owned and operated by the city of Alcoa.

It is true that Eagleton Properties, Inc. negotiated a contract with the city of Alcoa under date of February 15, 1950, whereby the sanitary sewerage from Eagleton Village is disposed of through a sewerage disposal plant of the city.

Yours sincerely,

A. B. SMITH,
City Manager.

These facts disclose the sordid, callous indifference to the rights of the taxpayers of the United States of America by the Public Housing officials of this Government here in Washington who permitted Mr. H. D. Epstein, of Philadelphia, to make an unconscionable profit on his purchase of Eagleton Village, with its facilities, for one-half of the value of said properties.

H. D. Epstein, the purchaser, was, of course, under no obligations to the Government to safeguard its interests in his purchase of these properties. He was looking after his own interests. I make no criticism of the steps he took to feather his nest in this transaction.

Had the Public Housing officials who hurriedly, incompetently, and in utter disregard of the rights of the public pushed through the sale of Eagleton Village and its facilities as a rental proposition, in its entirety, and who arbitrarily and wrongfully refused to accept the advice of the honest and fearless public official who directed them to sell the properties on an individual basis, employed the same zeal and shrewdness which Mr. Epstein used, the people of this country would not have lost the approximate sum of half a million dollars.

It is a matter of common knowledge, both in Blount County and surrounding counties in Tennessee, that hundreds of people of low and middle incomes and thousands of veterans were, and are now, eager to buy dwelling houses like those in Eagleton Village at the price at which Epstein will sell them to individual owners at this huge profit to himself. Upon purchasing the property as an entirety and before the sale was confirmed to him he went to another section of the Public Housing Administration and shifted his purchase to a different basis under the terms of which he will be permitted to sell the houses as individual units.

I am advised that he accomplished this purpose and will realize this profit by reason of the fact that he purchased the property under the provisions of title 6 of the National Housing Act and paid only 10 percent of his bid in cash.

Epstein then went to another section of the FHA and got permission to sell the houses separately, without putting out any money except the down payment.

It is time to call a halt on this character of double dealing by the officials of the Public Housing Administration at the expense of the people of this country.

[Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

(Mr. PHILLIPS of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, I really take the floor at the moment to conclude the comment I made when the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROOSEVELT] was talking and which necessarily broke in the middle because his time had expired. I am sorry that he is not on the floor at the moment. But I may conclude the suggestion I was about to make by saying that, when I was younger and less experienced than I am now, I also thought that was an excellent idea and academically I probably think it is now. However, in the intervening years I have come to the conclusion, to which the gentleman from New York will eventually come, that the accounts of a government are very different from the accounts of a corporation, even to those who have had some experience in that line in private life.

To begin with in the gentleman's list of items which he expects to set up under what he would call the various corporate accounts of the Government he omitted a very important item of contingent obligations, obligations which are being accrued by the Government for our insurance guaranties, our guaranties of housing, and our promises to pay under certain conditions for various groups in the United States. But more important than that is the difference between the capital assets of a corporation and the capital assets of a government. As my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Michigan, who is sitting over there listening to me and who has forgotten more about accounting than I ever knew, will remember and can concur with me when I say that a corporation in its capital assets has actual assets if anything happens. If you carried them on the books as depreciated assets and anything happened to the corporation you would have at least something to turn back to in order to secure funds. But I wonder what the people of the United States would do with a second-hand battleship, for instance.

Mr. TABER. Does the gentleman realize that in the whole appropriation bill anything that could be called a legitimate capital asset would be limited to a very few hundred million dollars, less than a billion dollars over all?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I thank the gentleman. That point is exactly what I would like to say. Further, and more important it seems to me, the budget which the gentleman from New York proposes would be a deceptive budget. We set up here today a budget which adding the item that are in the current bill and the items which are thoughtfully set aside as not being necessary to put in the bill, like the interest on the national debt, and adding up what the taxpayer is really interested in, which is the sum of the budget, we have a total of about $41,000,000,000. Under the budget which the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROOSEVELT] proposes, we would take out the current operating assets of the Government and put them in one item, then go on the other side, as the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] suggested, and put the assets or the expenditures, which go for reimbursable projects, and say that those are not costing the taxpayer anything because eventually they are going to be paid back. I can think of nothing that would be more dangerous from the taxpayer's standpoint than to think he is ever going to get back any money he has once invested in any Government project or put in the hands of any Federal agency, because when that money comes back it is turned over and used for some other project. Unless by some miraculous means we can somehow or other get money of that kind applied on the national debt, we can never get it back. We are not even able to get the interest, which the taxpayer is supposed to be getting on the money lent for reclamation projects, as my friend, the gentleman from Montana, a member of the Public Lands Committee, will realize. We are not able to get that paid back to the taxpayers because by a very curious decision of a solicitor in the Department of the Interior, that may be applied before the reduction of the debt and not paid back to the taxpayer as he hopefully thinks it will be. Now so much for that, Mr. Chairman.

I had intended to discuss some of the features of the appropriation bill which comes before you for the first time in one package. That also is a very interesting procedure. It will be a good procedure or it will be a bad procedure, depending entirely upon how it is handled by the Congress of the United States. And, I want to say with all respect to my friends on the majority side of the House who control the Committee on Appropriations that we are not making a very good start, and if we will take the timetable put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some days ago by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] you will see what I mean concerning the amount of time allowed to each one of the nine chapters of a $41,000,000,000 appropriation bill in the full Committee on Appropriations. We were permitted 3 hours and 7 minutes for the entire discussion of the entire budget bill, which means that only five members of a subcommittee, plus perhaps the distinguished gentleman from

New York [Mr. TABER] and the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] participated in detailed discussion of each chapter.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON. Did the gentleman himself or any member of the committee at any time request time for debate that was not granted, or did they request an opportunity to offer an amendment at any time, anywhere, which they did not receive? As the gentleman is aware, we intended to take 4 days on the bill in the committee but no one desired to debate it further and no one desired to offer further amendments. The gentleman had the opportunity to take all the time he wanted, and he had every opportunity to offer any amendment he wished to submit.

On each chapter of the bill we recognized the chairman and the ranking member of the minority of the subcommittee reporting it. Anybody had a right to interrupt to ask any question he desired to ask at any time, and everybody who asked for recognition was given recognition. Does the gentleman deny that?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. The gentleman will be very glad to tell the Chairman if he will give him a chance.

Mr. CANNON. Did anyone at any time request permission to speak when he was not accorded an opportunity to speak?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Yes. My distinguished chairman was rather hurried from time to time to get into the next chapter.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman was never denied the opportunity to speak when he sought recognition, and everyone who desired to offer an amendment and who wished to speak on the amendment, was give opportunity throughout the consideration of the bill.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I am glad the gentleman brings that out.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman give us an instance of anybody wanting to speak, who was not recognized?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. May I answer?

Mr. CANNON. I am asking the gentleman.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. May I answer in my own way?

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman can take all the time he wants to answer that question.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I will, thank you. In answering the gentleman's question I will say as a technicality somebody may have risen in the committee to ask a question and not been denied the opportunity. I yield him that very gladly and very willingly, but I merely wish the gentleman to go back to two points which are basic and which are, in my opinion, the principal difficulties in the budget bill as a package bill. Remember, I said I thought the package budget had much merit if it were handled a little differently. First of all, there is an old saying, as my distinguished friend well knows, that a burnt child dreads fire, and it is a little difficult for the minority side of the table in the full committee to forget, even after approximately 15 months, just what happened when the minority side of the table did try to offer amendments which would have prevented some of the things which have happened. That was in January a year ago.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman has got away from the proposition and clear away from answering my question.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. No, he has not.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman uses a great many words, but he winds up by saying nothing.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. The gentleman has a couple of words more he would like to get in sideways, if the gentleman will yield him about 5 minutes. Will the gentleman yield me 5 minutes?

Mr. CANNON. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I thank the gentleman very much.

The first point is, we did have pretty rough treatment, as the gentleman will have to remember, when we did try to offer amendments at a very important time in the history of the committee, which was the beginning of the session.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman wants to get away from the meeting at which the bill was brought in for consideration. He wants to get away from my question. Was he or anybody else denied opportunity to debate or to offer amendments?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I would like to yield to the gentleman but I would like to speak for myself a little, if the chairman will let me.

Mr. CANNON. I would be glad if the gentleman would say something about the question before the House. He wants to get away to a year and a half ago.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. That was important, a year and a half ago.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman does not deny that at the time when we considered this bill in the whole committee he was given every opportunity to speak and every opportunity to offer an amendment? Was he or was he not?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Will the gentleman listen?

Mr. CANNON. I will listen for an answer, but give us an answer.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Listen to me for a minute.

Mr. CANNON. We want an answer.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. All right; the gentleman is going to get it. He is going to get it because, first of all, on the gentleman's Missouri farm, when he plants——.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman answer the question? We will not go back to my Missouri farm. We will go back to the bill which is before the House, and go back to the question before the House. Was the gentleman denied an opportunity at any time, he or anybody else, to speak or offer an amendment? Let the gentleman answer that question.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Yes; I was denied an opportunity to know what I was to ask a question about.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman answer the question?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. If the gentleman will listen for just 2 minutes, I will explain it, and I think the gentleman will understand, but the gentleman has to keep quiet for 2 minutes in order to let me talk and tell him what I am trying to tell him. If the gentleman will give me that courtesy I will tell him that I was not denied technically a chance to speak, but I have been denied for 18 months a chance to find out what to speak about. It lies entirely with the gentleman from Missouri, who took from us every possible opportunity to find out what was in the bills by doing away with our administrative investigating staff.

Mr. CANNON. How ridiculous. The hearings were printed and distributed throughout the session. The bill was available longer than any previous appropriation bill in the history of the Congress. And there is no finer investigating staff than the FBI in existence. The gentleman will not come to the point.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I come back to the same thing. In a committee where I had no chance to know what was in a bill, I did not get up and ask questions. It is impossible to ask questions on a bill about which one know nothing. The fact that the gentleman did away without notice with the investigating staff of the Committee on Appropriations brought about the situation.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman had at his command the entire FBI force of the United States and any other Government investigating officials he might desire to mobilize. It is the finest investigating staff the world has ever seen.

I would like to ask the gentleman a question. Did he at any time propose an investigation which was not given him?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Yes, several times.

Mr. CANNON. I wish the gentleman would specify. Repeatedly, the gentleman and his committee were told if they had anything they wanted to investigate it would be investigated. No request made by the gentleman or any other Member was ever denied. No refusal was ever made to investigate any proposition they wanted to investigate.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Will the gentleman answer me two questions that can be answered very briefly?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. First, the gentleman is a lawyer, is he not?

Mr. CANNON. That has nothing to do with the question. Was the gentleman ever denied an investigation?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I thought maybe I could make this plain to the gentleman.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman is constantly trying to evade the issue. He wants to talk about something else. The issue is, did he ask for any investigation which he did not get?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, I must refuse to yield for at

least 2 minutes now so that I can answer the gentleman.

Mr. CANNON. Yes; I wish the gentleman would answer the question: Did he or anybody else ask for an investigation which was not made?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, the situation with which we are now faced is similar to the situation which might exist in a courtroom if one lawyer should say to his opponent on the other side of the case that his opponent had adequate opportunity to get legal services if he had referred the matter in dispute to his, the attorney's, law firm.

I am not a lawyer. I am just an accountant who knows something about budget making. But in a courtroom or, rather, in a budget-making room, I would want an investigator who is on my side, and not an investigator who is on the opposite side.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. We did not have that in this year's budget making. In spite of that, and in spite of the concern expressed by my chairman, whom I seem to have touched upon a somewhat sensitive spot, I might quote briefly from the Bible, as the gentleman from Minnesota has quoted from the Bible, "I would not have you be ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are asleep."

I do want to say I really think well of the intent of the budget, but I do think in successive years we would do better if we were to provide the same service and analysis and investigation which was furnished during the Eightieth Congress at which time we did take the budget back within the income of the United States. We did not do it by accident. We did it by hard work and we did it by analysis of individual items of each of the sections of the budget. That is the way we did it. The taxpayers benefited. This year the taxpayer finds himself and herself the owner of a small part of a five-billion-dollar deficit.

There were other items in the bill which I had intended to take up, but I have enjoyed hearing my chairman express himself upon a measure about which he seems to be, as I said, a little sensitive.

Mr. Chairman, I will reserve the items in the budget to which I do want to call attention, illustrating the points I have made here on the floor, and I will use them in the general debate on each of the individual sections, when I intend to offer several amendments, not necessarily to raise the amount, but to make corrections in the wording which we might have made if it had been possible in the full committee.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, many interests are opposed to a consolidated appropriation. A great many prefer to make expenditures under the old plan, taking up one item at a time, and making appropriations on each item individually without knowing how much might be in the other bills or what the total would be, or the impact on the Federal Treasury of all the appropriations when finally tabulated.

But while we have had to placate opposition from any sources, we have at last perfected a procedure through which the country may see at a glance the total proposed expenditures for the year, on one side, and the total estimated income of the Nation on the other side. It is in effect the legislative budget we have been trying so long to achieve and is in such practicable form as to meet with the general approval of the press throughout the country.

I think, Mr. Chairman, there has not been a metropolitan paper in the United States which has not expressed approval of this plan of considering all appropriations at one time and in one bill.

Of course those favoring the old plan and those opposed to the new plan have had their champions here on the floor, as indicated by the open filibuster against the bill ever since we have taken it up for consideration, and as indicated in the colloquys here this afternoon. But the facts remain, and cannot be obscured even by these obstructive criticisms that the bills have been better processed this year than ever before. The subcommittees this year spent more time on the bill, and more nearly reached unanimity on both sides of the table than ever before.

When the full committee met to receive the reports of the subcommittees we took up the bill chapter by chapter, and we recognized in the beginning, as has been the custom heretofore, first the chairman, and then the minority member of the committee reporting the bill. There was no limitation on debate. Some of the chapters required a shorter time; some of them took a longer time. But any member who desired to speak was recognized and talked as long and as often as he desired on any and all chapters of the bill. And every member, on both sides of the table, both the majority, and the minority, the Democrat and the Republican, was given an opportunity to offer amendments to any part of the bill.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I want to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations this question: Was it not following the appropriations mess in the Eightieth Congress, when summer had arrived and the appropriations had not been cleared by the other body, that the gentleman from Missouri named a man to merely one subcommittee of the full Committee on Appropriations, so that they could devote all their time to one bill and give that bill consideration which had never previously been given in the full Committee on Appropriations. Is that not the fact?

Mr. CANNON. That was one of the most successful features of the system. Up until that time every Member divided his time between at least two bills, and some of them had as many as four bills. This year by permitting each Member to devote his entire time to one bill, and each member of the staff of the committee to devote his entire time to one bill, we had time for intensive study and were able to make a more careful and more exhaustive analysis of each bill than was previously afforded.

Mr. ROONEY. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CANNON. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. And is it not a fact that a year ago all the appropriation bills, with the possible exception of one, had been cleared by the House for the other body before the Easter recess? And may I ask the gentleman to compare that with the situation this year, when gentlemen on the other side of the aisle have spent the past 7 or 8 days filibustering so as to prevent the package appropriation bill going to the other body?

Mr. CANNON. That is a very fair statement, and we called attention to the situation on the first day the bill was taken up. We reported all appropriations to the House and the bill was placed on the calendar March 21, the earliest date all appropriation bills have been reported in the history of the committee.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Does the gentleman feel that bringing the bill out in the open so that the membership may know what is in it, is filibustering? For my own part I feel that is our duty and that we should perform it.

Mr. CANNON. Well, we certainly have performed it. Never before has an appropriation bill been on the calendar, and distributed to the press and the public, so long before being taken up for consideration.

Mr. ROONEY. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. And is it not an open secret—as everyone here knows, that after a policy meeting of the gentlemen on the other side, it was decided that this bill was not going to be read for amendment if they could help it until after we got back from the Easter recess?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] has again expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill was, of course, a privileged bill. It was scheduled to come up Monday a week ago and was announced for that date both by the majority leader and the whip. But we voluntarily relinquished our place on the House schedule to permit the ECA bill to come in. We could have taken up this bill a week sooner, had we been desirous of hurrying consideration and denying everyone ample opportunity to know what was is in it, as the gentleman from New York suggests. This bill has been on the calendar longer, prior to consideration, than any appropriation bill ever before considered in the House.

Mr. ROONEY. Does the gentleman happen to know whether or not all of those set speeches which have been made into the RECORD in the last couple of days were drawn in the offices of the Republican National Committee or in the NAM offices?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Every single speech that anyone on this side of the aisle has made has been drawn by himself. They did not need any help from the outside because they had been around and they had listened to what was going on in the hearings, and they knew what was in these bills.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. It would appear from that statement that the gentleman was not present yesterday. Yet I am sure he was over there on the other side of the aisle and listened to speech after speech when he must have been convinced the speaker had never seen the speech before in his life.

Mr. TABER. I know that every Member on this side of the aisle prepared his own speech.

Mr. CANNON. When the bill came before——

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. When I complete my statement.

Mr. JENSEN. Now, you have had a field day over there. I would like to have——

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman always generates a great deal of heat without shedding very much light on the subject under consideration.

Mr. JENSEN. All right; will the gentleman yield to me?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri declines to yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I would like to put a little heat on.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa will kindly be in order. The gentleman from Missouri declines to yield.

Mr. CANNON. The test of whether a bill is well and fairly considered is in the opportunity afforded for consideration of amendments. When this bill was reported to the Committee on Appropriations, it was taken up chapter by chapter. At the end of each chapter, before the chapter was passed the chairman asked: "Does anyone desire to offer an amendment anywhere in this chapter?" And we did not leave that chapter as long as anyone on either side of the table desired to offer an amendment. There was ample and unlimited opportunity for amendment and debate.

Now, Mr. Chairman, so far as the question of investigation is concerned, the gentleman from California sought to leave the impression that there was no opportunity to secure information required in the hearings on the bill. Here is the complete answer to that charge. Here is a letter dated August 26, 1949, which I caused to be addressed to every member of the committee:

To all members of the Committee on Appropriations:

I am directed by the chairman to advise you that it is his desire that every subject on which members of the committee feel that they will require information in addition to that supplied in the annual budget and supporting documents, be referred to the investigating staff as early as possible in order to secure such information before consideration of the 1951 budget begins. If there is any problem which you feel should be made the subject of such inquiry please advise me as early as possible as to the names of the agencies involved in budget activity or organizational unit which should be studied. Immediately upon receipt of your letter steps will be taken to secure the necessary subcommittee authorization and institute inquiry.

By direction of the chairman.

Signed by the clerk of the committee.

GEO. Y. HARVEY, *Clerk.*

If the gentleman wanted information on any subject he ought to have said so. He was given the opportunity to requisition information on any subject in which he was interested or which he thought should be investigated. Why did not he avail himself of it?

He tells us he does not consider the FBI impartial enough to make a fair investigation. I dare say he is the only man in the United States today who has such doubts or such lack of confidence in FBI. But I noticed that when the FBI investigated a project in which he was interested, he had such implicit confidence in their fairness and capacity that he permitted his friend, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] to publish their report in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in violation of the rules and in contravention of the tenets of good sportsmanship.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

He has a favored project in his district and State, the Coachella Valley project, for which he wants more money than the committee decided he ought to have.

He proposes to offer an amendment, when we reach that section of the bill, to increase the amount of money to be taken out of the United States Treasury and spent in his district. Although in all other matters he is for strict economy.

And with his warm consent and approval the gentleman from Iowa took the report of the Committee on Investigation on that subject, and in violation of the rules of the committee, and in violation of every professional rule of investigation, without consulting anyone, he printed it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD——

Mr. JENSEN. Now, Mr. Chairman——

Mr. CANNON. As evidence in favor of the position which the gentleman from California himself assumes. In other words, this report by the FBI, was so fair, it was so impartial, that he was——

Mr. JENSEN. Now, Mr. Chairman——

Mr. CANNON. He was quick to put it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. JENSEN. Now, listen.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman, that a quorum is not present.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, if the gentleman does not want the truth to be told——

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, I have made a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair heard the gentleman.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I thank the Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is trying his best to get order so he can count. The Chair will count.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, now that there is quiet in the room, I am perfectly willing to withdraw the point of order.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee rise, and I ask for tellers on the motion to rise.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. RABAUT and Mr. TABER.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I do not seem to have any support on that point of order, therefore I withdraw it.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my motion.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman promised to yield to me.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] made the forthright statement, presumably quoting me, that I did not have confidence in the FBI. I have a far greater confidence in the FBI than I have in the gentleman from Missouri.

What I was trying to say is that the FBI is an investigating agency and that what the Committee on Appropriations needs, and what it had in the Eightieth Congress, was a research staff, which today we do not have and without which it is very difficult to decide in detail what is in the bill when you see the bill for the first time on Saturday and go to a committee meeting at 10 o'clock on Monday.

The second thing I want to say to the gentleman from Missouri, which I think he will have to admit, is that most of the facts and figures in the report, of which he speaks so derisively, and which were put in the RECORD by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], were from a report on the Coachella Valley County Water District of California by a nationally known firm of accountants, Price, Waterhouse & Co., the reputation of which must even have reached Missouri. In my opinion the gentleman from Iowa has done nothing out of the

ordinary in this instance. The Members should be familiar with these facts and figures for they will hear more of this subject when we discuss this bill under the 5-minute rule.

I thank the gentleman from Missouri for his very great generosity in yielding me this time.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, for the information of the Members of the House, let me give you the following information just to keep the records straight.

On August 19, 1949, regarding the liquidation of the investigative staff, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], in answer to my question, "Did the gentleman not write a letter which took members of the staff, which the Eightieth Congress had employed, off the pay roll?" The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] said, "I did not. If the gentleman has such a letter let him produce it. We did not refuse to retain anybody. If anybody wanted to remain on the staff, he stayed. He retained the same position he had at the same salary."

But the gentleman politely invited them to resign.

Mr. CANNON. No, no; we did not.

Mr. JENSEN. Now by way of further explanation it should be understood that with two exceptions all members of the staff submitted resignations by request of the chairman. The wording of the resignations, however, made it clear that they were not voluntary. Copies of the same are available. The two who refused to resign were James Kerr and Harry Barger.

I should at this point ask the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], if his chief clerk writes official letters without orders from him. Here is a letter signed by the chief clerk, George Y. Harvey, for whom all of us have great respect, which was sent to the disbursing clerk:

> Please remove James J. Kerr from the investigative pay roll of the committee effective at the close of business February 15, 1949.
>
> GEORGE Y. HARVEY,
> *Clerk.*

Concerning Mr. Barger, the following letter is in the files of the House Disbursing Office:

> Memorandum to the disbursing clerk:
>
> Mr. Harry S. Barger, having accepted employment elsewhere, has severed his connection with the investigative staff of the Committee on Appropriations and therefore will be removed from the pay roll effective at the close of business, January 31, 1949.

I can understand that last letter, but I want it thoroughly understood and I have proof to the effect that James Kerr and Barger were locked out of that office, the lock was changed on the door, and they were served these notices.

Mr. Kerr appealed to his Congressman to help him stay on the staff, but he got this letter from George Y. Harvey, and I know that George Harvey, the chief clerk, would not write such a letter unless he had been directed to do so by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. McGRATH. The gentleman made reference to James Kerr. The gentleman also made reference to the fact that he came to see his Congressman. I was his Congressman. He told me that he had another position, and he only wanted to stay on the staff for 2 weeks more so that he could go into other employment with the Government.

Mr. JENSEN. He was taken off the pay roll before he was ready to leave and locked out.

Mr. McGRATH. If the gentleman will yield further, Mr. Kerr told me on the contrary that the day he left he got other employment with the Government.

Mr. JENSEN. Would you like to have a letter from Mr. Kerr, himself, read on the floor, with reference to this matter?

Mr. McGRATH. Yes, I would like that very much, because I know Mr. Kerr and the neighborhood that he came from. He came into my office and told me he merely wanted to stay 14 days. He told me later he had reached the employment he wanted, and he wanted to terminate his services with the Department.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, when control of the House changed hands, Mr. Lee, who had been assigned to the committee from the FBI some 2 years previously and had been retained by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] in charge of the investigation staff, came to see me about retaining his position. It is our custom to keep a man from FBI up here in charge of investigations for 2 years, the first year as assistant supervisor, and the second year as chief supervisor.

At the close of the 2 years they return to the FBI without loss of seniority or other service advantages.

Mr. Lee had been in charge more than 2 years. When he came to see me I told him that while under the custom heretofore observed he was supposed to leave the committee and return to FBI, we would be glad to have him stay another year. He told me he would like for me to hold that offer open; that he was negotiating with the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] to see if he could not get a position as minority employee. I told him that would be entirely satisfactory if he could go with the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], I would be glad to approve it, but if he wished to stay we would retain him in his old position, at his current salary, in charge of the staff.

Later on he came back and told me he had arranged with the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and would be appointed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] to the minority position and thanked me for my consideration and for the opportunity I had given him to stay another year.

That is indicative of our attitude toward the men the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] says we fired.

So far as the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] is concerned, I give you the book and page here where the gentleman from Iowa contrary to the rules of the committee and the House, and contrary to the basic rules of investigation, inserted in the RECORD on March 28, 1950, at page 4322, the report of our investigation staff on the Coachella Valley project in which Mr. PHILLIPS of California is deeply interested and the appropriation for which he proposes to move to increase when the item is reached in the reading of the bill.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. It is not necessary to yield. The situation does not require a statement from the gentleman, because it is here in the RECORD in violation of the rules. We have a rule, of course, and a very necessary and essential rule, that our reports are confidential and are not made public without action by the committee. They are open to all members of the committee, but not to the public for the obvious reason that the investigators, in order to secure all the facts, must frequently get them in confidence. There are many men who can give information on a matter, but who naturally say, "I am not going to put myself up to be shot at by giving you this information over my name; but if I can give it to you in confidence, I shall be glad to help you.

The result is we cannot under such circumstances make these reports public and frequently we cannot give the sources of our information. If we did, such sources of information would soon dry up. Consequently, we have a committee rule that no reports on investigations shall be made public without formal approval by the committee, secured in advance. The rule against debate on proceedings in committee not formally reported to the House is one of the old rules of the House and is set out in volume V of Hinds Precedents, sections 5080–5083, and volume VIII of Cannon's Precedents, sections 2485–2493. The rule against release of committee papers is laid down in Hinds, III, 2663 and Cannons, VIII, 2496.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. May I ask the gentleman whether or not, during the great many years that he has been a distinguished Member of Congress, he has ever seen printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the report of an investigation without an order from the committee directing the investigation?

Mr. CANNON. Never before, to my knowledge, has any report made by any investigating committee been published without approval of the committee.

It is interesting to note that while the gentlemen indicate lack of confidence in reports from the FBI they are willing to see the rules of the committee and the House violated to get a report from one

of these investigations on the Coachella Valley project located in the district of the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It shows the confidence that both the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] place in our investigating staff when they publish the report of the investigating staff verbatim in support of their position.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, I want but 30 seconds to refute the misstatements. I think we ought not let stand on the record either one or two statements the chairman has just made.

The first is that I in any way questioned the FBI. I have already cleared that up. That is not a statement of fact.

The other is the report, to which the gentleman continuously refers, was based upon facts supplied by the firm of Price, Waterhouse & Co. That is not the investigating staff of the Committee on Appropriations, but was merely used by the investigator, and is public property. In other words, it goes back farther than the report to which the gentleman refers, and I might say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], if he will come to me later, I will give him the pag in the RECORD where we have also seen the same thing published.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

This report is not confined to the audit report referred to, but includes legal investigation and analysis, field studies, investigations into every phase of the question, both here in Washington and anywhere in the country where information could be secured.

It is unnecessary to call attention to the fact that the gentleman did criticize the FBI. I explained that the investigations are largely made by FBI investigators, under FBI supervision, the best that can be secured. He intimated that he would not approve investigations made by the committee's staff; that he had no confidence in them; that they were subject to question. My statement was made in justice to the FBI.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

(Mr. SHORT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, Missouri is a great State. Those of us who come from it frankly admit it. Not merely our mines and farms and forests and factories have contributed much to the material wealth of this Nation, but the greatest wealth of our State is in the intelligence and character of its citizenry. We have contributed much in statecraft, from Benton, Bland, Marmeduke, Reed, Clark, Stone, Hadley, and Spencer. We have contributed much in the way of literature, Mark Twain, Eugene Field, Sara Teasdale, Harold Bell Wright, Rose O'Neil, Rose Wilder Lane, down in my district. We gave to this country "Black Jack" Pershing, General Fries, and Admiral Koonz, in the First World War. We gave to them perhaps the greatest general in this Second World War, Omar N. Bradley.

But we have had other citizens in Missouri—Frank and Jesse James, Tom Pendergast. I do not care to pursue that too long. But I was a bit shocked when I picked up today's Washington Daily News and read from a United Press date line, Kansas City, Mo., April 6:

> Charles Binaggio, 43-year-old north end Democratic political boss who unseated the remnants of the old Pendergast machine in this city's river wards in a dramatic power bid 4 years ago, was shot to death early today in his clubrooms.

The irony of it is that it was on Truman Road.

> Killed with Binaggio was his right-hand man, Charles Gargotta, a hoodlum described recently by a special United States assistant attorney general as one of the top mobsters in Kansas City.

Then the article goes on to say:

> The Pendergast organization was knocked out of control at the city hall here in the cleanup election in 1940. The divided party has never been able to recoup that loss, although Binaggio 2 years ago named his followers to key offices in the county courthouse and appeared to be gaining strength until recently in his bid to take over full party control here.
>
> Binaggio had knocked the remnants of the Pendergast machine, now headed by Jim Pendergast, nephew of the late Boss Tom, out of the deliverable vote wards in 1946, but Pendergast maintained a slim lead in the local committees of the party. Binaggio never was able to get to first base with the national administration, although he made several futile trips to Washington. President Truman and Jim Pendergast are lifelong friends.

The safe was blown and records destroyed by one who is not yet known.

Now, Mr. Chairman, my district is 200 miles south of Kansas City. I do not have to run out and search for trouble; enough of it comes my own way. Only fools rush in where angels fear to tread. But as the lone Republican Member of this House from Missouri in the heart of this Nation, with her 69,000 square miles of territory and her 4,000,000 people, I cannot resist saying a word or two on this rather lamentable and tragic occasion.

I am not pronouncing any encomium or eulogy upon Binaggio; I never saw him nor met him; I do not want to have anything to do with the Democratic leaders in Kansas City. They had their goats and their rabbits under Uncle Joe Shannon who served in this body before Old Tom died. But I am going to pause long enough to say to you people, and I hope to all Americans, that of the men in high places, one was born at Lamar, in the county that adjoins my district; went to Kansas City and Independence, in Jackson County, and was made a county judge—not a judge of law, but a commissioner. Then he wanted to be county collector; that paid $20,000 a year, but Uncle Tom said: "Hold on. I have already promised that to the other boy; I will send you to the United States Senate." And he got here running against two former Members of this House, the late Jack Cochran, who for 20 years served here with distinction and honor, and against Tuck Milligan, who came out of the First World War a captain. He had served a dozen years and then went to Kansas City, Jackson County, Jack Cochran did, with over 100,000 majority from out State. But when the votes were counted, Mr. Truman had received a majority of about 136,000, which is about twice as many votes as Kansas City had at that time; and everybody in Missouri knows that they voted people who had been dead for 20 years, taking the names off of the tombstones. That is the way he got in the United States Senate.

Then, what happened? The brother of Tuck Milligan, Maurice Milligan, a Missouri Democrat from Richmond, who was United States District Attorney in Kansas City, prosecuted Tom Pendergast. Even Old Tom with all his faults had some virtues; any political boss has to have some virtue; he always kept his word. Of course, he loved the saloons and wild women and fast horses, but the trouble was he forgot to report his income. So for evasion of taxes, Maurice Milligan, brother of Capt. Tuck Milligan, who served in this House for 12 long years and who ran against Harry Truman the first time, sent the head of the State insurance agency, Emmett O'Malley, and over 100 Pendergast henchmen from Kansas City to the Federal penitentiary over at Leavenworth which we have named since "Uncle Tom's Cabin." They stayed there.

Then what happened? The United States Senator in the White House saw that Maurice Milligan was finally purged because Maurice Milligan and Lloyd Stark, the latter being our Democratic governor from Louisiana, Mo., the man who gives you the delicious Stark apples, made the mistake of splitting the votes, so that Harry got in a second time by a minority vote of the people not only of Missouri but of his own party.

Now, then, what has happened? Mr. Binaggio is murdered, he and his pal shot down last night on a street in Kansas City, Jackson County. I wonder why?

Many of us know Tom Hennings. Tom Hennings once served in this House. His father is a high official of the Mississippi Valley Trust Co. in St. Louis. Tom is now candidate for United States Senator. He has the backing of the St. Louis organization and I have been reliably informed he had the backing of the Binaggio faction in Kansas City. But Jim Pendergast is backing Mr. Truman's endorsed man. I do not know the State senator from Rolla. I never heard of his name until Harry endorsed him. Mr. Allison, no doubt, is a fine man. But,

you know, even thieves will fall out. Mr. Binaggio was in the way. So what happened? He was bumped off.

I do not like to wash dirty linen. This is the most unpleasant, most disagreeable task I have ever had to perform.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to delve into washing dirty linen here, or run outside of my district just to hunt for trouble. But I have cited incontrovertible facts. I have so many more that I can give, and perhaps one of these days, if I am goaded to it, I shall get an hour's time to recite to you the chapter, verse, and page of one of the most dastardly, the dirtiest, the most corrupt, diabolical, ruthless political machines in the history of this country, that takes its toll from bawdy houses and gambling dens, and will not stop short of murder.

Did you ever hear of the Kansas City massacre a few years ago? We have tough consciences, we have short memories. I have been sitting here since 10 minutes to 1, over 3 hours, just to get an opportunity under this peculiar procedure to say a word, after listening to words, words, words.

Oh, if I had a half-hour to talk about the Hisses, the Coplons, the Wadleighs, the perjurors, the traitors, I mean the corrupt, unspeakble morals, the degenerates, the homosexuals, over a hundred of whom, according to the testimony of the Under Secretary of State himself, a Democrat, have been dismissed.

Now, maybe you do not like it. Certainly I do not like it. I do not like it. I am not mad at anybody. I am filled with righteous indignation today. The trouble with the American people is that we have lost our capacity to become enraged at wrongdoing, and if you could have been with me the past 2 or 3 weeks, from New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, through Maryland, West Virginia, Kentucky, out to Missouri, you would have learned that the American people are losing faith and confidence in their Government, in the integrity, honor, and honesty of the men who have been chosen or appointed to represent them. God help us.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 30 additional minutes.

Mr. SHORT. Of course, I do not think I can last that long. Had I known it in advance, I would. No; the gentleman from Missouri is a keen student, astute, resourceful, diplomatic. I do not want to tie into him any more than with Jack Garner. Of course, there are some important differences between Jack and CLARENCE. I could take 30 more minutes, but I am not going to do it. You are hoping you will give me enough rope to hang myself. I think I have unraveled enough rope to hang many of you this coming November.

(Mr. RIVERS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and that they be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.)

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON].

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, first of all I want to pay tribute to the members of the various subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee who handled their respective chapters.

For many weeks they heard testimony from the various departments of our Government and they marked up their bills with the assistance of the chairman of the full committee. Then each subcommittee presented their work to the chairman of the central committee—a new departure from the customary method—for editing.

Now, I have no quarrel with the membership of the central committee, each and every one of them are hard-working men and each one is familiar with the work of his own particular subcommittee. But I do resent and challenge their right to glance over the voluminous work of each subcommittee and then insult the intelligence of the various chairmen of subcommittees and the membership thereof, and tell them to make further reductions—especially when this central committee, in the case of the Interior Department chapter, spent at the most an hour and a half in editing that chapter.

Now, I want to pay special tribute to the chairman of the Interior Department Subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], who feels as I do about such treatment. I believe I can speak with some authority on this chapter since I have had the privilege of being a member of this subcommittee for a number of years. Of one thing I am sure, and that is that no man living can glance over a chapter like the Interior Department and come up with the right figures in an hour and a half, with all due respect to the central committee.

However, and for the information of the membership of the House, my colleague the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] and I, as minority members of that subcommittee were voted down when we were marking up the bill on several attempts at reductions. Yes, several times we had the votes in our committee to make reductions, only to have the ex officio member cancel them out by his vote—a vote that was made without having heard the witnesses or being familiar with the project. Then the central committee, to add insult to injury, requested a reduction.

Of course, we reserved the right in our subcommittee to seek reductions when the bill reached the floor. We also reserved the right to seek reductions on the floor of the House when we refused the request of the central committee.

So, as far as the Interior Department chapter is concerned, there is no change made in it, since it was marked up by our subcommittee.

I congratulate the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], my subcommittee chairman, for standing for the principle of not relegating to second-class citizenship the membership of his committee.

Now, if this was all that happened, or was to happen, we would possibly swallow it without too much discomfort. Strictly speaking, after we dispose of this one-package bill in the House, the work of three members on each subcommittee, two from the majority and one from the minority, is, to all intents and purposes, at an end. The central committee, plus the chairman and ranking minority member of each subcommittee, will take over in case a conference with the Senate is necessary. Of course, while that does not appear too bad—because there will be two members from each subcommittee who will know something about their particular chapter—it does relegate most of the membership of the Appropriations Committee, not only to second-class citizenship but actually to third-class. Of course they attempt to add some sop in explaining that if they run into difficulty in conference they will bring it back to the subcommittee. Well, now is not that nice—is not that thoughtful of them?

Well, there you have it, ladies and gentlemen of the committee. It is about the worst bungled-up mess that I have witnessed since I am a Member of this body.

Now I want to speak of several items, one from the Defense Establishment chapter and the other from the Independent Offices chapter, before taking up the chapter of the Interior Department.

First, I want to comment on the Army Medical and Hospital Department.

The closing of five or six general hospitals of the Army has caused a lot of confusion, to say the least, as far as treatment for our veterans is concerned.

I am particularly disturbed that the Valley Forge, Pa., hospital is one of those about to be closed.

According to the testimony as disclosed in the hearings, Valley Forge is a general hospital of 1,650-bed capacity, with an average occupancy of 1,130. Its closing will certainly handicap the hospitalization of many of our veterans from eastern Pennsylvania, particularly in the Philadelphia area, until the new veterans' facility is built in Philadelphia several years hence. The VA has a contract with the Army for 175 beds.

The only other Armed Services hospital in eastern Pennsylvania is the Philadelphia naval hospital of 1,450-bed capacity, with an average occupancy of 1,125. In this naval hospital the VA contracts for 550 beds.

The Armed Services Committee is now conducting an investigation regarding the closing of these Army hospitals. I am sure from some of the evidence I heard at two of the subcommittee hearings that the subcommittee will have a very enlightening report.

I listened with a great deal of interest in two of their hearings, especially to the testimony given by my friend and constituent and medical colleague, Admiral Joel T. Boone. Admiral Boone, you will recall, was subsequently removed as the top-ranking uniformed official of the Defense Department's Medical Service Division for daring to take issue with the order. His experience covers a period of over 36 years.

No man in the Defense Department has had as much experience about service hospitals or medicine and surgery.

Yet, on the recommendation of Dr. Richard L. Meiling, Director of the Medical Services for the Defence Department, a man who was graduated from Munich University, Germany, in 1937, the Secretary of Defense issued the cut-back of these hospitals. In other words, a man with but about 12 years of medical practice—five of which were general practice—makes the decision for such drastic reductions of hospital facilities for the Secretary of Defense. It is my understanding that the Surgeons General of the Army, Navy, or Air Force were not consulted either about the cut. Talk about cooperation. Talk about unification. The morale of the armed services is being shot to pieces because men of the type and character of Admirals Denfeld and Boone dare to testify truthfully before committees of Congress of the United States.

Admiral Boone graduated from Hahnemann Medical College, Philadelphia, in 1913, and the Naval Medical School, Washington, in 1915. He is a fellow of the American College of Surgeons, and has honorary master of arts and doctor of law degrees from Hahnemann Medical College. Admiral Boone has had a brilliant career, both in hospital work and on the field of battle for this great country of ours. To be treated in such a manner is not fair; in fact, it is inhuman, if not un-American.

Rear Admiral Boone, born in St. Clair, Pa., August 29, 1889, attended Marcersburg Academy, Mercersburg, Pa., before entering Hannemann Medical College in Philadelphia, Pa., where he was graduated in June 1913. Appointed lieutenant, junior grade, in the Medical Corps of the United States Naval Reserve in April 1914, he was transferred to the Regular Navy in that rank in May 1915, and subsequently was promoted as follows: Lieutenant, March 7, 1918; lieutenant commander, temporary, during World War I, and commissioned in that rank June 3, 1922; commander, September 1, 1931; captain, July 1, 1939; commodore, April 3, 1945; and rear admiral, January 8, 1946, to rank from September 17, 1942.

Following his appointment in the Medical Corps of the United States Naval Reserve in April 1914, Rear Admiral Boone was attached to the naval hospital, Portsmouth, N. H., from July until September 1914, after which he had instruction at the Naval Medical School, Washington, D. C., until April 1915. After transferring to the United States Navy in May 1915, he served at the Naval Training Station, Norfolk, Va., until August of that year, when he was ordered to duty with the artillery battalion, marine brigade, Annapolis, Md. During that assignment, which extended to June 1916, he had service ashore in Haiti in 1915, with the marines, for which he received a letter of commendation from the Secretary of the Navy.

In September 1916, Rear Admiral Boone joined the U. S. S. *Wyoming*, and was serving in that battleship when the United States entered the World War in April 1917. Detached from the *Wyoming* in August of that year, he reported for duty with the Sixth Regiment of Marines, Quantico, Va. Arriving in France in early October 1917, he participated in the following major battles and campaigns, as battalion and regimental surgeon, Sixth Marine Regiment, later as assistant division surgeon of the Second Army Division, American Expeditionary Forces; defense of sector, south of Verdun; Aisne-Marne; St. Mihiel, Champagne, and Meuse-Argonne. For his services as surgeon in the Bois de Belleau, France, in June 1918, he was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross by the War Department. The citation follows:

Distinguished Service Cross (Army): For extraordinary heroism in action in the Bois de Belleau, France, June 9–10 and 25, 1918. On two successive days the regimental aid station in which Surgeon Boone was working was struck by heavy shells and in each case demolished. Ten men were killed and a number wounded were badly hurt by falling timbers and stone. Under these harassing conditions, this officer continued without cessation his treatment of the wounded, superintending their evacuation and setting an inspiring example of heroism to the officers and men serving under him. On June 25, 1918, Surgeon Boone followed the attack by one battalion against the enemy machine-gun positions in the Bois de Belleau, establishing advanced dressing station under continuous shell fire.

For heroism in action at, and in the vicinity of Vierzy, France, on July 19, 1918, Rear Admiral Boone received the highest military award for bravery that can be given to any individual in the United States of America, the Medal of Honor, awarded by Congress. The citation accompanying the medal is as follows:

Medal of Honor: For extraordinary heroism, conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity in actual conflict with the enemy, at and in the vicinity of Vierzy, France, July 19, 1918. With absolute disregard for personal safety, ever conscious and mindful of the suffering fallen, Surgeon Boone, leaving the shelter of a ravine, went forward onto the open field where there was no protection, and despite the extreme enemy fire of all calibers, through a heavy mist of gas, applied dressings and first-aid to wounded marines. This occurred southeast of Vierzy near the cemetery and on the road south from that town. When the dressings and supplies had been exhausted he went through a heavy barrage of large-caliber shells, both high explosive and gas, to replenish these supplies, returning quickly with a sidecar load and administered them in saving the lives of the wounded. A second trip, under the same conditions and for the same purpose was made by Surgeon Boone later that day. He served with the Sixth Regiment, United States Marines.

He also was awarded the Silver Star Medal with five Oak Leaf Clusters, and the Purple Heart with two Oak Leaf Clusters by the War Department, for services during World War I with the Sixth Regiment of Marines, and received special citations from Gen. John J. Pershing, United States Army; Maj. Gen. John A. Lejeune, United States Marine Corps; Maj. Gen. Harry Lee, United States Marine Corps; Maj. Gen. Omar Bundy, United States Army, and Maj. Gen. James G. Harbord, United States Army.

Following his return to the United States in February 1919, Rear Admiral Boone served in the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery, Navy Department, Washington, D. C., and as the Director of Naval Affairs, American Red Cross, from March 1919 until May 1922, when he reported for duty as medical officer aboard the presidential yacht *Mayflower*. During the period of that assignment, which extended to April 1929, he was physician to Presidents Warren G. Harding and Calvin Coolidge. From March 1929 until May 1931, he was attached for record to the Naval Dispensary, Navy Department, while on duty as medical officer to the White House during the administration of President Herbert Hoover, and with the establishment of the position of the Physician to the White House, he continued in the latter capacity until April 1933. During his assignment as Physician to the White House, he served in the temporary rank of captain.

After completing a general postgraduate course at the Naval Medical School, Washington, D. C., in May 1933, Rear Admiral Boone joined the hospital ship U. S. S. *Relief*, in June of that year, serving as chief of medicine of that vessel until June 1935. He then had duty at the naval hospital, San Diego, Calif., until August 1936, when he was transferred to duty as force medical officer of the Fleet Marine Force, San Diego, Calif., where he served until May 1938. In November of that year Rear Admiral Boone joined the U. S. S. *Saratoga*, and served in that aircraft carrier until July 1939.

Rear Admiral Boone had 6 months' duty at the naval dispensary, Long Beach, Calif., before reporting in January 1940 for duty as force medical officer on the staff of rear admiral—now vice admiral, retired—William L. Calhoun, United States Navy, commander base force, United States Fleet, in the flagship *Argonne*, to serve until August 1940. He had duty as senior medical officer at the naval air station, San Diego, Calif., from December 1940 until April 1943, and from May of that year until March 1945 served as medical officer in command at the naval hospital, Seattle, Wash.

In April 1945, Rear Admiral Boone reported for duty as fleet medical officer on the staff of admiral—now fleet admiral, retired—William F. Halsey, United States Navy, commander, Third Fleet. He was selected by Admiral Halsey to be one of three officers to liberate Allied prisoners of war in Japan prior to the military occupation of that country. He was the Naval Medical Corps representative at the surrender ceremonies of the Japanese aboard the U. S. S. *Missouri* in Tokyo Bay on September 2, 1945.

For meritorious service as fleet medical officer on the staff of commander, Third Fleet, from May 28 to September 19, 1945, Rear Admiral Boone was awarded the Bronze Star Medal with Combat Distinguishing Device, and cited as follows:

Bronze Star Medal, Combat V: For meritorious service as fleet medical officer on the staff of commander, Third Fleet, from May 28 to September 19, 1945. Serving with distinction in an assignment of vital importance, Rear Admiral (then Commodore) Boone participated in the planning for the initial landings in the occupation of Japan, particularly in respect to the evacuation and care of Allied prisoners of war, and was in large measure responsible for the improvement of the Third

Fleet's medical organization. Leading a medical evacuation team into the interior of Japan on August 29, he instituted immediate steps to relieve the conditions among the prisoners and, after dealing with Japanese military officers and concentration-camp officials prior to the enemy's formal surrender, succeeded in providing care for men who were suffering from starvation, disease, and malnutrition. By his professional skill, initiative, and devotion to duty throughout, Rear Admiral Boone upheld the highest traditions of the United States naval service.

In November 1945 he was ordered to the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery, Navy Department, Washington, D. C., for temporary duty pending further assignment. In January 1946 he was ordered to duty as district medical officer, Eleventh Naval District, San Diego, Calif. In April 1946 he was designated inspector of Medical Department Activities, Pacific coast, with additional duty as medical officer, western sea frontier. During the period May 1946 to June 1947 he served on temporary additional duty as medical adviser to the Federal Coal Mines Administrator and as the director of the medical survey of the coal industry. Early in 1948 he was assigned as the general inspector, Medical Department Activities, serving simultaneously as Executive Secretary of the Secretary of Defense's Committee on Medical and Hospital Services of the Armed Forces. He was detached as General Inspector, Medical, September 1, 1949, and reported to the Secretary of Defense for duty having been appointed Chief of Joint Plans and Activities in the Office of Medical Services. On November 13, 1948, Rear Admiral Boone was elected president of the Association of Military Surgeons of the United States for the year 1949.

In addition to the Medal of Honor, awarded by Congress; the Distinguished Service Cross, Army; the Silver Star Medal with five Oak Leaf Clusters, Army; the Bronze Star Medal; the Secretary of the Navy Commendation Ribbon; and the Order of the Purple Heart with two Oak Leaf Clusters, Army, Rear Admiral Boone has the Haitian Campaign Medal; the Marine Corps Expeditionary Medal; the Victory Medal with six battle clasps; the Army of Occupation in Germany Medal; the American Defense Service Medal, Fleet Clasp, U. S. S. *Argonne*; the Asiatic-Pacific Area Campaign Medal with two bronze stars; the American Area Campaign Medal; and the World War II Victory Medal. He also has the Order of Fourragere—three awards—Officer of the Legion of Honor, and the Croix de Guerre with two palms, awarded by the French Government; and the War Cross and Diploma, awarded by the Government of Italy.

His official address is St. Clair, Pa. His wife, the former Helen E. Koch, of Pottsville, Pa., resides at 4000 Cathedral Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

Rear Admiral and Mrs. Boone have one daughter, Mrs. Milton F. Heller, Jr., and two granddaughters, who now reside in San Mateo, Calif.

I feel confident that when the subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee makes its report that it will show that Admiral Boone was correct, and that right and justice will prevail.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Now in addition to these cut-backs of Army hospitals, the Veterans' Administration issues an order to drastically curtail its medical personnel.

A bipartisan committee from the Pennsylvania Members of Congress, composed of Senators MYERS and MARTIN, and Representatives CHUDOFF, DAGUE, MORGAN, and FENTON called upon General Gray, the VA Administrator, Tuesday, March 28, protesting the cuts in Pennsylvania. General Gray admitted that the curtailment order might have been premature but that they were finding themselves going in the red because about $20,000,000 was utilized to pay increases in wages, and so forth. It was also admitted that he did not seek or ask for a supplemental appropriation so the lay-off order went out to take effect April 12, 1950.

Incidentally, I just heard from a member of the Associated Press that he understands an order extending the day for the cut-back has been issued today. I hope that is true, and that the cut may be restored or prohibited from going into effect.

General Gray, realizing the effect that this order might have on the services rendered our veterans, is now conducting a resurvey of all the VA installations and has promised to send a report of the survey to Congressman MORGAN and me, who were designated as a subcommittee as far as Pennsylvania is concerned. General Gray assures us that he will be advised by his medical men as to what his course will be on the completion of the survey and that he does not propose to leave the veterans without adequate medical care.

Incidentally, I was glad to hear General Gray make that statement, for too often the medical profession in our Government is subjected to orders and decrees handed down to them from superiors—individuals who know nothing about medicine or hospitals. That goes for the Army, Navy, Air Force, Indian Bureau, and other Government departments including the Secretary of Defense. Yes; even the USPHS under Oscar Ewing. It is time that medical and surgical services be taken out from under the domination of this conglomeration of Federal bureaus and put in its rightful place—a Department of Health.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I will ask leave to place in the RECORD a statement by the Honorable Cicero F. Hogan, national director of claims, for the Disabled American Veterans, when we go into the House, which was made before the House Armed Services Committee in reference to the closing of military hospitals.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the people of this great country of ours do not like this uncertainty of treatment for our veterans. The medical profession and the various service organizations are at their wits end in trying to get their comrades in veterans' facilities. The families and loved ones of the veterans are frantic in a great many instances at the usual delays in getting their sons, or their brothers into institutions for treatment. They do not like it, especially when they see this administration appropriate billions of dollars for rehabilitating foreign countries, some of whom were just a few years ago trying to conquer us and who were the cause of many of the illnesses and infirmities of our own veterans.

These hospitals should be kept open also, because of the great amount of research work that the Army and Navy and Air Forces have been doing in them, not only for veterans but for everybody—for humanity.

Valley Forge Hospital in Pennsylvania was considered one of the great plastic and surgical centers. With the closing of this institution our veterans and servicemen from the East will have to go to San Antonio, Tex., to the Brooke General Hospital. Now, this Brooke General is a wonderful hospital, make no mistake about that, but the veterans' families should be taken into consideration too. San Antonio is a good distance from Pennsylvania and other eastern States.

The same is true for surgical conditions of the eyes—ophthalmological cases.

To close Valley Forge Hospital is to my mind the most stupid piece of work that I have heard of and is contrary to all common sense. It is stupid because Valley Forge Hospital is in the vicinity of one of the finest medical centers of the world, whether Dr. Meiling, of the University of Munich, thinks so or not. It is close to Philadelphia which enjoys such fine medical schools as the University of Pennsylvania; Hahneman Medical School, Admiral Boone's alma mater; Temple Medical School; the Woman's Medical School; and my own alma mater, Jefferson Medical College. The services of the medical men of those institutions were and still are available for our veterans at Valley Forge, for treatment or consultations.

And what is true of Valley Forge is also true of the other hospitals.

STATEMENT OF CICERO F. HOGAN, NATIONAL DIRECTOR OF CLAIMS, DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS, BEFORE THE HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE, IN RE CLOSING OF MILITARY HOSPITALS, MARCH 8, 1950

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Cicero F. Hogan. I am national director of claims for the Disabled American Veterans. This report was prepared with the able assistance of Francis M. Sullivan, our national director of legislation, and Rear Adm. Charles S. Stephenson, United States Navy, retired, our national medical adviser.

We of the DAV appreciate your courtesy in permitting us to submit our organization's views regarding the closing or curtailment of service in existing military and naval hosiptals and the disastrous effect it will have upon the adequate hospitalization for veterans.

The DAV desires to emphasize the fact that we are vitally interested in the order of Secretary Johnson inactivating or restricting military hospitals only insofar as it affects the present hospitalization and treatment of America's veterans. Also, it is our desire to restate our position as being primarily interested in the disabled veteran

who has been wounded, disabled or diseased while in active service during time of war. We wish, however, to stress the fact that we are convinced that in a great majority of cases, especially World War II veterans suffering from conditions which may now be considered as non-service connected will, in fact, be able to prove service connection upon proper development and presentation of their claims before rating agencies of the Veterans Administration. This is especially true in the cases of hundreds of World War II men suffering from active tuberculosis as well as innumerable cases of World War II veterans suffering from mental and nervous disorders

The committee is familiar with the fact that the Veterans' Administration had contracts with service hospitals for the admission and treatment of veterans otherwise entitled to admission into Veterans' Administration hospitals. Figures of the Veterans' Administration indicate that some 7,500 beds were under contract during the year 1949 and divided as follows: Army, average 2,500; Navy, average 3,000; Air Force, average 2,000. As a matter of record, there were some 1,800 beds occupied by veterans on February 1, 1950, and in many hospitals affected by the Secretary's order.

This office is confident that the situation existing in the Veterans' Administration hospitals is such that they cannot absorb this load at this time and, in order to submit to you accurate figures as to the crowded conditions existing in all Veterans' Administration hospitals, and numbers of veterans waiting hospitalization and treatment, we sent to our field offices, in the 68 regional offices of the Veterans' Administration, the following wire under date of March 1, 1950:

"For submission to congressional committee wire collect accurate figures as to waiting list for admission in VA hospitals your area. Specify number service-connected and non-service-connected and type of disability such as tubercular, neuropsychiatric, etc., if figures available. Follow wire with letter giving detailed information regarding hospital admission problems if any. Information as to probable immediate effect of Secretary Johnson's closing order of military hospitals important."

The response was enlightening, if depressing, and it is not our intention to burden the committee with a résumé of all the facts secured but we have decided to confine ourselves to the report of conditions of the Veterans' Administration hospitals in those areas served by the five general hospitals which have been ordered inactivated and closed. This office further believes we can best serve the committee by quoting from the wires and letters received from our national service officers in response to the wire indicated above. We will present this information in the order in which these hospitals are listed in Secretary Johnson's order.

EXHIBIT 1

The following letter, dated March 3, 1950, received from Francis J. Henry, DAV national service officer on duty at the Veterans' Administration regional office, Boston, Mass. The letter is quoted in full and we wish to emphasize the fact that the Veterans' Administration in Massachusetts is not even able to hospitalize and treat the admittedly service-connected cases:

"This report is in compliance with your telegram of March 1, 1950, concerning the VA hospital waiting lists, and is a follow-up of our telegram of yesterday. I have compiled the following facts, figures, and information by personally calling all five of the VA hospitals in this State:

"Veterans who are awaiting hospitalization in this area (Massachusetts):

"Service connected:	
(a) Neuropsychiatric [1]	91
(b) EENT	10
Total service connected	101
"Nonservice connected:	
(a) Neuropsychiatric	775
(b) GM and S	41
(c) Tuberculosis [2]	142
(d) Orthopedic	93
(e) Neurology	80
(f) EENT	43
Total nonservice connected	1,154

"[1] There is a valid possibility that there are at least 50 more, service connected, being maintained in non-Government hospitals. The chief of the neuropsychiatric unit, Boston regional office, is inclined to believe that the VA neuropsychiatric hospital at Bedford has minimized its waiting-list figures.

"[2] Twenty-two of these have service connection for other conditions.

"At the VA hospital, Northampton, Mass., there are 31 service-connected neuropsychiatric cases on the waiting list. However, the registrar informs us that 30 of these are presently being maintained in non-Government hospitals and are awaiting transfer. At this particular VA facility, the P–10's of 188 of the non-service-connected neuropsychiatric veterans waiting admission, have been held by the hospital for 41 days or more.

"The Boston VA regional office quite definitely has considerable difficulty in obtaining prompt hospital treatment for service-connected disabilities not considered emergencies. As a matter of fact, in order to obtain immediate hospital treatment for a service-connected disability, the condition must be considered an emergency; otherwise, as is the case at the Cushing VA Hospital, Framingham, Mass., the P–10's received on the service-connected conditions may take from a week to 3 weeks for processing. Factually, again, there are presently 10 service-connected neuropsychiatric cases awaiting admission to the Cushing VA Hospital.

"The situation as to non-Government hospitals in Massachusetts:

"Many service-connected neuropsychiatric cases are presently being hospitalized and maintained in non-Government hospitals in this State. For example, there are 30 in this category who are awaiting admission to the VA hospital at Northampton, Mass. At the VA hospital in Bedford there are at least a minimum of 50 service-connected neuropsychiatric cases, presently maintained in non-Government hospitals, that are awaiting admission to this VA facility.

"There never has been any necessity to close any wards or beds or wings of any VA hospitals because of difficulty in obtaining or procuring doctors and nurses. There would be no difficulty encountered whatsoever in procuring necessary professional personnel, doctors, nurses, etc., in this metropolitan area.

"At the present time there is under construction a 1,000-bed VA hospital for general medical and surgical cases. This is being constructed in the city of Boston, and completion is expected within 21 months.

"There is still being contemplated a 1,000-bed neuropsychiatric hospital for the city of Brockton, Mass. However, it is still in the blueprint stage, being designed by the VA.

"The figures cited above portray an accurate compilation, and the VA officials did not hesitate to furnish me with this information.

"A VA district office official was somewhat amazed at the high total of service-connected cases awaiting admission, namely, 101, and he emphasized that a percentage of these that are being maintained in non-Government hospitals should not be considered in the same compilation as the figures depicting the total number of service-connected cases awaiting admission to VA hospitals. However, you should realize, as we do, that many of these service-connected neuropsychiatric cases being maintained by the VA in non-Government hospitals are not being given the medical care and treatment that they would otherwise receive in a VA facility. Therefore, using good common sense, one could state that they are officially awaiting admission to a VA hospital and, therefore, should be considered in the total over-all picture.

"We are quite certain of the accuracy of the figures furnished, and are even more certain that they cannot draw a denial from any VA spokesman."

The Veterans' Administration proposes to erect a 1,000-bed general medical hospital in Boston. The site has been approved, and bids were scheduled to open on February 7, 1950.

The Veterans' Administration proposes to erect a 1,000-bed neurophychiatric hospital at Brockton, Mass. The site has been approved. Further information as to the progress on the project is not available.

EXHIBIT 2

The following letter dated March 3, 1950, received from Rudolph Milewski, DAV national service officer, on duty at the Veterans' Administration regional office, Philadelphia, Pa. It, too, is quoted in full as it appears to be a complete and accurate analysis of the veterans hospital program in the area served by the Philadelphia regional office. May we stress the service being rendered by the United States naval hospital in Philadelphia and the number of veterans being hospitalized and treated at the Valley Forge General Hospital and the apprehension this service officer feels over the order closing the Valley Forge General Hospital.

"In further reference to your telegram of March 1, 1950, the following information concerning the hospital situation in the Philadelphia area is hereby submitted:

"United States naval hospital: As of February 1, 1950, the capacity in this facility was 1,250 beds and the VA has a contract with the Navy for 550 beds. The VA case load as of February 1, 1950, was 611. As you will note, this is approximately 61 veteran patients over the prescribed amount allotted under the contract with the United States naval hospital. There is no difficulty encountered by our organization on the general medical and surgical cases, and there is no known waiting list that can be discovered at this time, either for service-connected or non-service-connected general medical or surgical cases.

"However, no known neuropsychiatric cases or known active tuberculosis cases can be admitted to the United States naval hospital if, upon examination or on form P–10 these two conditions are diagnosed. There are, at the present time, some patients who are in the United States naval hospital who have active tuberculosis who entered the hospital and are awaiting treatment for a general medical or surgical disorder, and are awaiting transfer to the only VA tuberculosis facility at Deshon, Butler, Pa. Our biggest situation with the United States Naval Hospital is attempting to secure hospitalization for the diseases of a chronic nature such as multiple sclerosis, arthritis, and so forth where it is more important for patients to receive domiciliary care rather than medical.

"Coatesville Hospital: As of February 1, 1950, bed capacity at Coatesville VA hospital was 2,144 and veteran patients were 1,950; the other beds available in this hospital are on a reserved basis for the use of

female neuropsychiatric cases. At the present time there are approximately 890 non-service-connected neuropsychiatric cases on the waiting list awaiting admission, and 90 service-connected neuropsychiatric cases who are awaiting transfer and hospitalization at Coatesville but who are presently hospitalized in either the Pennsylvania State hospitals or hospitals with which the VA has a contract. One of the hospitals which handles neuropsychiatric cases is the Philadelphia State Hospital at Byberry, and there are presently 150 non-service-connected veterans hospitalized in this facility who would undoubtedly be better cared for in Coatesville, if facilities were available.

"Philadelphia General Hospital: This facility has approximately 25 neuropsychiatric cases at this facility, patients are either transferred to the Philadelphia State Hospital or released if not actively psychotic, and at times we feel that even active psychotics are released due to lack of adequate hospital space.

"Valley Forge General Hospital: As of February 1, 1950, Valley Forge General Hospital has a contract with the VA for 175 general medical or surgical veterans, and at that time there were 163 VA patients hospitalized there. There is no waiting list for either service-connected or non-service-connected cases although Valley Forge acts in the same capacity as the United States Naval Hospital where known tuberculosis or neuropsychiatric cases are not admitted when these conditions are denoted upon the examinations.

"As you probably know, the Defense Department is endeavoring to discontinue this hospital for further use as an Army facility, but with the lack of facilities for tuberculosis and neuropsychiatric cases in the eastern area of Pennsylvania, this hospital should adequately serve the Veterans' Administration in the capacity of a tuberculosis hospital and/or a neuropsychiatric hospital. The difficult situation with tuberculosis hospitals is that there is, at the present time, only one hospital which is located at Butler, Pa., that accepts service-connected and non-service-connected tuberculosis patients although the hospital was primarily established as a general medical and surgical hospital. Our only hospital other than Coatesville which will accept neuropsychiatric non-service-connected cases is located in Lebanon, Pa.; and you will undoubtedly receive a full report of this facility from our representative in Wilkes-Barre, Pa.

"Deshon VA Hospital, Butler, Pa.: Although this facility is in the area over which the Pittsburgh regional office will have the jurisdictional information, a few facts from this office may assist you in securing further information as to the tuberculosis veterans in the area of Philadelphia. There presently is a waiting list of 245 non-service-connected patients awaiting admission to the Deshon facility, and in the Philadelphia area as of February 1, 1950, there were 110 of these veterans. Of the 110, there are 62 veterans who are presently in need of hospitalization for non-service-connected active tuberculosis who are not hospitalized in any facility. The majority of the veterans who are hospitalized are located in the municipal or State hospitals awaiting the determination as to the available space so that they can be admitted to Deshon.

"As you can surmise from the material presented in this letter, the situation in the Philadelphia area is acute in the need for adequate hospitalization of veterans for non-service-connected neuropsychiatric disorders and non-service-connected active tuberculosis. It is almost impossible for our organization to secure immediate hospitalization for a veteran suffering from these disorders, although the medical division of the Philadelphia office knows the veteran is in need of hospitalization and to prolong his entrance into a hospital would endanger his health if tubercular, and if a neuropsychiatric veteran, he would undoubtedly be placed on the waiting lists although actively psychotic and a danger to society.

"We do not have any difficult situation in securing hospitalization for general medical or surgical cases, either service-connected or non-service-connected, as the service-connected cases can be worked out with the medical division on a contract basis with facilities other than VA hospitals, and the non-service-connected cases are taken into Valley Forge General Hospital, United States Naval Hospital, and VA hospital in New Castle, Del. But the situation is critical for tuberculosis and neuropsychiatric hospitalization and we feel that if Valley Forge General Hospital could be secured and devoted to use as a place of treatment for either or both of these conditions, the strain on the Veterans' Administration in this area would be greatly relieved.

"I hope this is the information you desire and I trust it will be of some value in your presentation to the congressional committee with reference to the need for hospital beds in this area."

EXHIBIT 3

The following quotation is from a communication, dated March 1, 1950, received from John J. Keller, DAV national service officer on duty at the Veterans' Administration regional office in Wilkes-Barre, Pa.:

"In general, the hospital situation has been favorable in this area. However, since the Valley Forge General Hospital, Phoenixville, Pa., decided to close down and stop admissions, effective February 15, 1950, I can assure you that it has brought about most unfavorable results insofar as this office is concerned. The Valley Forge General Hospital was always considered in this office as the old mainstay, in that if a veteran could not obtain hospitalization for a non-service-connected or a service-connected disability, we could almost always have him hospitalized at the Valley Forge General Hospital where he would receive adequate care and attention. This is the only instance in this situation which affects hospitalization of veterans, and I might add that it affects them very seriously.

"This Veterans' Administration regional office does use the hospital facilities at United States Naval Hospital, Philadelphia, Pa.; Lebanon Veterans' Administration Hospital; Butler Veterans' Administration Hospital; Aspinwall Veterans' Admiinstration Hospital; Coatesville Veterans' Administration Hospital; Lyons Veterans' Administration Hospital, and prior to February 15, 1950, they did use the facilities at the Valley Forge General Hospital."

This office has first-hand knowledge of the outstanding medical achievement that has been rendered by the Valley Forge General Hospital, especially in the treatment of combat cases so seriously disfigured and maimed that years of treatment and hospitalization were required before they could be released to civil life.

The Veterans' Administration has erected and proposes to open in June of this year a 200-bed general medical hospital at Altoona, Pa.

The Veterans' Administration has erected and proposes to open during June of this year a 200-bed general medical hospital at Erie, Pa.

The Veterans' Administration has erected and proposes to open in July of this year a 545-bed addition to the neuropsychiatric hospital at Lebanon, Pa.

The Veterans' Administration proposes to erect a 500-bed general medical hospital in Philadelphia. Contract has been awarded but construction has apparently not yet started. The original proposal was for a 1,000-bed hospital but was ordered reduced to 500 beds by Executive order, dated January 10, 1949.

The Veterans' Administration proposes to erect a 1,000-bed neuropsychiatric hospital at Pittsburgh, Pa. The contract has been awarded but construction has not yet started. This was originally proposed as a 1,250-bed hospital but was reduced to 1,000 beds by the Executive order of January 10, 1949.

The Veterans' Administration proposes to erect a 750-bed general medical hospital at Pittsburgh, Pa. Preliminary plans have been completed. This was originally proposed as a 1,200-bed hospital but was reduced to 750 beds by Executive order of January 10, 1949.

The Veterans' Administration has erected and proposes to open in August of this year a 475-bed general medical hospital at Wilkes-Barre, Pa.

EXHIBIT 4

We are quoting a telegram, dated March 2, 1950, received from Philip H. Muller, DAV national service officer on duty at the Veterans' Administration regional office, Fort Jackson, S. C. This is submitted for the reason it indicates the crowded conditions of the Veterans' Administration hospital at Fort Jackson, just outside of Columbia, S. C., and which has apparently been forced to use the Oliver General Hospital, Augusta, Ga., ordered to be inactivated:

"In re your telegram 1, 1950 hospital information available to us for VA hospital, Columbia, S. C. only. Waiting list as of March 2, 1950, includes 12 general medical white; 12 TB colored; 3 EENT white; 5 eye white; 12 orthopedic white. All above cases nonservice connected. Now have 50 P–10S awaiting determination of eligibility for inclusion on waiting list. Most difficulty now being encountered with white medical, orthopedic, and neuropsychiatric non-service-connected cases due to lack of space. Medical personnel no problem. Hospital well staffed. Hospital now holding number of white TB non-service-connected cases for transfer to specialized hospitals but can't release because all TB institutions this area filled to capacity. White non-service-connected neuropsychiatric cases not being accepted because hospital space not available except for emergency. VAH Columbia not equipped for treatment of closed ward patients and proper NP hospitals are filled to capacity. Service-connected cases are being admitted within the shortest possible time and no difficulty being experienced. Secretary Johnson's closing order will affect this area in that VA cases formerly being admitted to military hospitals will now have nowhere to go except VA hospitals and this will cause further jamming up of already overloaded facilities."

The Veterans' Administration Hospital at Fort Jackson is a general medical hospital of 606 beds.

EXHIBIT 5

The following communication, dated March 3, 1950, received from Sydney J. Allen, DAV national service officer on duty at the Veterans' Administration regional office, Detroit, Mich. We urge careful study of this communication coming from the State where is located the Percy Jones General Hospital. Please note Mr. Allen's statement to the effect that Michigan veterans suffering from tuberculosis must seek hospitalization in five different States outside the State of Michigan. It is to be noted that a 500-bed tuberculosis hospital was approved by the Veterans' Administration and the appropriation secured for its erection at Detroit, Mich. This project was eliminated by the executive order of January 10, 1949. May we also stress the fact that the Veterans' Administration is paying to private and State institutions for the care of service-connected veterans which they are unable to hospitalize in the crowded VA hospitals.

"This letter will supplement and furnish more detailed information contained in our telegram.

"The figures we quoted in our telegram 622 general medical and surgical cases on the waiting list and 350 NP cases, no TB's, does not furnish an adequate picture. The general medical and surgical cases on the waiting list will increase by approximately 200 on account of Percy Jones Army Hospital closing at Battle Creek. The TB situation, of course, is very misleading. Since the Veterans' Administration has no TB beds in Michigan, with the exception of 50 for terminal cases at Dearborn, TB applications for hospitalization are forwarded to Wisconsin, Illinois, Ohio, New York, and Kentucky. For that reason do not appear on the Michigan waiting list.

"Recently, the veterans' organizations surveyed the State and county hospitals in Michigan and found that there were 598 TB patients hospitalized and 500 NP cases. There was a misunderstanding between the State and the Veterans' Administration. It is estimated that the Veterans' Administration owes the State approximately $1,000,000. However, due to technicalities the Veterans' Administration refused to pay most of this money because official request was not made in accordance with Veterans' Administration regulations. In many cases, form P–10 was submitted to the Veterans' Administration prior to the date service connection was established. The State failed to submit a second form P–10. We analyzed 30 cases representative of 400 and find that the Veterans' Administration did not pay the State for approximately 9 months in each case. Since we started the survey, they are paying currently but refuse to pay the retroactive amount. This is now being investigated by central office as a result of our conference with Gen. Carl R. Gray, Jr., on February 16. The TB situation in Michigan is terrible. There are so many State and county veterans in TB hospitals, it is becoming very difficult to have either citizens or veterans admitted.

"So far as NP cases are concerned, we no longer attempt to have non-service-connected cases hospitalized at Fort Custer. It is useless. We estimate that if the Veterans' Administration had 1,000 additional NP beds they would be filled within 90 days.

"The 500 TB hospital if built would be filled to capacity. As far as general medical and surgical cases are concerned, only one out of two cases are being taken from the waiting list per day. It is becoming impossible to have a non-service-connected case admitted unless it is very serious. Many P–10's are being rejected because of the long waiting list which would be admitted if beds were available.

"We cannot understand why the Veterans' Administration authorized a 500-bed general medical and surgical hospital in Ann Arbor which is 35 miles from Dearborn and cancelled the TB hospital. Certainly the Veterans' Administration must know that TB beds are more urgently needed than general medical and surgical, particularly since a new general medical and surgical hospital is being officially opened in Iron Mountain on March 5 and another general medical and surgical hospital will be available to patients sometime in July. The real problem here is TB beds."

The Veterans' Administration is erecting a 500-bed general medical hospital at Ann Arbor, Mich., estimated to be completed on or about March 1951.

The Veterans' Administration has completed as of January 1950, a 250-bed general medical hospital at Iron Mountain, Mich.

The Veterans' Administration has erected a 200-bed general medical hospital at Saginaw, Mich., which will be completed in April of this year.

The Fort Custer neuropsychiatric hospital, referred to in Mr. Allen's letter, is a 2,017-bed hospital in operation.

Please note Mr. Allen's statement that it is useless to attempt to secure admission for any veteran not admittedly service connected.

EXHIBIT 6

While not referring to a general hospital ordered inactivated, we wish to protest the marked reduction at the Madigan General Hospital at Fort Lewis, Wash., and desire to submit here the following wire received from Perry E. Dye, DAV national service officer on duty at the Veterans' Administration regional office, Seattle, Wash., because it emphasizes the assistance the Madigan General Hospital has rendered to the Veterans' Administration and the serious condition which is bound to result if Secretary Johnson's order reducing this hospital becomes effective:

"MARCH 6. No waiting list of service-connected disabilities for which hospitalization is indicated in any medical category. Since Johnson order closing 350 beds Madigan General Army Hospital, Tacoma, Wash., no beds available for non-service-connected cases. Cannot give figure on non-service-connected general medical, TB or NP cases on waiting list as this regional office forwards all P–10's to hospitals in area. They have waiting list. Will endeavor to get waiting list in these VA hospitals in next few days. Beds now available under Federal hospital contract amount to 195, previous available beds 545. Situation is serious here due to Johnson cut. Letter will follow in few days with detailed information on waiting list at VA hospitals and Federal contract as well as private hospitals. Our understanding that a great many non-service-connected VA cases, both TB and NP, are being cared for in private and State hospitals throughout this area."

The Veterans' Administration is erecting a 300-bed general medical hospital at Seattle, Wash., and the estimated date of completion is November 1950.

The Veterans' Administration is building a 200-bed general medical hospital at Spokane, Wash., and estimated date of completion is June 1950.

EXHIBIT 7

The following letter, dated March 2, 1950, is from Charles A. Sloane, DAV national service officer, on duty at the Veterans' Administration regional office, Los Angeles, Calif. This communication is submitted in full because it analyzes the veterans'-hospital problem in that area of California served by the Los Angeles Regional Office and refers specifically to those cases which heretofore have been hospitalized in the naval hospital at Long Beach and its patient load of 427 veterans on the 15th of February this year. We wish to call your attention to Mr. Sloane's statement that the average monthly turnover at the Long Beach Hospital is in the neighborhood of 500, which means that some 6,000 veterans have been treated at that hospital each year:

"I am enclosing confirmation of telegram forwarded you as quickly as figures requested could be assembled. Here is the breakdown:

"San Fernando TB Hospital has a waiting list of 224; however, 33 of them are awaiting transfer from other hospitals, and there is no break-down as to whether service-connected or not. The list includes 88 non-service-connected and 3 service-connected.

"At Birmingham, in Van Nuys, there are no service-connected awaiting although on a non-service basis there are 32 TB's, 35 medical and surgical, and 18 NP's.

"At Wadsworth there are 180 on the medical and surgical waiting list, none of whom are service-connected, but it is estimated that about 37 of whom have other service-connected disabilities.

"All emergencies, both service-connected and non-service-connected, are being handled so far, but the situation is becoming exceedingly acute.

"At the Brentwood NP Hospital, of 1,111 on the waiting list, 991 are non-service-connected and 120 have other service connections than NP. In other words, the entire waiting list is non-service-connected as far as NP disability is concerned.

"Of the 562 men and 8 women awaiting admission to the domiciliary, there is no breakdown to tell whether or not they are service- or non-service-connected.

"With reference to the closing of the Long Beach Hospital, on the 15th of February our patient load there was 427. The average monthly turn-over was 500.

"However, in view of the fact that only emergencies are being admitted now, our Chief Medical Officer here estimates there will be 60-some-odd orthopedic cases remaining by May 15 when the orthopedic service will be discontinued. Those cases, therefore, which heretofore have been hosiptalized in the naval hospital at Long Beach, will have to be hospitalized elsewhere, either at Birmingham or Wadsworth, here in Sawtelle, or be placed on waiting lists.

"In the week prior to May 15, any remaining patients at Long Beach will be divided between Wadsworth and Birmingham. The result will probably mean that only service-connected emergencies can, during most of the time, be hospitalized at all unless future hospital facilities are made available."

The Veterans' Administration has constructed a 250-bed general medical hospital at Fresno, Calif., which was estimated to be completed as of January 1950.

The Veterans' Administration proposes to build a 1,000-bed neuropsychiatric hospital at Los Angeles, Calif. This project was approved on October 19, 1946. The site is still in the process of selection which means that the hospital will not be available for patients for 3 years or more.

The Veterans' Administration proposes to erect a 1,000-bed neuropsychiatric hospital at San Francisco, Calif. This project was approved on October 19, 1946, and its site has been approved and title acquired. It is questionable if this hospital either will be available within 3 years.

EXHIBIT 8

The following quotation from a letter, dated March 2, 1950, received from Lumir F. Vobeyda, DAV national service officer, on duty at the Veterans' Administration regional office, San Diego, Calif. We are quoting only that part of Mr. Vobeyda's letter which refers to the use by the San Diego regional office of beds in military hospitals, including the United States Naval Hospital at Corona and Long Beach, Calif.

"The San Diego regional office has been using various county and private hospitals to take care of the more serious neuropsychiatric and tuberculosis cases. There are contracts for these cases made between the Veterans' Administration and these hospitals. The Los Angeles regional office takes care of the grand majority of the tuberculosis and neuropsychiatric cases from this area and, therefore, the problems of this area are reflected in the waiting list of the Los Angeles regional office.

"In reference to the immediate effect of closing of military hospitals on this area, the situation in the United States Naval Hospital in San Diego is that of an increased military load, due to the closing of the United States Naval Hospitals in Corona and Long Beach, Calif. The immediate effect on the Veterans' Administration patients in the United States Naval Hospital is reflected in an increasing trend toward using the

200 contract beds for emergency and temporary cases only, and transferring to the Los Angeles regional area all chronic or apparently chronic cases. According to my own personal observations, I have noticed that Veterans' Administration patients have been released from the United States Naval Hospital with a discharge of maximum hospital benefits before they were actually fit for discharge and, thereby, had to be rehospitalized shortly thereafter."

With reference to the closing of the Long Beach Naval Hospital, please be advised that we have received a communication from our office in Reno, Nev., to the effect that one-third of the patients from the Reno, Nev., regional office, Veterans' Administration, are hospitalized in the Army and Navy hospitals in California, including Oak Knoll Naval Hospital, Oakland, Calif.; Mare Island Naval Hospital, Vallejo, Calif.; and Letterman Army General Hospital, San Francisco, Calif.

May we recall the testimony already submitted by the Surgeon Generals of the Army and Navy that the marked reduction in military hospitals will necessarily affect their ability to accept veteran patients in remaining institutions.

As proof of crowded conditions in existing Veterans' Administration hospitals, reports received from almost every section of the country refer to the large number of veterans, all admittedly service connected and suffering from active tuberculosis or serious neuropsychiatric disabilities, who are hospitalized and being treated at Government expense in private hospitals, sanitoriums, or State institutions. An outstanding example is the report received of 965 service-connected neuropsychiatric cases hospitalized in New York State institutions all at the expense of the Veterans' Administration.

We respectfully submit the above information as indicative of the dire need of hospital beds in these military institutions by wartime disabled veterans. The Disabled American Veterans emphasize the fact and believes that Secretary Johnson's order was premature insofar as it will vitally affect the hospitalization and treatment of thousands of veterans who are entitled to hospitalization and treatment in the Veterans' Administration but who will be denied such treatment until the building program of the Veterans' Administration is nearer completion.

Further information regarding situations existing in other regional offices of the Veterans' Administration, which are bound to be affected by the marked reduction in military institutions listed in the Secretary's order, will be gladly submitted to this committee if we are called upon to do so. We can assure you that the facts and figures submitted are authentic and that the communications quoted come from trained, full-time national service officers who are all on duty in regional offices of the Veterans' Administration throughout the country.

Notes on veterans' hospitals and VA personnel situation in Pennsylvania

VA HOSPITALS IN OPERATION

Location	Type	Operating beds	Patients, Feb. 21, 1950	Waiting list
Aspinwall	GM	924	904	915
Butler	GM	880	809	[1] 311
Coatesville	NP	2,038	1,940	[2] 1,061
Lebanon	NP	501	478	[3] 288
Philadelphia, naval (contract).	GM	620	617	210
Total				2,785
Valley Forge, Army (contract).	GM	175	152	(4)
Total		5,138	4,900	

Footnotes at end of tables.

VA HOSPITALS UNDER CONSTRUCTION

Location	Type	Number of beds	Estimated date construction complete
Altoona	GM	200	June 1950.
Erie	GM	200	Do.
Harrisburg	GM	200	Canceled, Jan. 10, 1949.
Lebanon addition	NP	545	July 1950.
Philadelphia	GM	[5] 500	July 1951.
Pittsburgh	NP	[6] 1,000	January 1952.
Do	GM	[7] 750	Estimated date bids, May 1950.
Wilkes-Barre	GM	450	December 1950.

[1] Including 252 TB cases.
[2] Including 100 service-connected NP cases.
[3] Including 124 NP cases.
[4] Admissions discontinued as of Feb. 15, 1950.
[5] Reduced from 1,000, Jan. 10, 1949.
[6] Reduced from 1,250, Jan. 10, 1949.
[7] Reduced from 1,200, Jan. 10, 1949.

NUMBER PERSONNEL, VA HOSPITALS, JAN. 31, 1950

Location	Total	Medical	Fin-Pers-Rec-VRE	Special services	Construction and supply
Aspinwall	1,029	788	50	17	174
Butler	966	731	50	19	166
Coatesville	1,206	975	47	21	163
Lebanon	453	330	26	9	88

REDUCTION IN FORCE ANNOUNCED MAR. 3, 1950

Location	Number of employees Jan. 31, 1950	To be dismissed (Department of Pennsylvania estimate)
Hospitals:		
Aspinwall	1,029	50
Butler	966	44
Coatesville	1,206	66
Lebanon	453	13
Regional offices:		
Philadelphia	1,531	[8] 68
Pittsburgh	1,330	[9] 44
Wilkes-Barre	1,046	[10] 38

[8] Including 1 full-time doctor, 2 full-time dentists, 6 part-time doctors.
[9] Including 3 dentists, 16 part-time doctors.
[10] Including 5 full-time doctors, 2 dentists, 9 part-time doctors.

NATION-WIDE WAITING LIST

	December 1948	January 1950
Veterans awaiting hospital admission	14,080	22,993
Applications pending, eligibility not determined	8,192	7,437
Total [11]	22,272	30,430

[11] 36 percent increase.

Waiting period—Applicants for hospitalization, VA

Total applicants eligible	22,993
1 to 20 days	4,066
21 to 40 days	2,510
Over 40 days	16,417

T. O. KRAABEL,
National Director.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT

Mr. Chairman, our subcommittee reduced the budget estimate of the Interior Department from $669,251,505 to $621,634,130—a reduction of $47,617,375. This is $31,430,183 more than the current year when they had $590,203,947.

In addition the committee allowed them $37,250,000 in authorization out of a request for $44,750,000—a reduction of $7,500,000. This is in contrast to $65,251,700 allowed for the current fiscal year, or $28,001,700 less.

In every Bureau of the Interior Department a cut was made from the budget estimates with but one exception—that of the Fish and Wildlife Service—they were granted $25,000 more.

As has been my custom in debate on the Interior Department Appropriations bill I will not take up the time of the committee on the details of the Reclamation Bureau since it is covered or will be by others on the committee. I would like to reiterate, however, that I am in full accord with the policy of development of the States west of the Mississippi, but feel that perhaps we should proceed in a more orderly fashion and in conformity with our means. Certainly I am in full accord as far as irrigation, conservation, and flood control is concerned. I will even subscribe to hydroelectric power as a means of providing electric energy in those localities where it is necessary and where private industry cannot supply or will not supply the demand. On the other hand I cannot or will not subscribe to any encroachment on or confiscation of private property. Neither do I condone the building of steam plants by one agency to eventually turn them over to another agency at a future date when they are prohibited to build themselves. This is not forthright and should be stopped.

In the Southwest, the Southwest Power Administration is being stabilized through the energetic efforts of Douglas Wright. We heard a lot of testimony. At least Mr. Wright is honest and is trying to get contracts with the various utility companies. I do not know whether he has persuaded the Interior Department or not to sign the Oklahoma contracts.

If the Government is insisting on getting into the power business I believe that Douglas Wright has as honorable approach to it as anyone.

Not content with confining their work in the power field to the western part of the country the Interior Department is now extending their itching hands into the southeastern part of our country. The committee recommended an appropriation of $150,000 for 1951—over twice that of the current year. They asked for $175,000. My advice to the private power companies down there is to "watch your step" boys—or you will find yourselves in the same boat as the boys in the Northwest.

The squeeze is on private enterprise by the advocates of public ownership and the Army engineers. The latter have just recommended a power project up in the Susquehanna River area to try and justify flood control projects in that region. I know that there are plenty of electric power companies in that area to supply the demand for power.

Let us not kid ourselves, it is not a case of "brown outs" as much as it is cheap power that is wanted. Sure, everybody would like cheap power, but it takes away from local, State, and Federal Governments an awful lot of tax money.

Now I would like to talk for a few moments about the Bureau of Indian Af-

fairs, particularly the health, education, and welfare phases of it.

I wish you would take the time to read what Dr. Foard, the medical director, says about his program. I have a lot of confidence in Dr. Foard and if he can go forward with his program without being interfered with by laymen who do not know the first thing about medicine or sanitation, he will clean up the mess that prevails in that service.

Year after year we hear the same story about the morbidity and mortality rates of the Indians. The great prevalence of tuberculosis, the high morbidity rate in infants and children, the terrible unsanitary conditions, the woeful lack of school facilities and the 16 to 20,000 children who never have been to school. Shall this keep up indefinitely or are we too concerned about underdeveloped areas in foreign countries?

It was testified that the United States Government had from 1900 to 1950, inclusive, apropriated $1,019,477,525 for the Indians and Indian activities. I believe that averages about $20,389,544 per year.

Now while I do not like conditions as they exist, I do not believe it can be charged that the United States Government has not expended a pretty good amount of money for the Indian Service.

I believe a proper and thorough investigation is in order and would suggest that if Dr. Foard cannot carry out his program without interference from people who know nothing about health and sanitation, that his program be placed under the United States Public Health. The United States Public Health Service is spread all over the world and I believe if they could be given the job to clean up this mess in the Indian Bureau it would be done within the shortest possible time.

It was rather reassuring to the membership of the subcommittee to have the pleasure of having a group of Indians from California come before us and, in effect, say that they did not want any part of the appropriation to the Indian Bureau granted in their name. They want to be integrated into the population of California and assume the rights of citizenship. The committee granted their request and decreased the project amounts accordingly.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY AND BUREAU OF MINES

Two other very important bureaus of the Interior Department—the Geological Survey and the Bureau of Mines—I want to comment on for a few minutes.

I believe, in the light of what has transpired in the House in the second session of the Eighty-first Congress, that more attention should be given to those two bureaus.

In the case of the Geological Survey—a very, very important cog in our Government's wheel—we have approved an appropriation for $19,129,000. They asked for $20,000,000, or a decrease of $871,000. We allowed them $3,084,600 more than for this fiscal year.

When we consider that the Geological Survey is responsible for the discovery, study, and evaluation of our natural resources in the ground—our minerals, our water—I am constrained to admit that this Bureau has done a fine job with the money they have received. It is admitted that we have not done enough in this field and this has been shown in the past few weeks right here on this floor when the bill to assist our metallic mines was up for consideration, and when we voted to develop underdeveloped areas of foreign countries.

With only 30 percent of our strategic stock pile on hand, it behooves this administration to do everything possible for information on our resources through this fine bureau.

The Bureau of Mines, whose responsibility starts with the mining and production of our resources, together with technical methods of mining, metallurgy, and beneficiation of ores, is likewise a very, very important Bureau. This Bureau was allowed $24,235,600 for fiscal 1951—a decrease from the budget estimate of $973,100.

Most of this appropriation is for the conservation and development of mineral resources in the amount of $17,758,000.

For health and safety $3,805,000 was granted; $1,376,600 for construction, and $1,300,000 for general administration.

The Bureau of Mines received the same amount of money for this item as the current year plus $102,636 for increase of base salaries.

The two main projects in this item are for operating mine rescue cars and stations and investigating mine accidents in the amount of $1,118,046, and for coal mine inspections in the amount of $2,506,822.

It is my opinion that these two items are very worth while, and I believe are producing good results. Certainly if the advice given industry and employees was carried out the results could be still greater.

It is gratifying to observe that the number of fatal accidents in coal mines were reduced in calendar year 1949. There were 593 fatal accidents reported. This is quite a reduction when the records show that from 1942 up until 1949 the fatal accidents ranged from 1,000 to 1,500 a year, with the exception of 1946 when 974 fatal accidents occurred.

The major cause of the fatal accidents is still "falls of roof." I am pleased to note that the Bureau is now concentrating their efforts in research to try and solve this problem.

There has not been a major explosion since July of 1948.

Of course, there are far too many fatal accidents. There is no question in my mind that with cooperation between operators and employees, State departments of mines, and the Federal Bureau of Mines these accidents can be reduced to a minimum.

In the field of conservation and development of mineral resources the Bureau of Mines is doing a fine job. Their work on synthetic fuels, control of mines' fires, the mine-water survey, and pilot plant operations are progressing very well. I feel that the country will greatly benefit from this fine work.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Finally, the National Park Service was granted $36,745,200, a cut of $2,661,300 under the budget, but $6,995,250 over the current year.

Each year as I look over some of the areas of our national-park system I become amazed at the extensive job this find group of people are doing in managing, protecting, and maintaining our great parks. Last year was no exception when I visited a number of their installations in the South, including the Everglades National Park.

Last year our park system, up until October, handled 31,800,000 visitors. Every year since the end of the war more people visited our parks. For instance in 1945, 10,521,375 people traveled in our park system, while in 1948 it more than doubled that figure with 21,682,782 visitors. In 1941 the number was 21,050,426. In 1941 they had personnel of 1,591 as compared with 2,733 in the fiscal year 1950.

I want to congratulate Director Drury for the fine personnel he has in the southeastern part of the system, from the regional office in Richmond down to and including the Everglades and Fort Jefferson. All these people are doing fine work.

I did find that there is need for additional rangers in the Everglades. In fact, I believe there is need for that type of personnel in increasing numbers, particularly in the Everglades. Vandalism and poaching, to say nothing of fire, should be recognized as the reasons for furnishing more protection to park property.

Finally, I want to comment on our inadequate police protection for the National Park Service right here in the Capital of the United States.

For fiscal 1950 we allowed additional 40 policemen but for 1951 we did not allow any increase in police protection. The figures given us in crime, arrests, and so forth, certainly justify better protection for the 60,000,000 people who use the 750 areas in the local park systems each year. Much has been said about homosexuals and perverts in the last several weeks. The park police picked up 274 perverts in our national parks last year. Many crimes from rape to robbery and auto thefts are committed. I believe there is urgent need for more protection for the American people right here at home.

(Mr. FENTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, last Tuesday I introduced two bills designed to promote economy and assist in achieving a sounder fiscal policy. These measures give to the President the power to veto individual items in any appropriation bill. The essential difference between them is that one provides by legislative fiat that each item shall be considered a separate bill for the purpose of the Executive veto, whereas the other proceeds on the theory that a constitutional amendment to achieve this objective is necessary.

Presidents Grant, Hayes, Taft, and Roosevelt, and perhaps other Presidents,

have requested Congress to empower them to disapprove particular items in appropriation bills without being forced to veto the entire measure and run the risk of depriving a Government department of the power to function by withholding funds completely. At least 39 of our States permit their Governors to veto separate items and in some cases simply to reduce an item.

This has always been a problem in the case of the national budget. Even when presented with an appropriation bill affecting a single Government department containing items objectionable to the President, he has been faced with an unfortunate choice either to sign the bill, thereby approving of items which he considers unjustified, or disapprove the bill in its entirety, thereby depriving the department concerned of funds essential for its continued operation.

This problem, always acute, has been accentuated manyfold by the presentation of the present omnibus appropriation bill. To permit an item veto will contribute greatly, it seems to me, to the success of this one-package method of making appropriations. The purpose of this approach to approving funds is twofold—to save time and to save money. The latter purpose, however, may never be accomplished unless the President is empowered to disapprove specific items which he feels are unjustified.

If to get operating funds for the Government the President is forced to sign the entire bill, including any floor amendments which may be adopted, our annual expenditures may skyrocket more than ever and the one-package approach, contrary to the expectations of its sponsors, may be used as a device for bigger spending and more extensive log rolling. Certainly we should welcome any check on our deeper submersion into red ink.

The opposition to such legislation may be voiced that it centers too great power in the President. Any step to enlarge Executive authority is certain to be viewed, and very properly, with some skepticism. Generally speaking, it is the position of many Members, including my own, that curtailment rather than enlargement of executive powers is desirable. Particularly in the field of appropriations, the Congress has historically been reluctant to yield any part of its control over governmental operations. When we are faced, however, with an operating deficit for 2 years in a row, greater than the entire cost of running the Federal Government 17 years ago, perhaps we should reappraise our attitude. Right at this critical moment it seems to me the most constructive service we could render would be to adopt every reasonable suggestion advanced to cut down the cost of running the Government.

Let us take a look at the way this plan would operate if the President were given the power of single-item veto. It may be argued that he might disapprove a particular appropriation because he felt it was not enough and that the Congress had cut a budget estimate too much. Thus, it may be said, the passage of such a measure as I have proposed might lead to increased rather than reduced expenditures. The answer to this argument is that such action by the President would always run the risk of resulting in a complete denial of any funds for such a project, unless his veto were overridden, in which case, of course, the figure as originally fixed by Congress would be retained.

As a practical matter it seems to me the only result which could flow from the single item veto would be a downward revision of congressional appropriations. It is true, of course, that the President might strike out some pet project of an individual Member and that action would stand unless revised by a two-thirds vote. But that is a chance I am prepared to take. I believe that, by and large, the people of this country would prefer to run the hazard that some particular Federal project might be curtailed if they were reassured by the prospect of achievement of a substantial over-all reduction in spending.

I am completely satisfied that the net result of permitting the single-item veto would be bound to be substantial and constructive economy in government.

Conceding the desirability of such a change, we are still faced with a determination as to the method of effecting this legislative improvement. There is a substantial body of opinion, perhaps a majority, which holds that this can only be done by constitutional amendment. The first sentence of article I, section 7, reads:

> Every bill which shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate shall, before it becomes a law, be presented to the President of the United States; if he approve he shall sign it, but if not he shall return it, with his objections, to that House in which it shall have originated, who shall enter the objections at large on their Journal, and proceed to reconsider it.

By stress on the word "it," which appears at several places in the quoted sentence, the argument is advanced that the sentence is free from ambiguity, so that there is no occasion for construction. It is said that it would be too deliberate a departure from the literal and ordinary meaning of words to extend the latitude necessary to interpret this sentence as permitting item vetoes. Eminent text writers have supported this view. They may be right. The courts may eventually sustain that position, but I venture to assert that there is a powerful argument which can be advanced on the other side. At the least, it seems to me there is sufficient doubt that we would be thoroughly justified in passing legislation to bring about this much-needed reform, leaving to the judicial branch, the appropriate forum, the eventual determination regarding constitutionality.

The Constitution is not a mere compilation of legalistic rules. It is the pattern of a philosophy of government. It sets forth general principles rather than detailed procedure. It was designed to create a government of laws as distinguished from a government of men. It sought to accomplish this by dividing the powers of government among three independent and coordinate branches, each one of which should be a check on the other. The Constitution simply creates these three branches and draws the line between them. We can only maintain our form of government if each independent branch recognizes the rights and duties of the others and protects them as diligently as it protects its own.

Webster defines the word "bill" as follows:

> A form or draft of a law presented to a legislature but not yet enacted, or before it is enacted; a proposed or projected law.

The term "bill," as used in the Constitution, does not have any technical meaning and apparently had none when the Constitution was adopted. It is simply a vehicle for carrying proposed law through the legislative bodies. There is no constitutional requirement that it shall be in any particular form. It is simply a device by which the legislature may express its will. Neither usage nor constitutional limitation requires us to attach any restrictive meaning to the word "bill" which will prevent the fulfillment of the real intent of the framers in providing for an Executive veto. We must, as in all constitutional construction, look to substance and not to mere form. In State against Platt, a South Carolina case reported in 2 South Carolina 150, there is an illuminating discussion of the meaning of the term "bill." There the court says:

> In a technical sense, the term "bill" is applicable properly to the enactment as a whole. Although the technical use of words should prevail where not inconsistent with the clear intent of the instrument, yet when such intent requires that words should be used in the larger sense, it is competent so to regard them. If we should hold that the Constitution regards the enactment as a whole, in an exclusive sense, we would be led to the inevitable conclusion that to become a law, all the substantial parts of the measure must have together passed through all the requisite stages. The consequence of this would be that alteration in a substantial part during such progress would be fatal to the whole bill.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Forced upon the opposite construction that every substantial part of a bill is to be regarded as a bill in the sense of the Constitution, we find nothing in our way but the technical import of the term "bill." It is not easy to perceive why, if any detached part of a statute is a law within the meaning of the Constitution of the United States forbidding States passing laws impairing the obligation of contracts, any part of a bill is not a bill under a clause intended to secure deliberation in the passage of legislative enactments. Such a conclusion is inevitable if regard is had to the fixed principles governing constitutional construction. The objects had in view by a constitution in government are habitually substantial; matters of form are usually left to the legislative body as subject to change with the progress of ideas and events. The great objects in view in framing a constitution are the division and distribution of the powers of government, the establishment of limits and boundaries beyond which they shall not be exercised, and the creation of an efficient responsibility, tending to restrain and furnish the means to correct neglect or abuse of public authority. Clauses having for their object the creation of responsibility in the exercise of political functions are, to a large extent, intended to act upon the motive, either by way of creating inducement for right action or removing the temptation or opportunity to such abusive exercises. This is in part accomplished by fixing the responsibility for all political action in some definite person, or body of persons,

by securing deliberation in the performance of public acts, and by ascertaining modes of authentication and action in important cases vitally affecting the welfare of the state. It is obvious that, in construing clauses of this class, substance rather than form is to be considered. The object to be secured is to be sought for not alone in the formal expressions of the Constitution, nor yet in the technical character of the means employed to serve its ends, but in the nature of the subject intended to be acted upon through such means. In a word, the language of the Constitution in such cases is to be construed in the largest sense fairly attributable to it, and that will best subserve the objects it has in view.

All that article I, section 7, means is that all legislation which has passed the Congress must be presented to and approved by the President before it becomes law. The intent of the Constitution is that barring an overriding of a veto, legislation shall be a result of the meeting of the minds of the Congress and the Executive—the former affirmatively creating the legislation and the President exercising his right to affirm or reverse congressional action.

It is my conclusion, therefore, that the method of achieving this result lies largely in the discretion of Congress. It seems reasonably clear that a provision could be inserted in each appropriation bill stating that, for the purpose of the Executive veto, each separate and distinct item appropriating money shall be considered a separate enactment of Congress within the meaning of the Constitution.

It seems to me the membership should have an opportunity to express its will regarding this proposed reform which might lead to very substantial savings. For that reason, although an amendment in precisely the form of the one I have introduced would probably be subject to a point of order as legislation in an appropriation bill, I propose to offer at the appropriate time in the debate a limitation on the amount of the appropriation in each chapter, which will provide that the total sums appropriated under the chapter shall be reduced to the extent of any separate and distinct item appropriating money which is disapproved by the President.

I feel confident that the adoption of such an amendment throughout the many chapters in this imposing measure would make it possible for us to approach much more closely the goal of a balanced budget.

This bill authorizes the largest peacetime expenditures in the history of our country, or any country. It is virtually impossible to cope with an appropriation bill of this size, unless we lay down basic considerations which must be followed.

If we are going to practice economy as well as preach it, if we are to make a serious attempt to reduce this staggering total as much as is legitimately possible, we must recognize certain controlling considerations.

Now I realize the tremendous sum requested in this bill envisions many worthy projects and plans. Some of them are absolutely essential to our national security and well-being. Perhaps nearly all the proposals could be justified as fine, legitimate undertakings. It would be nice if all the habits of fish could be studied, plans for innumerable new rivers and harbors projects made, hundreds of new buildings constructed. I agree in principle—just as I agree in principle with our former Vice President Henry Wallace that every Chinaman should have a quart of milk a day. Unfortunately, there comes a time when we must emerge from a dream world and get down to earth.

We are now in the situation of a man who wants both a new yacht and a new house, but can afford only one. It would be wonderful if he could afford both, but he cannot, and neither can we. A yacht would be enjoyable, but a house is a necessity. He should forego his yacht, at least for the present, and build his house. We should do the same.

In fact, our choice has been dictated to us by Russia. We cannot afford the luxuries of normal peacetime spending, no matter how much we may desire them.

We must realize that the money that could be expended on worthy causes is unlimited. Unfortunately our income is not. Therefore, it is our duty to vote against many of these tempting and worthy projects and proposals, not so much because of their intrinsic lack of merit as because the full limit of our financial capabilities must be otherwise employed.

All our billions spent for foreign aid and needs of the armed services will have gone for naught if we win the cold war abroad, but lost at home our offensive against national insolvency and collapse. We must remain financially sound; we owe it to the rest of the free world as much as we owe it to every person in this country who earns a dime or has put away a penny for a rainy day.

The rest of the world is counting on the value of the American dollar as a basis for trade. If we further devalue the dollar by uncontrolled inflation, we shall not alone ruin ourselves but we shall also wreak havoc in the world markets and betray the faith and confidence which has been painstakingly built up during the past 150 years.

When we realize how much the monetary stability of the American dollar means to the security and peace of all the world, these worthy projects suddenly resume their correct proportions, and we realize that many so-called immediate needs and urgent plans are not so needy or urgent after all.

We must realize that if we devote our time and money now to winning the ideological conflict that ranges universally, while maintaining our basic monetary soundness, there will be decades in which to study the mating habits of fish or further methods of using peanuts in our diet.

America has vast resources and tremendous potentials as yet undeveloped, but we must not fritter this wealth away in a mad rush to do everything at one time. Onerous as they are, we can and must stand the cost of the essentials, but to attempt to bear the additional burden of the frills, attractive as they may be, is sheer folly.

We must carefully weigh the consequences of each dollar expenditure against the merit of the proposed result.

At election time and during the 2 weeks preceding March 15, loud are the protestations of economy from all sides. But now is the time for action. Now is the time to cut expenditures. Now is the time to cast our votes for or against the pocketbooks of our abused taxpayers and the pay envelopes of the sorely pressed working men and women of the Nation.

Here in Washington, we blithely calculate in millions and billions, but I shall consider that I have done a good week's work if I can cut this budget so that it will mean even a few cents savings in the cost of living each week for the people of this country.

The taxpayers of our Nation are paying this bill twice—once, in the form of personal taxes, hidden or recognizable, and again in the form of the inflated cost of living brought about by a continuing national deficit. All the good works in the world will not accomplish any ultimate good if to do them we must tax our people out of a decent living.

We have an obligation to our old people and modest pensioners who have saved and put away a little money for their later years. We must not fail the workingman who wants to provide adequate food, shelter, and schooling for his family. Yet, by allowing these mounting deficits and consequent inflation to eat into their savings and their pay envelopes, we are striking a blow at the very people who most deserve our help.

The people at home realize what is happening to them and bitterly resent it. My office is literally snowed under by mail from my district, protesting against any unnecessary Government expenditures. From every walk of life the citizens of this Nation have been aroused to a realization that they must all, in one form or another, pay the shot for Washington squandering and waste.

Now that we have adopted the omnibus form of annual appropriation bill, there is even less excuse for a deficit than heretofore.

In previous years, it has not been possible to figure the income, outgo, and resulting balance at any given moment. This made it possible to talk economy, while at the same time logrolling for new Federal projects here or there. Now, when the balance sheet is right here, there can be no excuse for this raid on the Federal Treasury for the benefit of one locality.

If the budget cannot be balanced at this time, and, much as I dislike the realization, I reluctantly agree that it cannot at this late date; nevertheless we must come as close to that goal as we possibly can.

In the Eightieth Congress, if the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle will forgive a little pointing with pride, we not only balanced the budget, but we managed to reduce the national debt and reduce taxes, too. We proved that this is not an impossible task when the majority party is sincerely interested in economy.

We cannot go on defying the laws of economics by continually spending more than we earn. Any housewife on a budget or schoolboy on an allowance can tell you that.

People all over the country are demanding that we do all we can to cut Government spending. They are ahead of us in their thinking, as so often happens. Though we may be blinded to the dangers, they see clearly the perils of our headstrong course. If we fail to heed their warning, we shall prove false to the trust reposed in us.

While I would not recommend perusal of either the hearings or the report if one is looking for entertaining reading, nevertheless there are portions which have their amusing side and which, incidentally, demonstrate convincingly the thesis that we can make cuts in this bill without serious impairment of any essential services.

During the hearings on the agriculture funds, for instance, the Chief of the Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics explained what her Bureau does in the way of research and compilation of information. You may recall that the Bureau's newest publication, Family Fare, received wide publicity recently.

The Bureau Chief explained the activities of her Bureau over the years, and in doing so mentioned that it needs funds to determine with more accuracy exactly how high a table should be for a person to work on it with maximum efficiency. In other words, when your wife makes a pie, she can work better if the table is a certain height.

However, as the gentleman from Mississippi, Representative WHITTEN, so ably pointed out, and I quote, "A lot depends on the height of the person that has to work on it, does it not?" The Bureau Chief agreed.

In other words, the Bureau of Home Economics has been compiling statistics and doing research for years on how high a table should be if you are 5 feet 6 or 5 feet 8. Of course, if some other member of the family wants to use that table, he or she is not going to be very efficient.

I can see the ending of an era, when this research is completed—gone will be the old kitchen table—relegated to the junk heap in favor of a hydraulically operated counter.

But, sadly enough, this research has its serious side too—it costs money. In fact, in 1941, the appropriation for the Bureau was only $360,000, while the bill before us contains an authorization of a million and a half.

Incidentally, the Bureau also has published a pamphlet on How To Buy Men's Suits and printed a pattern for a coat in which a woman may shop for groceries most efficiently, with special pockets for grocery lists and Kleenex. Now, all this is, of course, valuable information, but I wonder if we can afford it now.

On page 33 of the committee report, we find that the State Department, like so many others, authors some publications. This Department has 20 persons working on volumes titled "Foreign Relations," of which the greatest number sold of any one volume during 1948 and 1949 was 290 copies. Again, no doubt a commendable historical or research project, but how far afield can we go with such activities, when every dollar we spend on them is borrowed money?

I invite the attention of the members to the Agriculture Department appropriation provisions starting at page 156 of this volume before us. The expenses of the Agriculture Department have always interested me. Perhaps it seems niggardly to quibble over a few hundred thousand dollars here or there when we give them billions to build up huge stocks of food and other commodities in Government warehouses, to spoil or be destroyed, but there are several items which I think would be interesting to those who must foot the bill.

With commendable frankness, the committee, in its report, expresses its disturbance over the lack of efficient administration and operation within the Department of Agriculture. As they say:

> The need for better planning, organization, and administration is apparent * * *. Overlapping and duplication of activities, particularly in connection with activities in the field, is constantly being brought to the committee's attention. * * * A large number of separate units are conducting completely independent programs in the field, each with a separate representative contacting the farmer.

All of this costs money and, of course, it is money completely wasted, as well as constituting a constant source of annoyance and trouble to the farmers themselves.

The Bureau of Agricultural Economics would seem to be a spot where substantial savings could be made. There is provided $2,600,000 for economic investigations, which are set forth in detail in this measure, but involve a study of every phase of the farmer's life and conduct, except that provision is made, in a spirit of concession, I assume, to the real dirt farmer, that this wide power of investigation shall not include cultural surveys.

In the next paragraph there is $2,725,000 provided for what is called Crop and Livestock Estimates, which include, among other things, the Collection and Publication of the Statistics of Peanuts. Perhaps this is the activity which gave rise to the recent request of the peanut farmers for increased acreage allotments. Is it possible that we have appropriated $2,000,000 for the purpose of educating these peanut farmers that they should ask for $25,000,000, the "guess-timated" additional cost of the bill we have just passed?

When all of this investigating and estimating is summed up, it probably means, in the long run, that this appropriation of over $5,000,000 is to be spent, at least, in large measure, in promoting the favorite scheme of the Secretary of Agriculture, known as the Brannan plan and propagandizing the farmers and consumers throughout the land regarding its merits. Surely here is a point where we should cut, and cut deeply.

Then we find over $700,000 appropriated for library membership in societies or associations. The comment of the committee in its report seems a masterpiece of understatement when it says, "it is believed that a review of the scope of the activities of the office is advisable."

One could go on indefinitely picking up this 431 page bill before us, opening it at random and selecting instances similar to those I have cited. In mentioning the Department of Agriculture, or the Department of State, I have not intended to indicate that they are necessarily any more at fault than other Government departments. Those who must pay for all of these activities simply have no conception of the extent to which Government departments and agencies have mushroomed and extended their scope gradually, but consistently, into matters never originally contemplated, nor even now generally understood. We would perform a distinct service if we were to take action here which resulted in widespread retrenchment of many fields which may be attractive icing on the cake, but under no stretch of the imagination can be considered essential to the maintenance of the security, prosperity, health and well-being of our people.

(Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER].

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, as we present the single-package appropriations bill for 1951, certain facts are evident.

The Federal tax income is below spending by many millions per day. Currently there are nearly 4,750,000 Americans unemployed, which will be augmented by hundreds of thousands of springtime graduates from schools and colleges as they, too, seek a place in the labor and production forces of our country. On top of this, 300,000 refugees will be given priority in jobs over American citizens. We further find that bankruptcy cases of all kinds have risen from 10,196 in 1946 to 26,021 in 1949 and the Department of Commerce estimates that this number will continue to rise to between 32,000 and 34,000 for 1950; to ultimately reach 70,000 per year.

The Commerce Department also reports over twenty billions in installment buying showing that Americans are following the Government example into deficit spending and financing.

Yet we go blithely along eagerly sniffing the oxygen of Government hand-outs and kidding ourselves that all is well. We disregard the amber lights flashing caution as well as the red ones calling for us to stop. Here we are 5 years after the firing ceases with war taxes still upon our people, along with excise taxes heaped upon pyramided concealed taxes; taxes that are bringing many segments of our economy to a halt. Jewelry, alarm clocks, baggage, handbags, furs, cosmetics, baby oil, transportation—all

taxed, and still the spending climbs like a jet fighter into the stratosphere.

My home newspaper, the Bryan Times, March 22, had headlines three columns wide, "Government lends and spends huge sums in Williams County," a county of 25,000 by the way. Salaries, crop payments, and loans from Government reach into hundreds of thousands of dollars. Then the article proceeds to list the various offices and their personnel—scores of them.

What does not, of course, appear as the other side of this picture is the $25,000,000 of private funds in Williams County banks seeking a chance for investment. The banks try to pay 1 percent to local people, but what bank can compete with the United States Government with loans on all kinds of collateral or no collateral at all.

We embarked on these do-gooding practices as emergency measures. We continue them into national bankruptcy as political expediencies. We see the caution and danger lights dimly, but we hurtle on, heavy foot on the accelerator and give her the gas. The spending burden on my county is over $8,500,000 annually.

Our subcommittee on State, Justice, and Commerce has recommended the largest percentage cut of any of the 9 committees. I wish these cuts were real and firm. But alas. They are mostly deferments of statutory projects, and cuts in authorization that may be activated by conference later on. Our subcommittee will be replaced, for purpose of the conference with the Senate, with a new subcommittee completely ignorant of the facts developed in the hearings.

This knife did not go into personnel and get at the root of the evil. Most of the extra activities of the State Department could be cut in two or dispensed with entirely with a healthy result for the country. Two hundred and fifty international bodies and groups can create a lot of mischief and cause a lot of little countries to go broke trying to keep up with the international Joneses that bedevil and despoil America. Over 100 of these groups are to meet in 1951, as of now, and several million of your good dollars go to pick up the check for travel and expenses. The real check for what they decide to do comes later and costs many millions more. The effects of deals and trade treaties made against the best interests of American workers are exporting the jobs of some million or more and the total grows daily and it spreads to more trades and skills.

This Congress has seen almost all the trained personnel, which was added by the Eightieth to enable the Congress to cope in a small way with swarms of executive spenders working the year around to exploit and confuse us, discharged and not one professional expert has been available to assist us in evaluating the data presented.

We operate blindly, like a surgeon without X-ray charts. Our minority had to fight tooth and nail to get the green sheets on personnel in the various departments and the information is given grudgingly or not at all. Each one of these departments has a full year to integrate its claims and schemes into spending proposals and they present them in fresh relays before the committee with all the force of the Notre Dame platoon system, with a new backfield for every play. Human flesh can stand just so much shock and I marvel that the committees last out the long weeks of hearings. Without even a tool, without professional assistance, without even clerical or technical assistance, we take up end result and in an hour or two mark up the bill. On a strict party vote—minority against, majority for—we see billions okayed in a minute or 6 or 8 minutes, with each chapter in complete ignorance of the other 9 chapters or its contents and bring a deficit spending program before you for a vote. Uncle Joe himself could not present a more efficient steam roller. We can spend billions for everybody everywhere, but nothing for a subcommittee staff to arm us with knowledge before we pick up the meat ax and start to cut. Certainly reorganization lasted no longer than the Eightieth Congress, then out of the window with it and the Missouri Waltz became the theme song.

Here is the State Department, grown to more than a dozen times its size when I came to Congress. Here are some of the salient items.

State Department costs for 1940, slightly over $18,000,000.

Now here we go for the 1951 requests:

Salaries and expenses	$78,731,000
Representation allowances	879,000
Foreign Service retirement and disability	2,223,000
Building funds	12,000,000
Emergencies	10,700,000
Contributions to international organizations	55,178,000
Missions to international organizations	1,636,000
International contingencies	3,300,000
Salaries and expenses, International Bounary Commission	1,380,000
Construction, International Boundary Commission	7,185,000
Rio Grande emergency	50,000
Salaries and expenses, international commission	529,000
International information and education	36,645,000
Salaries, Philippine rehabilitation	13,000,000
Expenses, Institute Inter-American Affairs	6,500,000
Total	229,936,000

Now, what has been the result of all these millions? Are our international relations in a happy state? Is the record of the State Department one to cause our hearts to swell with pride? Does it describe to the world the glory of the American Republic as a government of laws, one of checks and balances between the three coordinate branches of Government?

Does its Voice of America describe the kind of America you know and love? I suggest you read your State Department hearings on pages 1085 and 1087 and tell me if the $37,000,000 voice program describes the America you know.

Follow my colleague, Mr. STEFAN, as he tries at every opportunity to have these State Department officials tell us what our foreign policies are. The whole sorry story for two decades is one of folly, failure and frustration. In Europe, one unhappy ally, Poland—fighting with a quarter of a million men—was sold out and these men have scattered over western Europe doing anything they can to hold body and soul together. All the Baltic countries, along with the now so-called satellite nations, were delivered by clandestine agreements to the tender mercies of the Soviets; one retreat after another; one frustration after another; one betrayal after another. Now China has been delivered to the same all-embracing clutch of totalitarian expansion. By two decades of foreign interference, spending billions of American money, we have created the greatest organization in the world for sticking our nose into every nook and cranny in every land, involving our people and all their resources in every domestic spat everywhere in the world. Our people are subjected to endless yak-yak by dozens of paid propagandists every day and almost every hour they are frightened out of their wits by sensational stories of mass destruction. Millions of our people find it too much to withstand and are emotionally ill. More and more of them become casualties of this one world drive of the international busybodies, do-gooders and Socialists that are eating away the substance and structure of America. America the Republic; America, man's last best hope on earth.

These costs of the State Department, I have listed above, are only operational and personnel costs. The implementing of their meddling costs many billions of dollars more. The end results of their treaties are untold millions more in loss of jobs to increasing thousands of American working men and women.

I might, in all kindness, suggest that my colleagues in the House put their passports in storage this autumn and take a look about their own country. The ceramic and glass workers in West Virginia and Ohio, out of work, might tell them American automatic glass machines work in Belgium and Czechoslovakia as well as at home and at wages one-third of their own. Hatters in Connecticut and shoe workers and watchmakers in the State of Massachusetts might add their story to the glove workers of New York, the textile workers of all New England, the crab fishermen on both coasts, and the fishing industry generally. If they want to see millions of people more poorly housed than almost any country in Europe, they might take a bus trip through the southeastern part of the Nation, not forgetting to get back aways off the concrete. See if you have seen anything like it in Europe, leaving out, of course, the bombed areas. These are American people of almost pure colonial descent whose patriotism is of the highest order—again giving the lie to the claim "low incomes breed communism." Let us learn to know and appreciate America. Communism is an alien growth. These Departments of State and Commerce are generally wasteful of the peoples' substance—overmanned, overequipped, oversup-

plied—and the State Department particularly has created dozens of useless agencies all over the world.

Once more let me remind you that these sins are not the results of shortcomings of the House Committee on Appropriations. They are the result of legislative authorizations right here on the floor. We can only trim here and there and try to compel the agencies to follow the law. The responsibilities are those of Congress itself.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 13 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

(Mr. VURSELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, the people have become aroused and are demanding as never before a reduction of the cost of Government. They know, and the Congress knows, that you cannot reduce the crushing tax load and begin retiring the present dangerous national debt unless this is done. The Congress is in a mood to do it.

We cannot succeed as we should without the cooperation of the President. The President, in his recent message from Key West urging that no reductions be made in the ECA program, and his insistence on much new and unnecessary legislation that would add billions of dollars to the cost of Government, gives no indication that we shall have his cooperation.

If the President would change his position and cooperate with the Congress and exert the power of his great office for economy in Government, we could stop new expensive legislation, we could cut this budget by $4,000,000,000 and stop deficit financing for the coming year.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us calls for an appropriation of $27,266,000,000 for the purpose of paying the expenses of 11 departments of government for the next fiscal year. This does not include all of the budget requests of the President. The President has requested a total budget of $42,438,000,000.

This is the biggest budget for governmental expense ever asked by any nation in the world. The size of this budget is a threat to the future financial solvency of this Government and our contribution to the peace of the world.

It is a danger signal flashing in the faces of we Members of Congress which should cause deep concern, because we, the Members of Congress, were given the power and the responsibility to control the purse, or the spending, of the Nation.

We have reached the point where the people, bearing their heavy tax load, are calling upon the Members of Congress to live up to their responsibility and stop the constant upward spiral of the cost of Government. They are demanding that we Members of Congress reduce the cost of Government.

May I point out to you that the founders of our Government who wrote the Constitution, specifically provided in that document that all Members of the House of Representatives must come back to the people for their reelection every 2 years. This provision was written into the Constitution because this body has the great power to levy taxes and to initiate legislation to provide for the cost of Government.

We who pass on this budget who are candidates for reelection must stand before the people and be judged by them on November 7.

Mr. Chairman, unless we are able to further substantially reduce this budget, I do not believe the judgment of the people generally will be favorable. I fear they will be greatly disappointed.

I realize the members of the subcommittee who have heard the testimony of the various heads of Departments of Government in considering the various items of these several bills are best qualified to point out to the members of the House who have not had an opportunity of serving on the Appropriations Committee, just where additional expense can and should be reduced. I understand that some of the members of the subcommittee at the proper time will offer such amendments.

Mr. Chairman, big government and big bureaucracy with its enormous expense and its power over the people is the greatest threat and danger to the people of this Nation. The way to reduce big government and lessen the threat to the people is to reduce the appropriations. This is the time and place to do something about it. I am anxious to join with the other Members in an effort to reduce the bill before us by as many billions as is possible. May I point out, as I did Monday in the debate, that big government has grown until it requires 2,000,000 people to manage it, and it will cost the taxpayers $42,438,000,000 unless we reduce the amount.

Now here is where we can be realistic and reduce the amount of this bill. Monday I asked the minority chairman of the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] if he thought we could reduce the Federal pay rolls and save a billion dollars without adversely effecting governmental services. The gentleman from New York, who has served many years as chairman, or as the ranking minority member of the committee replied:

> The total personnel cost in this budget is right around $7,000,000,000. In my opinion we could come very close to a billion dollars in reductions of personnel cost without, in the slightest degree, impairing the efficiency of the Government.

Mr. Chairman, here is one place where we can and should, in my judgment, reduce this budget by a billion dollars. I believe most Members of the Congress realize pretty well just how loose and expensive great over-grown politically controlled departments of government have become here in Washington. There is no question but that thousands and thousands of men and women, most of them in what might be termed the "middle or higher classifications of government," could be spared from public service and greater efficiency would result. A reduction of 100,000 at a salary of $6,000 each would save $600,00,000.

I think the majority of the Members of Congress feel as I do that very substantial reductions in personnel could be made in every department of government, probably through every classification of the departments from the highest to the lowest.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that an amendment may be offered to reduce the personnel in every department of Government considered under this bill which would effect a total savings of not less than $750,000,000. If we will take the money away from the various departments, we can force them to reduce the personnel. I fear no other plan will work.

Undoubtedly further reductions can and should be made effecting chapter IV, and certainly chapter V should offer a fertile field for heavy reductions. Chapter VI should be able to stand some further reductions.

Then we come to chapter VII, the Interior Department, which should also furnish an opportunity for heavy cuts and savings.

Mr. Chairman, in fact, we should, and I believe can, effect substantial savings in nearly all of the departments of Government which come under this bill. We should reduce this bill another billion and a half dollars.

When we consider the chaotic condition of the world and take into consideration that our first line of defense is the financial solvency of this Government, it should emphasize to every Member of the House the necessity of trying to balance spending against the income of the Government taken in taxes from the people.

Mr. Chairman, we will most likely have a deficit of expense over income at the end of this fiscal year of $5,000,000,000. It is predicted by the President that at the end of fiscal year 1951 there will be another deficit of $5,000,000,000, making a total of approximately $10,000,000,000.

We cannot go on at this rate and maintain the financial solvency of our Government. No businessman or farmer can spend more in his most prosperous years than he takes in without going broke. The Government is made up of 45,000,000 families, and it cannot continuously spend more than it takes in without getting into serious financial difficulty.

This budget request affords the time and the place for the Members of this House to call a halt against spending this country into financial bankruptcy. For my part, I am ready to join with the economy-minded Members of this House on both sides of the aisle to call such a halt, by reducing the budget every million and billion of dollars possible.

Mr. CANNON. I will say that the telephone charges of the Government as a whole are scattered through innumerable accounts of the departments, bureaus, and agencies, and it is impossible for us to say at this time what the aggregate is.

Mr. VURSELL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. I think the gentleman would like to have a recap of the total amount used in communications. There is no such information. You would have to search every bill to find that out, but

the communication and transportation items have risen tremendously—transportation around 40 percent.

Mr. VURSELL. I thank the gentleman. I brought this matter up honestly because I know and the Members know that many people in Government pick up the telephone at a cost of $10 when it is unnecessary. Something ought to be done to try to stop it.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman is bringing up a very good point. For many years in the committee we have warned the departments about the use of the telephone and the great cost to the Government. We have told them time and time again about it. In some of the departments they have a control office, where in order to make any sort of long-distance call you must have permission. The gentleman has brought up a good point, and it is a place where there is a tremendous expense to the Government.

Mr. VURSELL. I appreciate the sincerity of the gentleman from Michigan, and I know he is trying to do his best.

Mr. STEFAN. We have insisted in our particular bill that air mail be used, with the result that a considerable saving has been made, but still the cost of communications is very, very high. However, the use of air mail has resulted in considerable saving.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield.

Mr. FLOOD. I would like to add, on the subject of communications, that we have taken up, for instance with the State Department on many occasions, as the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] is aware, and insisted upon using the cheapest kind of communications. I have in mind telegraph and cable communications, using night letters instead of regular telegrams, and the telephone control through all of the various bureaus of the Department. This subcommittee, to my personal knowledge, is paying great attention to this. We are aware of the abuse, and a great saving has been made.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. I think the gentleman has made a good point. I think it would be good information for the Congress and the public that each year we make available the total expenditures for telephone calls by all departments.

Mr. VURSELL. I will say to the gentleman from Oklahoma that I hope to go into that, to try to see if we can get some rough estimate, because I think it will be rather startling. I know the members of the Appropriations Committee are trying to hold it down.

Now, I read an article some weeks ago to the effect that we are about to build a new embassy in the Communist-dominated city of Warsaw in Poland. I should like to know, if anyone can give me the information, as to the amount of money required, that is in this appropriation bill, or about what it might be.

Mr. STEFAN. The objective of the United States Government, insofar as furnishing quarters for our employees in foreign countries, is to own property where it is cheaper to own it than to lease or rent it. We have approximately 300 missions scattered over the world. In some places it is cheaper to lease than to own, but with the program now under operation, we have acquired millions of dollars worth of property in order to house our Foreign Service more economically. The gentleman may be interested to know that that is the only way we are getting back any money from lend-lease or surplus. We are acquiring this property by taking credit for lend-lease or surplus.

So far as buildings in countries behind the iron curtain are concerned, that same program is being carried out. I assume the gentleman fears that there might be some danger that we might lose them; but that is a diplomatic problem we will have to face when we come to it.

Mr. VURSELL. The gentleman from Nebraska has anticipated my thought. I think we should provide a home for the Ambassador, quarters, and so forth, out of blocked currencies and lend-lease where it might fall into enemy hands; it is all right, but it would be better not to have too much of our own American dollars in it; I would be afraid of it.

Mr. STEFAN. I assure the gentleman there are very few American dollars being used in the acquisition of property behind the iron curtain.

Mr. VURSELL. I want to ask another question; I hope it will not be embarrassing, although at times the subject has been, and I will ask my friends on the Republican side of the House. I am wondering if you can tell me how much money is in this bill for representation allowance for the State Department for the purchase of liquor for entertainment purposes.

Mr. STEFAN. I notice the gentleman used the figure of $800,000-plus for representation allowance. As I recall it, you will find representation allowances scattered throughout the bill. I do not have the exact figures before me, but I would judge that the total amount for representation runs around $1,250,000 or $1,300,000.

Mr. VURSELL. I thank the gentleman. And now I come to another one of those things that is not too nice. I presume the appropriations subcommittees in taking care of transportation expenses for the heads of departments and Cabinet members, and so forth, are using as much economy as they can, considering the high posts the people occupy; but, after all, as I said before, the Congress controls the purse strings. When we read of the great gathering out in Iowa where the President launched the Brannan plan some 2 or 3 months ago and a great many officials went out from Washington to support his Secretary of Agriculture, and then 2 or 3 weeks later at San Francisco, and then the great gathering to celebrate a particular political event at Kansas City; and when I read in the press every week where they are speaking to political and nonpolitical meetings all over the country, we realize that there is tremendous expense and that it must come out of the taxpayers if they are using Government airplanes and Government gasoline.

Has the gentleman any idea how much that cost is in this budget, and whether or not the committee is watching that just a little? I realize that when my party is in power they might abuse it some. But I object to any party in power not requiring a man drawing $25,000 a year to help run the Government, to stay on the job in Washington. I want him to stay in Washington as we Congressmen do and as the person does in the lowest place in the Government; I want him to stay in his place and work at least 60 to 75 percent of the time and not spend two-thirds of the time politically at the expense of the Government. Can the gentleman give me any information on that point?

Mr. STEFAN. I certainly could not tell the gentleman the total amount entailed in transportation. Naturally, I could say something intelligent about the transportation problem insofar as the Foreign Service is concerned, and the State Department. I told the gentleman previously that transportation has gone up about 40 percent according to our figures. It is a gigantic sum, it is true, and I am talking about only our bill, State, Justice, Commerce, and the Federal Judiciary. That transportation which is necessary is a gigantic amount; and there is, of course, considerable criticism against the State Department sending out a lot of people talking around the country. But so far as the real transportation in the particular bill is concerned, it is a legitimate item because there is so much transportation necessary in the Department of Justice, and in the Department of Commerce, especially when you have 300 missions scattered all over the world. You have to transport these people and their families from one place to another, and it runs into a lot of money.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the ranking minority member of the committee, if he has any others to speak?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I have about a dozen questions which I have been asked to answer. I assure those Members of the House who have asked me the questions that I will be very happy to answer them when we come to the section of the bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman desire any further time?

Mr. TABER. We have no one.

Mr. CANNON. Does anyone on this side desire to be heard? There seems to be no one else who desires to debate the bill. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. EBERHARTER asked and was given permission to address the House today for 5 minutes following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LESINSKI (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to extend his remarks and include a radio address.

Mr. SHELLEY (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to extend his remarks in four instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. STEED asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. KING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. MURDOCK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances.

Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a report notwithstanding the fact that it is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $578.

Mr. PATTERSON (at the request of Mr. TABER) was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article appearing in today's Times-Herald.

Mr. JENISON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. IRVING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article taken from the Kansas City Star.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Hawks, one of his secretaries.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. McDaniel, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had on October 19, 1949, passed without amendment concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. Con. Res. 146. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of certain hearings held before the House Committee on Agriculture, and

H. Con. Res. 147. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to have printed 50,000 copies of Senate Rept. 1169.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 547)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

One of the great advances in economic legislation made during the 1930's was to establish the Federal-State system of employment security. This system has two parts—first, a Nation-wide employment service to help workers find jobs and employers find job-seekers; and second, a Nation-wide system of unemployment insurance to help tide workers over periods of unemployment.

Finding a job is of more importance to an unemployed worker, of course, than receiving unemployment-insurance benefits. Consequently, great emphasis has always been placed on strengthening and improving the employment service.

We cannot, however, completely eliminate unemployment; even in times of high employment, there will be turnover of jobs and numerous shifts and changes in job opportunities. Consequently, we must have a strong and steadily improving system of unemployment insurance.

Under our Federal-State unemployment-insurance system, benefits are paid in accordance with State laws, to workers who, while able and seeking to work, are unemployed through no fault of their own. These benefits are paid from the proceeds of State pay-roll taxes, which are deposited in reserve accounts—one for each State—in the Unemployment Trust Fund in the United States Treasury.

In the past 12 years unemployment insurance has proved its worth not only as an invaluable source of support to unemployed workers and their families, but also as a means of maintaining purchasing power of great value to the entire economy. In 1949, for example, 1.7 billion dollars in benefits were paid to more than seven million individuals, the largest amount for any year in the history of the system. This was a significant factor in preventing serious dislocations during last year's period of economic readjustment.

Our experience with unemployment insurance has revealed weaknesses as well as strengths in the existing system. While many improvements have been made in the State laws since the program began, the system is far from adequate today.

Over 15 million workers—about one-third of all employees—are not protected by unemployment insurance. In 1949, only about one-fifth of the purchasing power lost through unemployment was replaced by unemployment insurance benefits. In 1949, weekly benefits averaged only about $20—not enough to preserve a minimum standard of living. Nearly 2 million workers used up their benefits entirely—showing that benefits were not available for a long enough period. While the unemployment reserve funds of the States have so far proved to be adequate, a few States may soon face financial difficulties because of local concentration of unemployment.

On several occasions in recent years, I have recommended that the system be improved so as to extend protection to many workers not now covered; to provide, in every State, benefits for 26 weeks ranging up to $30 a week for single persons, with additional benefits for dependents; and to increase the financial stability of the system.

Action on these proposals has become more urgent as unemployment has increased somewhat in spite of the continuing high levels of business activity. While unemployment dropped over half a million between February and March, on the average nearly 4½ million persons were looking for work during the first 3 months of this year, as compared to 3 million in the same months of 1949, and nearly 2½ million in 1948. Furthermore, the length of time it takes people to find jobs is becoming longer. One million people—about one out of every four unemployed—have been out of work for 15 weeks or more. A year ago, only 420,000 were without jobs that long, and in 1948, only 330,000.

This gradual growth in unemployment over the last 2 years is not because there are fewer jobs. Employment has remained at high levels, along with industrial production, consumer incomes, and other indicators of the health of our economy.

But there are more people looking for work. In recent years, up to one million more people have come into the labor market each year, looking for work, than have left the labor market. Part of the new group entering the labor market this year will be the largest number of college graduates in our history—some 500,000 young people, including about 250,000 veterans. In addition, of course, a large number of high-school graduates will also be looking for jobs.

Furthermore, as new plants and equipment have been added and supplies of raw materials have become more ample, businessmen have been able to produce more with the same number of workers.

Thus, our labor force has increased, our productivity has increased, but the number of jobs has not kept pace. This emphasizes the importance of expanding our economy so that new jobs will be created to use skills and energies that are now being wasted. It also emphasizes the importance of making the better provision for those who are temporarily out of work.

The Congress now is well along toward completing action on legislation to improve the old-age and survivors insurance and public-assistance programs. Like those programs, the unemployment-insurance system needs to be improved in the light of experience. Accordingly, I recommend that the Congress turn its attention as soon as possible to strengthening our Federal-State unemployment-insurance system.

First, I recommend that coverage be extended to about 6 million workers not now covered. The first major deficiency in the present Federal-State system of unemployment insurance is that it excludes large numbers of workers.

Coverage should be extended to employees of small firms—those employing one to seven workers. Workers in firms employing fewer than eight workers were originally left out of the Federal law be-

cause of expected administrative difficulties. In fact, however, such employees have been satisfactorily covered for years under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system, and 17 States have already extended their unemployment-compensation systems to cover them, without encountering any serious administrative difficulties. Many other States are waiting for the Federal Government to act and have provisions in their laws which would cover these employees automatically when the coverage of the Federal act is extended. No reason exists for discriminating longer in the Federal law against such workers.

Coverage should also be extended to Federal Government civilian employees. Although the Federal Government took the leadership in establishing a system of unemployment insurance for workers in private industry, it has not assumed the same obligation toward its own employees. Yet, the rate at which Federal workers—especially manual workers—are separated from their jobs is approximately as high as in private industry. Federal workers should no longer be denied the protection of unemployment insurance.

I also propose extensions of coverage to about 500,000 persons who are employed on a commission basis, and about 200,000 workers in occupations of an industrial nature connected with agriculture all of whom are excluded at present. Moreover, the Federal unemployment-insurance legislation should be extended to Puerto Rico, subject to its acceptance by the Territorial Legislature.

Second. I recommend the establishment of Nation-wide minimum levels for amounts and duration of unemployment benefits, in order to correct the second major deficiency in the present insurance system—the inadequacy of benefits.

At present, while the Federal law includes a number of standards which the States are required to meet, it does not establish minimum levels for benefit amounts or duration. Maximum weekly benefits in the various States now range from $15 to $27 for single persons. Benefits are somewhat larger for persons with dependents in the 11 States providing dependents' allowances. With these maximum levels, average weekly benefits for the Nation as a whole were just over $20 in 1949.

The variations among States create serious inequities. They mean that workers who lose their jobs in identical circumstances are treated very differently because of the accident of geographical location. They mean that businessmen in some States suffer a greater loss in markets when unemployment occurs than do those in other States.

Furthermore, while the States have generally increased benefits in recent years, so that the situation is not nearly so bad as in the case of old-age and survivors' benefits, in most States the increases in benefits have lagged considerably behind increases in wages and costs of living. Thus, unemployment benefits today replace a smaller proportion of a worker's regular wages than was the case when the system was started.

For these reasons, I believe that Nation-wide minimums should be established by law which will assure adequate benefits in all States. The standards proposed are these: Benefits for single persons should approximate 50 percent of normal earnings, up to a maximum of at least $30 a week. Additional allowances should be granted for individuals with dependents. The proportion of previous earnings replaced would vary with the number of dependents, up to a maximum of 70 percent of wages, or $42, whichever is lower, for an individual with three or more dependents.

These standards are not high. If they had been in effect, the national average weekly benefits in 1949 would have been just over $24. But this would be a substantial improvement in an income level which, at best, is intended to provide only for subsistence expenses. Furthermore, uniform standards would reduce present inequities in benefit levels among different States. Some variation in benefit amounts would and should remain, reflecting the differences in wage levels and costs of living in different parts of the country.

At present, the maximum duration of benefits varies among the States from 12 to 26 weeks. Like the variation in size of benefits, this is inequitable, and in many States simply represents a lag in reaching what was considered from the beginning to be a desirable standard, but which was originally set low because of actuarial uncertainties. With this wide range, the average duration of benefits in 1949 was less than 13 weeks. Because of the short duration of benefits, nearly 2 million workers exhausted their rights to benefits before finding another job.

Benefits should be available for at least 26 weeks in a year to all workers who are out of work that long. Experience in the States which have increased the duration of benefits is that while average duration does not rise very much, because most workers find a new job before using up benefits, the number who use up their benefits entirely is markedly decreased. It is estimated that, under my proposal, the number of workers who exhausted their benefits in 1949 would have been only half as large as it was.

The combined effect of my recommendations for extended coverage, higher benefits, and longer duration, would have resulted in about 850 million dollars more in benefits and in consumer demand in 1949. The cost of these improvements would be moderate. At the same time that weekly benefits are raised, the upper limit to the amount of wages taxed should be raised from $3,000 to $4,800 per worker, in line with the increases in wage levels. On this basis, the combined cost of all benefits for all States under these proposals would have been about 1.2 percent of taxable pay rolls in 1948 and 2.5 percent in 1949—compared with actual costs (on the basis of the present $3,000 wage limit) of 0.9 percent of taxable pay rolls in 1948 and 2.2 percent in 1949.

In most States the rate of tax has been extremely low in recent years; many employers have had to pay no tax whatever. Some States have had to increase rates somewhat last year or this year, but in all but a few cases, taxes are still well below the rate of 2.7 percent contemplated when the system was started. Under my proposals, many States would not have to increase tax rates to cover all the increased costs, since they still have excess reserves. Most, if not all, States would find no trouble meeting the additional costs within the 2.7-percent tax rate.

Consequently, I believe that the standards I propose will achieve substantial improvement in the unemployment-insurance system, benefiting both workers and businessmen, at very reasonable costs. As is the case at present with respect to coverage, the Federal law should not prevent the States from exceeding the minimum standards if they wish to do so.

Third, I recommend that adequate methods should be required to provide benefits for workers who move from one State to another.

Clearly a worker who is employed in two different States during a year is as entitled to unemployment-insurance benefits when out of work as a worker who is employed in only one. The States have generally recognized this, and have attempted voluntarily to work out methods for paying benefits in such interstate cases. They have, however, been only partially successful. Interstate workers generally must wait much longer to receive benefits than intrastate workers. Furthermore, the benefits of many interstate workers are lower than if they had worked in only one State.

It is a difficult problem to develop adequate methods for paying benefits promptly and equitably to interstate workers in our Federal-State unemployment-insurance system. Nevertheless, it is in the national interest to encourage the mobility of labor, since that is indispensable to economic expansion in a free society like ours. Consequently, I believe that the States should be required to adopt such methods as are necessary to provide fair and adequate protection for interstate workers.

Fourth, I recommend that both Federal and State laws concerning fraud and disqualifications should be revised and improved.

It was a weakness in the original Federal legislation that it did not clearly require the States to deal adequately with the question of fraud. Some States—without going to uneconomical extremes in inspection and policing—have instituted effective methods for preventing or detecting fraudulent claims. I believe, however, that the Federal law should be clarified so that all States can be required to have adequate means for dealing with those few individuals who attempt to obtain benefits through misrepresentation.

During the last few years, some States have considerably enlarged the number of reasons for disqualifying workers who seek unemployment benefits and have increased the severity of penalties for disqualification. These excessive disqualifications have operated to prevent

repaving the plaza, restoring some of the sidewalks and renewing some the drains. Some of those drains have been in here for unaccountable years. They are full of rust, choked with tree roots and fibers, so that the drainage is not as it should be. These streets around the Capitol were built for what used to be called the carriage trade. We all know that a carriage and a team of horses was not a very great load, it did not make much stress on the surface; but in this day and age of large and heavy automobiles, particularly the heavy busses used by the tourist guides here in Washington, that load is each year becoming heavier and heavier, and eventually some of these streets are going to give way and then, of course, repairs must be made.

In view of the fact that it was deemed necessary in the comparatively near future to rebuild the terrace, in view of the fact we have at least six more months of heavy hauling and heavy use of the streets by the trucks of the contractors that will resume work on the repairs to the House Chamber and the Senate Chamber, it seemed absolutely false economy on our part to now start rebuilding these streets only to have them torn up by these trucks this fall, and by the heavy trucks and machinery which will be necessary when we undertake to rebuild the terraces. It was our opinion that this was not the time to repave and rebuild our streets or rebuild our sidewalks and drainage system. While that did bring about a reduction in the number of dollars to be spent this year for the Capitol Grounds and the Capitol itself, it has not honestly effected a real saving.

Then again, another item, and a sizable one of $6,000,000, is not a real economy move, and we must be frank about it. As you will recall, a program is under way to transform the lighting system throughout the Capitol, cutting out many of our boilers where we generate our own electricity, cutting out many of the old transformers we have over in the Old House Office Building and the Senate Office Building as well, and eventually bring to the Capitol electricity, power, and heat generated by and purchased from Pepco, finding, as we have through our studies, that that will save a great bit of money and bring about a reduction in the number of employees, plus increased improvement in the service. It was anticipated that the cost for the fiscal year 1951 would be about $10,000,000, but further checking with the Architect discloses the fact that $10,000,000 would not be necessary this year. We could not even spend that much this year, so that that figure was reduced to $4,000,000, effecting a paper saving of $6,000,000, but that merely means that next year, when this program gets going at a little more rapid gait, we will be faced with the necessity of increasing this appropriation for this particular item at least that much.

As the gentleman from New York, Chairman McGRATH, pointed out in discussing the Library of Congress, which does call for an item of almost $9,500,000, they came in to us with a request for quite a few new and additional employees. We looked over all their activities, studied their requests diligently, and we did allow some new employees, as the gentleman from New York, Chairman McGRATH, pointed out, in what we call the self-sustaining activities. One is an activity calling for the printing, preparing, and issuance and sale of library catalog cards which go to all the libraries throughout the country. These libraries pay for those cards, and the receipts from the sales of those cards go into the General Treasury. Those receipts are adequate to pay for all of the employees in the library which are doing that particular kind of work, having anything to do with it, either in the preparation or sale or distribution. We felt, inasmuch as the Nation's libraries were spending their money to get this service, that they were entitled to as adequate and speedy a service as the Government could give them. Inasmuch as there is no desire on our part and no purpose, surely, to put the Government in the business of selling library cards for the purpose of making a profit, we did allow them some additional employees so that they could more efficiently and adequately care for the demands being made. The only actual new employees outside of those mentioned were three employees to be allowed solely for use in what is called the Russian section of the Library so that these three employees could continue to compile and interpret and collate and publish monthly lists of Russian papers, magazines, and documents so that they might be available if any occasion is had to refer thereto.

The only other place we added any other employees is another self-sustaining operation; namely, the Copyright Office. As has been mentioned, the rates for copyrights were increased last year. Therefore, we thought it was incumbent on us as a duty to those persons who make use of the Copyright Office to give them efficient, speedy, and effective service, so that there should be no occasion for any great delay in the issuance of these copyrights since these persons are paying higher rates for them now. We did allow a few more employees—not as many as they would like to have had—but a number that we thought would be sufficient to bring into efficient operation the Copyright Office work of filing, accrediting, and selling their services to the American public.

If you will turn in your hearings to page 131, which I assume you all have in your office—at least, they arrived there some time ago—you will find that upon my request Mr. Brockwell, the manager of the House restaurant, gives a full and complete history of the House restaurant, when it started, how it started, why it is necessary, and what the problems are that they face each day; the whole story. Therefore, from now on, in case anyone asks you or makes any comment, as is sometimes done in our daily press, about the operation of this facility, the whole story is here.

We roughly estimated that surely the time of a Member of the House of Representatives ought to be as valuable or worth as much as the time of one of the carpenters who works on the building here, $2.50 an hour. We figured that if only 300 of the Members use the restaurant each day and it would save them an hour, there is $750 saved every day of the year that the House is in session. For we must be close to the floor of the House, if we are to properly carry on the Nation's business.

Another thing you Members of the House may have noticed in recent days or weeks is the new experimental traffic lights over across the street between the Capitol and the New and Old House Office Buildings. Traffic is becoming one of the biggest problems we have to solve not only in the District of Columbia and throughout the Nation but particularly here on Capitol Hill.

Under the Federal Employees Compensation Act if one of your clerks should be critically injured in crossing a street in this traffic, without proper direction, that one injury to one clerk would cost far more than the cost of installation of these new traffic lights with which we are now experimenting. Therefore, we felt it was a good expenditure of the taxpayers' funds to install one of these lights at one of these corners to see how it works. If it does what the proponents for it say it will do, another light will be installed in the next street. Thus we may be able to have better control of traffic and less hazard to our employees, as well as to Members of the House.

The chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. McGRATH], did mention to you that in our deliberations following the precedent established last year, possibly at my suggestion, we did not look at or listen to any testimony relating to items of expenditure by the other body. We did not touch those items. Not that they are any better than we are, but we felt unless we could hear all of the facts relating to proposed expenditures by the other body, we would not be legislating wisely or properly. Hence, if the other body desires economy and if they want to practice economy in their own expenditures, of course, they, in their wisdom, can work their will on their own requests for appropriations. We are hopeful that they will do as good a job in economizing in the expenditure of the taxpayers' money as we have done for you in the House of Representatives. There is a substantial saving here.

An item of approximately $180,000 will revert to the Treasury because it was not spent by the House committees, particularly by the Committee on Appropriations. While that in itself may reflect a savings to the taxpayers, my personal opinion is that we could have saved the taxpayers much more than that if the minority on each subcommittee could have a clerk or an employee or an investigator at their own disposal to use any time they see fit.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to refer to the committee report as a whole and call your attention to some language which was inserted under the guiding aegis of the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]. I think it might well be considered not only here, but throughout the

Nation and particularly in the vicinity of 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, Washington, D. C.

The report says this:

Economy neither begins nor ends in the Halls of Congress.

It points out there is a responsibility upon the executive branch of the Government to submit annually to the Congress the estimates of the amount that the Government is going to spend through each one of its agencies. Of course, the President having done that, it comes to us in the form of his budget message. We found not only this year, but in previous years, as the various heads of agencies, bureaus, and departments came to us they had but one thought, namely, that it was their duty to support only the President's budget. That meant they were bound not to ask for any increase over that which the President told them their agency could have, and by the same token they were bound not to suggest any way or place that cuts could be made.

We tried as best we could, under the new performance budget with the lack of detailed information, to find some place where some economies might possibly be made. But without that necessary detailed information formerly contained in the estimates and without the assistance, on our side, of some detailed searching, it was difficult to find any place where these funds were being expended.

But today, with all of the talk of economy, with our mail filled with letters demanding that Federal expenditures be cut so that there can be an eventual reduction of taxes, so that the load will not be so great upon the 60,000,000 workers in America—because they are the ones who eventually pay the greatest share of the taxes, either directly or indirectly—it does seem possible and probable and proper that the Executive himself should issue to each of his agency and department heads an order, if you please—because they are his appointees; he names them—issue an order directing them to bring about economy in their own departments to whatever extent the President thinks it should be, whether 5 percent or 10 percent or 15 percent, and expect them to accomplish that purpose. If they cannot, now that they have raised the salaries of all these men, in order, so they said, to get better men in the Federal service, let them get out, and let the President put in somebody who will effect some economies. Then perhaps we will start getting some place. But that is the President's responsibility. He could and he should do that very thing.

Yet there is some responsibility that comes right back to the House and Senate—not on the members of the Appropriations Committee particularly, but on the members of the legislative committees—because, no matter what bill it is, any new law costs the taxpayers some additional money. Perhaps it is only a few dollars, but it may run into hundreds of millions. On several occasions during the past few weeks, when members of the subcommittees on appropriations would come from their little cubbyhole hearing rooms where they had been trying to bring about some reduction in Federal expenditures, we came into this Chamber only to find that the legislative committees and this body itself had just approved some legislation that wiped out not only what savings we had been able to make but sometimes costing hundreds of times more. We realized then our work had been completely for nought. That is one of the reasons why I introduced a resolution asking that until this one-package appropriation bill was out of the way, and until the Ways and Means Committee had determined what the new revenue tax bill was going to be, we should call a moratorium on all new legislation or resolutions calling for increased spending, or new spending, until we found out where we were going. Of course, I know where that resolution is. I cannot tell you the exact pigeonhole, but I can come close to it. Until some action like that is taken. I can see no hope for any great economy, if we continue to pass new laws calling for more spending than we can bring about through cuts by the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

That CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed 31 minutes.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 additional minutes so that I may answer any questions which may be asked.

Mr. REES. I first want to express my appreciation for the splendid manner in which the gentleman from Kansas has explained this particular portion of the bill. In line with the interrogatories I directed to the gentleman from New York a while ago, I am in favor, of course, of providing all of the assistance and all of the help that is necessary to run our Government. I realize that in this chapter we are talking about only one comparatively small segment of our Government. I would, however, like to inquire whether or not this committee made any exploration or examination with regard to the need of all of the employees now on the Federal pay roll. It has been stated here that funds were recommended for a similar number of employees as last year or, in some cases it recommended one or two additional; but did the gentleman's committee explore or examine into that question at all with respect to need?

I ask that question because last year it was suggested on the floor of the House a number of times that even though salary increases were provided it should be possible to work economies through the employment of a less number of employees. I am just wondering whether this committee had a chance to or did examine into that question?

Mr. SCRIVNER. In answer to the gentleman's question, I may state that to my recollection the number of legislative employees, their designation, their duties, and their salaries are fixed by action of this House through recommendation of the Committee on House Administration. When they have spoken our hands are tied.

The remedy, the thing that the gentleman from Kansas is pointing out, a reduction of the number, whether it be in the office of the Sergeant at Arms, the Doorkeeper's office, or the Speaker's office, wherever it may be, must initiate with the Committee on House Administration. If a reduction is to be made the action has to be accomplished through action taken by the Committee on House Administration. Unless they act, our hands are tied.

Mr. REES. One more question. I have had mail from people complaining about the excessive cost of securing copyrights. That subject matter has been discussed by both the chairman of this subcommittee and the gentlemen from Kansas who now has the floor. The cost of a copyright used to be $1. All at once it was increased to $4. Did this committee examine into the question of whether the increase was justified?

Mr. SCRIVNER. No; we did not, because that was not our province. Our Subcommittee on Appropriations has nothing whatsoever to do with any of the charges made by any department or bureau whether it is the Government Printing Office, the Library of Congress, or the Copyright Office. My recollection is that the fee for a copyright was fixed by statute through action of the House and the Senate. If it is to be revised, there again is the place that the action must be taken. We as a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations have no power to go into the cost of copyrights and by our edict fix that charge, any more than we have power arbitrarily to say that the price of the copyright should be reduced.

Mr. REES. The gentleman a few minutes ago suggested that one of the difficulties faced by his subcommittee and the entire Appropriations Committee is that the recommendations made by these departments with respect to the expenditure of funds is never a recommendation of reduction.

Mr. SCRIVNER. For nearly 4 years I have asked of nearly every witness: "Is there any place in this item where a reduction can be made, as much as a single dollar?" The answer is always the same: "This is the irreducible minimum."

Mr. REES. The gentleman has spent many hours and days listening to witnesses who come before his committee in respect to these expenditures. Has anyone ever testified that there ought to be reductions in expenditures as far as the gentleman knows?

Mr. SCRIVNER. If there was I do not recall it, and I feel that if such recommendation had been made I would have remembered it because it would be such an outstanding event. It would be so outstanding we could not help but remember it. I cannot recall of any single one.

Mr. REES. In other words, it is the gentleman's experience as a member of this great Appropriations Committee of the House that when witnesses come before the committee requesting funds for the various departments of Government, and throughout the whole of the Gov-

ernment, the circumstance is very rare where witnesses recommend that there be reductions in expenses or reductions in the number of employees in any department of the Government?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I have heard of none myself, and I know of no other member of the Appropriations Committee making the remark that he heard any such request or suggestion. As a matter of fact, every reduction that has been made has been made over the opposition of the heads of particular departments, bureaus, or agencies, and almost always with the contention on their part that it will cripple the work of their department.

Mr. REES. I make this inquiry in particular for the reason that we are hearing from various sources, including Members of Congress at both ends of the Capitol, that there should be a great reduction in the number of employees of the Government. So I make the inquiry to find out whether there have been witnesses or anyone come before the committee recommending such reductions, and if so, where such reductions could be made.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I assume the gentleman is talking about the heads of these various bureaus.

Mr. REES. I am talking about employees of the Government, and especially heads of agencies who testify before this committee.

Mr. SCRIVNER. We question them and say, "Well, of course, I assume that you know there is a demand for economy in Federal expenditures. I assume that you surely must be for economy in Federal spending." Of course, all of them "are for economy, but." They say, "We cannot make any reduction in spending in my particular department."

Mr. REES. I am simply calling attention to some of the difficulties facing the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Like every other Member of the House, I have enjoyed very much the fine explanation the gentleman has given of this section of the bill. There is a little matter that has been brought to my attention on several occasions. It is not a world-shocking item. For some time down here in the House restaurant, in order to get bread, the staff of life, put on your table, it is necessary to order it.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Not only order it but you must pay for it.

Mr. JENSEN. And pay for it; yes. Everybody is willing to pay for it. However, since every other restaurant puts bread and butter on the table, why is not the same custom followed here in the restaurant in the Capitol of the United States? The gentleman comes from a wheat State and I thought possibly he might be interested in knowing why bread, most of which is made from wheat, is not put on the table in the restaurant in the Capitol of the United States.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Bread is the staff of life. It should be on the table—charged for, if necessary.

May I recall to the memory of the gentleman from Iowa and other Members of the House that just a couple of weeks ago through the courtesy of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] and Mr. Morris Coover, one of his wheat growers and bakers out in Kinsley, Kans., the Members were given without any extra charge bread containing 16 percent more wheat than present-day bread contains. The report I get, which is unanimous, is that Members of Congress wished that that kind of bread were served in the House and Senate restaurants every day.

Mr. JENSEN. It was wonderful bread. I enjoyed every slice.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I thank the gentleman from Iowa, another great farm State, for his commendation.

It might be observed that not only is this bread better, more palatable, but if all bread were to be made with 16 percent more wheat flour, a great part of the surplus wheat problem would be solved, and our people better fed. The wheat growers and millers of Kansas would be quite happy should this be done. We will do our best to bring that kind of bread in, for I understand a baker here is going to start putting in more flour and less chemicals and compounds. The charge for bread though was just another step showing to the rest of the country at large that we can begin to economize at home. In order to make our deficit a little smaller in the restaurants, we are paying extra for that particular portion of food.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I want to inquire more about the Federal employees. Can the gentleman tell us what the turn-over is in Federal employees in the course of a year? I have heard statements that some four to five hundred thousand Federal employees quit the Federal service each year.

Mr. SCRIVNER. There was nothing brought before this subcommittee regarding that matter, but possibly the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] can answer that inquiry for us.

Mr. TABER. The turn-over runs from 30,000 to 50,000 a month.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That would be about 25 percent a year then?

Mr. TABER. Twenty to twenty-five percent, somewhere in there.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Then to reduce the Federal employees, one might tell some of these departments just to stop hiring them for maybe 4, 5, or 6 months and you could get quite a reduction in some of these departments.

Mr. TABER. Well, you could accomplish a very substantial reduction if they did not fill vacancies.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Is not the turn-over in the Federal Government higher than in private industry, and why is the turn-over so large in the Federal Government?

Mr. TABER. Well, it is higher than in private industry, and part of it is due to the fact that there is a very large percentage of young people who go into the service who do not stay there but a little while, and never have, and it is partly due to the fact that they are never satisfied, and they always want to get into something else.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I wondered whether it was due to the pay or conditions of work.

Mr. TABER. The pay rates are generally higher than they are for comparable work outside.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I asked for these 5 minutes to say a few words with reference to a problem that I noticed existing in the Southwest. I just came back from home, and I found that the price of eggs there has fallen to the point where it is far below the cost of production. For instance, in the area that I traversed in north Louisiana eggs are selling at retail in large quantities at 25 cents a dozen. I ran across one locality where eggs were selling at retail at 20 cents a dozen. The best eggs, candled and graded, packaged and everything else, are selling around 30 to 35 cents a dozen. I talked to Mrs. Brooks when I got back this morning, and I find she is paying 69 cents a dozen for eggs here in Washington. That impressed me as being entirely out of line. I talked with Secretary of Agriculture Brannan this morning in reference to this problem. The problem seems to be one of merchandising and distribution. It seems that here in the United States we are running a horse-and-buggy distribution system in an atomic age. We cannot get Louisiana eggs, or eggs from the Southwest, which could be bought for from 20 to 25 cents a dozen easily, and deliver them here in Washington for less than 70 cents a dozen, which, to me, does not make sense.

The retailer is selling his eggs for 20 or 25 cents a dozen, which means that the farmer is not getting that amount. He is getting something like 10 or 15 cents a dozen for the eggs down home at the present time.

The matter has been mentioned to me that the cost is in candling the eggs, grading the eggs, crating the eggs, shipping the eggs, handling the eggs, and middlemaning the eggs, and pretty soon the incidental and other costs that arise from the time the eggs leave the farm to the time they reach the home for consumption are almost prohibitive.

It occurs to me that something can and should be done to cut all these intervening costs and give us a streamlined merchandising system in this country. We are not going to get anywhere when we continue on the basis of the farmer's getting nothing for his product and the consumers paying everything to consume the product.

[Mr. MILLER of Nebraska addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the

gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GOODWIN].

(Mr. GOODWIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Chairman, we are now approaching the end of general debate on the biggest appropriation bill ever considered by the legislative body of any people anywhere in peacetime. It proposes a spending program of over $41,000,000,000. The Committee on Appropriations advise that the bill represents a saving of one and a third billion dollars over the original budget estimates. It appears that estimated revenue will be between four and five billion dollars less than the amount proposed to be spent.

Furthermore, experience has shown that estimated revenue is likely to fall short rather than overrun. If that is so, then if this bill is passed without further cuts we will be adding between five and six billion dollars to our staggering national debt of nearly two hundred sixty billions.

If the deficit should prove to be $6,000,000,000 then it will mean that we will be spending every day $16,000,000 more than we are taking in.

Keeping on running the Government in the red to that extent presents a truly alarming picture and I am satisfied that our people will not be content unless we can come nearer to bringing the budget into balance. We will certainly not be doing our duty in representing our constituents who are demanding substantial cuts in the cost of government unless we effect still greater savings than are contemplated in the report of the Appropriations Committee.

I realize the difficulty of knowing where cuts ought to be made. We all know that there are many duplications and overlappings in the administration of government and we all know that waste and extranvagance is ever present. We also know that practically every governmental department and agency is overstaffed. There are many places where an excess of personnel may be reduced without taking away from our people any essential service.

It is unfortunate that we, the legislative body fixing the amount of appropriations, cannot have the cooperation of the executive branch of the Government. Every department head and division head must know full well where savings may be made without any loss of efficiency in the conduct of Government business. Since they will not cooperate to the extent of disclosing their knowledge, then I see no other way than to curtail proportionately and leave it to the various governmental departments and agencies to cut the coat according to the cloth.

My mail contains two classes of letters—one from constituents who ask me when we may ever expect to balance the budget unless we do it now in a period of prosperity and full production. The second class is from constituents who ask me to vote to restore to the appropriation bill some item which has been eliminated by the Committee on Appropriations. Many of these deleted items are undoubtedly desirable, but these constituents must be reminded that such improvements must await a more favorable time when we can better afford it.

I know of no way to economize except to economize. I know of no way to cut expenses except to cut. I feel that the temper of my own people is such that they will not be satisfied with my representation of them in Congress if I preach economy and fail to practice it.

I have never felt that I had to apologize for being one of the so-called economy bloc in Congress and when the votes come on this appropriation bill I propose to be consistent and vote for every reasonable saving which can be made. I know of no other way in which I can demonstrate that I have been sincere when I have warned my people back home that we are headed for national financial disaster unless we can call a halt in reckless Government spending and do it now.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and Mr. MILLS having assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 7786, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEOGH (at the request of Mr. McGRATH) was given permission to extend his remarks and include two statements, which are estimated by the Public Printer to cost $205.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted, as follows:

To Mr. SMITH of Kansas (at the request of Mr. REES), for an indefinite period, on account of illness in the family.

To Mr. MANSFIELD (at the request of Mr. JACKSON of Washington), for the balance of the week, on account of illness.

To Mr. MILES (at the request of Mr. FERNANDEZ), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

To Mr. QUINN (at the request of Mr. DELANEY), for 2 weeks, on account of illness.

To Mr. WAGNER (at the request of Mr. HAYS of Ohio), for an indefinite period, on account of serious illness in the family.

To Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. (at the request of Mr. GRAHAM), on account of active duty in the Navy.

To Mr. ALLEN of California (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), until April 21, on account of official business.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 6656. An act for the relief of Peter Michael El-Hini.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2911. An act to authorize the President to appoint Lt. Col. Charles H. Bonesteel as Executive Director of the European Coordinating Committee under the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, without affecting his military status and perquisites.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on April 14, 1950, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5839. An act to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 19, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1369. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease for the month of February 1950; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1370. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a letter proposing the transfer to the Department of Police, Los Angeles, Calif., two 38-foot picket boats, hull Nos. C–105172 and C–105173, for harbor police protection of the city of Los Angeles; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1371. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force to reproduce and to sell copies of official records of their respective Departments"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1372. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act of August 1, 1947, providing appropriate lapel buttons for widows, parents, and next of kin of members of the armed forces who lost their lives in the armed services of the United States in World War II, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1373. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, to cause to be published official registers for their respective services"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1374. A letter from the Chairman, United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange, Department of State, transmitting the third semiannual report on the educational exchange activities conducted under the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (Public Law 402, 80th Cong.) from July 1, 1949, to December 31, 1949 (H. Doc. No. 556); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

1375. A letter from the national shipswriter, Navy Club of the United States of America, transmitting the annual report of the receipts and expenditures of the Navy Club of the United States of America for the

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CHRISTOPHER] is recognized for 1 hour.

(Mr. CHRISTOPHER asked and was given permisison to revise and extend his remarks.)

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the Members that the subject I intend to discuss merits the attention of every Member of this House. In the appropriation bill now before us we are being asked to contribute some $14,000,000,000 to the military defense of our country. I am going to vote for that appropriation. I know nothing else to do. The Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Air Force, the Bureau of the Budget, and the President of the United States say that this is the irreducible minimum with which the interests of the United States of America can be protected and safeguarded at home and abroad. Who am I to say that I know more about what it takes to protect the interests of the United States of America at home and abroad than do the distinguished gentlemen I have just mentioned and our President of the United States. I have got to vote for that appropriation.

Mr. Speaker, you know Napoleon found out years ago that an army marched on its stomach and when a nation reaches the place that it cannot feed an army, and many nations of the world have already reached that place, then is when the subject I want to discuss here this afternoon comes into focus.

What I wish to talk about is found on page 189, line 10, of the bill we have had so long under consideration and that we will probably have under consideration for some time to come. I refer to the $282,000,000 appropriated for the PMA, soil conservation in the United States. Considering the things that the Federal Government is doing in other directions and the amount of appropriations for other things the world over, that $282,000, is pitifully inadequate.

It is the one thing that is justified above all the other agricultural expenditures in the Nation at the present time, and I am thinking of offering an amendment when that section is considered before this House to raise the figure from two hundred and eighty-two to four hundred million dollars.

You know, we like to brag about our country; what a great Nation we are. We are the greatest Nation in the world at the present time, but we like to hook our thumbs in the armholes of our vests and say, "We did this. This is the result of American ingenuity; this greatness is due to the kind of Government we have; it it due to our superior knowledge." Now, that is only partly true. I think we have great ingenuity. We have the best form of Government in the world, but a government has to have something besides people to govern.

When you wake up in the morning, what do you want? You want your toast, and bacon and eggs, and orange juice; that is what you want. Where does it come from? Why, the corner grocery store; they have got it down there. That is only part of the story.

It comes from the soil of the United States, and there never has been a nation of people since the dawn of history that has destroyed their natural resources and depleted their soil at the rate we have been doing and are doing in the United States. One hundred and seventy-five years ago, which is a very short time in the history of lost nations, the 13 Colonies had just won their independence and had started to form a nation, and everything from Pittsburgh, Pa., west, and part of the country east of Pittsburgh was nothing but a jungle, a wilderness, peopled with savages. We have taken over all of that country now and populated it out to the Pacific.

We say we are the greatest country in the world, which is true, but let me recall something to your minds. India, Korea, China, Manchuria, Formosa, Burma, Indochina, with their teeming populations, have only four-tenths of 1 acre of land that is fit to grow food per capita. We say that is Asia; those are the backward countries of the world, the countries that we need to help. And, I voted on the floor of this House for appropriations to help them. How do we stand in the United States from the standpoint of something to eat? We have 3½ acres of good agricultural land for every man, woman, and child in the United States, figuring that we have a population of 150,000,000. What would we have in the United States if we were crowded like Asia is crowded? Instead of having 150,000,000 people in the United States to live off of our soil we would then have more than 1,300,000,000 people in the United States to live off of our soil. If we should double our population and add 1,000,000,000 people to it, then we would be in the condition that Asia is in today, and today in the United States we have some unemployment even with only 150,000,000. Today in the United States we do not have enough houses with only 150,000,000 people. What in God's name would we have if we had 1,300,000,000 people in the United States to live off our soil instead of the 150,000,000 that we do have? Why are we the greatest Nation in the world? Because God almighty gave us so many natural resources in the beginning that with all of our profligacy, with all of our waste, with all of our disregard for our natural resources, we have not been able to dissipate all of it yet. That is the reason we are the greatest Nation in the world today. Providence just gave this United States of America so much that in 175 years we have not been able to tear it all up and throw it all away, but we are doing a pretty good job of it. We have lost half of our topsoil already, that little black film of topsoil from 8 to 18 inches thick spread over this United States, that carries less than 10 percent of the relationship to the solid content of this earth that the varnish carries to the solid content of a globe. When it is gone, we are gone.

China saw the day when they had no idea that 50,000,000 people would starve in 1 year in that country. India saw the time when they said, "We have lots of soil. Our river valleys are fertile. There is no reason why we should ever be hungry." But we are following the very same road that has been followed by every nation of antiquity.

I have heard men say on the floor of this House that the soil is the problem of the American farmer, that it does not concern anybody else; why does not the farmer himself take care of his own soil? I wish it were that simple.

We do have farm prosperity in the United States compared with some of the conditions we have had in the past, but I want you to remember this, and these figures are fresh. They came from the Department of Agriculture yesterday:

In 1949, with approximately 6,000,000 farm families in the United States, 1½ million of those farm families had a cash income for last year of less than $225 per family. The next million and a half had $705 per family, the third million and a half $1,425, per family, the next million and a half $2,775 per family, and the high bracket, the highest-income group of a million and a half of the farmers of the United States, had a family income of $9,870 per family of five, and that figure just about reached the average of the nonfarm per capita income in the United States.

That is one of the reasons the farmer cannot stand the entire burden of soil conservation if it is going to be done in time to save the soil of the United States. We are doing the job but we are not doing it fast enough. I can tell you how fast we are doing it. I have checked the figures. That is one thing I do know about.

We have terraced, in God knows how many years, 20,000,000 acres of land in the United States. That is all the Soil Conservation Service has terraced plus what PMA has terraced, plus what individual farmers like myself have terraced, all working together. We have built terraces to protect 20,000,000 acres of land in the United States, and there are another 100,000,000 acres that need that protection and need it now. Yet we appropriate $282,000,000 a year to do the job, and we send $100,000,000 to Korea, we send $100,000,000 to China, and we send enough money to implement the Marshall plan in Europe to build every mile of terrace that needs to be built in the United States. Then we come down to $282,000,000 for the one thing this Nation needs most of all, soil conservation.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. I am very much interested in the speech the distinguished gentleman from Missouri is making, because he is talking along a line which I am sure he knows I have a very deep interest in. As a matter of fact the gentleman knows that these vast deficits we are incurring go on the national debt. Is that not true?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Yes, sir.

Mr. KEEFE. Does not the gentleman feel that any program which involves agriculture should do something for fu-

ture generations who are going to be called upon to pay that obligation?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Unless we do something for the soil of the United States—soil which we do not own—we just have a life tenure on it—no farmer owns the farm he lives on. When he dies it falls into the lap of the nearest probate judge—he just has a life tenure on it. If we are not careful the father will not leave anything to the son but a sheet of subsoil covered by nothing but a mortgage.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman in what he says, but it seems to me when we are contemplating drawing out of the Treasury of the United States billions of dollars to finance this farm plan or that farm plan by way of the Brannan route or by way of the present route, the fact remains, unless we are able to step up and amplify tremendously the soil conservation, tree planting, and reforestation programs in this country we are going to leave a legacy to the people who come after you and me and their great-grandchildren which will be an obligation for them to pay with no corresponding benefit to them—benefits which would result if we stepped up this soil conservation, tree planting and reforestation program. Does not the gentleman agree with that?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for his contribution. Let me also state to him we are not trying to discuss the Brannan plan this evening because I am talking about soil conservation. I have a statement I want to make if the gentleman will permit me and I will proceed with that statement now. At some future time we will discuss the Brannan plan at great length probably.

As I was saying a few minutes ago, farming is not a corporate enterprise. Farming is a means of sustenance. It is a way of life. Perhaps a dozen corporations could take over the agriculture of the United States and conserve the soil and operate more efficiently than the 6,000,000 farmers who are living on that soil today, but I do not want to live to see the day when that happens. I believe in the family-sized farm and the people who live on those farms because they love the soil and they love the livestock and love the work they do. They would not stay out there if they did not.

Let me tell you a few of the things that go on on the farm. First I want you folks to visit a field with me. Maybe in this House where we talk about foreign countries—where we talk about armies and where we talk about navies and where we talk about the Air Force and our State Department and our great banking institutions and the tariff and such things as that that really amount to something—maybe a field is an anticlimax. But we live out of those fields and any time we do not live out of those fields we will not live at all. So I want to ask you folks to visit a field with me. if you can, in your mind, I would like for you to go back to 1895—5 years before the turn of this century. Go with me and my old father to visit a field. There are only 25 acres in this particular field. Its only importance lies in the fact that its prototypes are in every community in this country. Oh, in 1895 the soil in that field was 2 feet deep. It was nice black, sand loam and the leaf mold was laying over that field so that you could walk with no more noise than you make on this rug as your footsteps passed over those rotten leaves on top of the ground.

The first time I saw that field was in late June, and the mulberries were ripe. The young squirrels were ripe, too. My father was an old squirrel hunter. He learned to hunt squirrels in southern Indiana, not long after the Civil War. I went with him to that Missouri field. It was a flat 10 acres, and then a hill that covered about 15 acres. The hickory trees stood there, the black walnut, and the mulberry trees full of mulberries that the squirrels were eating in late June. I walked around the tree while father stood still. The squirrel went around the other side of the tree and he would motion me to stop when the squirrel came around and he would shoot the squirrel. I pulled the grape vines that ran up to their nests that were made with green leaves, and I carried the squirrel. That field was like God had laid it down there. But that farm changed hands. Father and I went down there a few years later to that field, and a sawmill had been set in there. Every tree that would make a few boards had been felled, and the logs taken out and sawed up. There was a pile of sawdust on the creek bank, and the mill was gone. The owner of that field said to the folks who lived out on the prairies, "I have got wood down here. If you will come down here and clean it up, I will give it to you." So the neighbors came and cleaned it up, and he went in there with what we called a jumping shovel plow. You pushed down on the handles to make it go into the ground. He dug up a little lose dirt in there and he planted corn and pumpkins. Then in the fall he cut that corn up and shocked it. You could almost step from one yellow pumpkin to another. The corn made 50 bushels to the acre and a wagonload of pumpkins or more on every acre in addition. That shows you what kind of soil it was.

Well, it was farmed in corn a few years, and then they sawed the stumps off level and sewed it to wheat, and it made 35 bushels to the acre without fertilizer. I helped thresh it.

Go look at that field today. I can carry in one of my hands all of the black soil that is left on that 25 acres. There are gashes down the side of that hill 6 feet deep into the red clay. It will never raise another bushel of corn. Never in the memory of any man living today or any child living today will it ever grow another bushel of corn. It cannot even be seeded to grass. It is absolutely ruined for all time.

It is only 25 acres. What is the difference? Just this difference. It is part of the United States of America, and today that 25 acres, properly handled, could have been producing beef and pork, milk, eggs, or wheat; but it is ruined. The man that owned it did not know enough to take care of it. The name of such men today is legion. Some men can take care of their farms and do not do it. Others can and do, and others absolutely cannot do it.

Here is a young farmer. Let us go out into the country. Here is a young farmer. We will say he is a GI. He has saved up a thousand dollars, and he makes a down payment on a little piece of land. He has to buy the cheapest piece of land in the neighborhood so as to have enough money to make the down payment on it, and he borrows the rest. He has to pay a little insurance. He has to pay a little taxes, and he has to meet the payments on his home. He goes out to these fields that ought to be terraced. They ought to be limed. They ought to be fertilized. They ought to be sown in clover. But what can he do? He has not got the money to do it. He has to go out to those fields and say, "I have got to deplete you still more in order that I may ever own you."

That is one case. Here is another man. He owns 160 acres of good land that has been taken care of. He has two sons and two daughters. One of his sons is already in the city. The two daughters are married and moved away. There is one boy left at home with dad. That one boy would like to have the farm. Dad lays down and dies; the two girls come home and the son comes home; they are interested in the estate. The boy who wants to stay on that farm does what? What little money he has saved up he spends to buy dad's tractor and some of the cows that sell at the sale. Two or three days later he goes into town, goes down to the loan company, and mortgages that farm for 75 or 80 percent of its value to pay Susie and Jean and Bob in order that he may stay on that farm. Then he goes out to those fields ,and he says: "I cannot take care of you any longer; I have got to mine you to the uttermost. I want to own you some day, and in order to do that I have got to abuse you." And suppose about the time he gets it paid for that the work has disgusted him with farming and he goes to town and he says to the real-estate man: "Sell my farm; I am not going to stay on it any more." Another man comes along with 25 percent of the price of that farm and mortgages it for the rest. He goes out to the land and says: "You have paid Joe; now pay me." Do you see the reason that the farm land of the United States is being destroyed? The time has got to come in these United States—and now you may choose to call me a Communist if you want to, and if you do, just crack away; I have been called everything but a gentleman anyhow, so you cannot insult me. The time has got to come in this Nation when a deed to a tract of land will not carry with it the right to destroy that tract of land. Now, I do not know what you are going to make out of that statement, but it has got to come.

Take the case of a man who lives on 160 acres of land but is no longer able to operate it; his children are gone, there is nobody there at home any more, and

he moves to town and rents a little house; he gets out to the farm only twice a year, and the only interest he has in the farm is the number of dollars it will bring him every year in order that he and his wife may live. That farm is going down and being depleted.

Then there is the last proposition that I am going to take up with you in this part of this program, and that is the man who buys a farm for an investment. There are still plenty of people in the United States who think that if you want to get rich just buy yourself a farm, rent it out, and live off the rent. That is very disappointing to the landlord and it is very bad on the farm. Now I want to talk about this little graph here.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield before he discusses that graph?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I yield.

Mr. PRESTON. I was interested a moment ago when the gentleman stated that the time is coming when an owner of land or the holder of a deed would not be permitted to do as he wished with his land. What solution does the gentleman have to offer? What sort of control or regulation does the gentleman propose whereby the owner would be compelled to practice good soil conservation policies in connection with his land?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I think the time will have to come in these United States when the farmer will have to be required to terrace the land that needs terracing, to spread lime on land that needs to be limed, and when he will not be allowed to plant it all to corn, to plant it all to cotton, or to plant it all to tobacco; he will have to observe good farming practices. I realize it will raise the devil whenever it is proposed, but we have either got to do that or the time is going to come in these United States when the production of our farms will not feed half of our population. I believe it.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I yield.

Mr. PRESTON. The gentleman is making a very interesting speech here this evening, and I am sure that every Member present is thoroughly enjoying it. Is it not true that at this time, while the regulation is not compulsory, we do have regulations which require farmers to comply with certain practices in order to obtain soil-conservation payments and benefits? This is an effort to induce him to follow good farming practices. So what the gentleman is suggesting now is that ultimately the time will have to come when he will be obliged to do that.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. The only thing that will keep him from being compelled to do that is the chance that he will do it without compulsion, and that is what I am hoping for.

Mr. PRESTON. I quite agree that it is an educational program that we must follow up vigorously if we are ever to get put into effect the things the gentleman so strongly recommends.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. That is right, and I want to say that the PMA program in the United States is the program that has gotten more soil conservation for the money than any program we have ever had in the United States. It makes soil conservation semicompulsory. It says: We make the payments if you do these things; if you do not, we will not.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take up this graph. A man comes into a town, let us say, and he buys a hardware store. He has money to pay for the building and a stock of goods. His shelves are full. Let us say he has enough money in addition to buy a residence in town for him and his family. He has had business experience. He knows where to buy advantageously. He can mix with the public well. His wife and children get along well with all the folks in town. He and his wife are social successes. He gets along all right. Let us give him every break.

Well, he has to make enough money to pay his help, he has to make enough money to pay his taxes, he has to make enough money to pay for his water and lights, he has to make enough money to support his family, he has to make enough money to help support the institutions that are in his town because if he is going to be a businessman there he has to be one of them, he is going to act like one of them, he is going to spend money like one of them. Let us say he makes enough money to do all of those things.

But when he takes inventory on the first day of January after he has owned that store 10 months, he finds his stock of goods lacks $5,000 of invoicing as much as when he bought the store. He has made enough money to do everything else, but he has not made enough money to replenish the goods on his shelf. Now, if he continues to do that, is it not a fact that at the end of a certain number of years he will either sell a depleted stock at a sacrifice, for whatever he can get, or he will be forced into bankruptcy? One of those two things await him. Now we are going to bring a farmer into that community and let him buy 160 acres of land or a half section if that suits you better. Let us give him every break. Let us let him pay cash down for his farm and let him have $3,000 or $4,000 over and above his stock and implements to buy fuel, oil, and food and fertilizer until he can harvest his first crop. Let him make enough money to pay all of his expenses expecting to put that calcium, nitrogen, phosphorous, and potash back into his soil. If he does not make enough money to do that, of if he fails to do that and continues to crop that ground year after year, his end is the same as the merchant's.

He does not know it; maybe his neighbors do not know it; maybe they will say that the man is making a success. He is meeting all of his obligations; he is educating his children; he is keeping his home in repair. But what is happening out in those fields? There is where he will succeed or fail out in those fields. Look at the graph. Note the mineral content of 40 bushels of corn. Note these figures represent the mineral content of 40 bushels of corn. These figures do not take into consideration the plant food lost by leaching or erosion on the acre of land during the year in which that acre was producing that 40 bushels of corn. In many cases an acre of land producing 40 bushels of corn loses twice as much plant food by leaching and erosion as the 40 bushels of corn contain. The mineral content of the 40 bushels of corn is 45 pounds of calcium, 60 pounds of nitrogen, 20 pounds of phosphorus, and 50 pounds of potash. Again notice the graph, 20 bushels of wheat contain 48 pounds of calcium, 36 pounds of nitrogen, 15 pounds of phosphorus, and 20 pounds of potash; and 2½ tons of alfalfa contain 73 pounds of calcium, 70 pounds of nitrogen, 23 pounds of phosphorus, and 113 pounds of potash. Many farmers say that alfalfa improves land; that is not true. Note the minerals that a crop of alfalfa removes from the soil; unless they are replaced the alfalfa will fail. It will simply starve to death.

The oil driller received a depletion allowance because he is depleting his natural resources; that allowance is often as great as 27½ percent. The same is true of the mining industry. But some folks consider the soil as eternal and the farmer is allowed no deduction for depletion. I tell you that the people of these United States have got to wake up.

Mr. Bennett, of the Soil Conservation Service, says that we are losing enough of our topsoil every day to put topsoil 12 inches deep on 8,000 acres of land every day, and that 1,000 acres of land goes out of the mouth of the Mississippi, in the Delta down there when the Mississippi is at full flood every 24 hours. How long can we stand that with our soil going down and our population going up? It is time and high time that the people of the United States and the Government of the United States woke up to the fact that soil conservation is the greatest need of the country at the present time and that our loss of topsoil is our greatest misfortune. The PMA program has taught the American farmer and helped him financially in a program of terracing and liming and has done more for actual soil conservation accomplished in the fields than all other programs combined. Every dollar of taxpayers' money that has been spent by PMA has already returned to the Federal Treasury in income taxes paid by farmers who would never have made enough money to pay an income tax had it not been for the PMA program. The appropriation for the PMA program should be raised to $400,000,000 per year. The two greatest needs today are lime and terraces. Terraces to protect the body of the soil itself and lime to increase the growth of legumes. Money spent for soil conservation is not an expense but the best investment the taxpayers of the United States have ever made or ever will make because it helps guarantee food, clothing, and shelter not only for themselves but for their children and grandchildren.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PATRIOTS' DAY

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, this is Patriots' Day in Massachusetts. We from the old Bay State are grateful to the Congress for the concurrent resolution commemorating the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the battles of Lexington and Concord.

"By the rude bridge that arched the flood" the farmers and townfolk stood up to the professional soldiers of Britain and gave a good account of themselves that the spirit of revolt was sparked throughout the Thirteen Colonies.

They fought against taxation without representation and it might be well for us in 1950 to remember that excessive taxation stirred the colonists to rebellion in 1775. It is not beyond the realm of possibility that many of our citizens might consider themselves as long-suffering colonists today and rise up—in political protest—if we do not give them a dollar's worth for every one of the billions of dollars which this Congress will appropriate.

As we honor the patriots of Concord and Lexington let us be mindful of the fact that the spirit which motivated them is not absent from their descendants of today.

Although the functions of Government have increased in order to balance the social and economic tensions in modern society, there is a limit to the extension of such powers.

The colonist of 1775 put his home or his farm first—of a value far more important than the Government he and his fellow citizens established to maintain law and order.

There are vast differences between the agricultural—almost pastoral quality of life in 1775—and the feverish tempo of our complex times.

But people were human beings then, as they are now. They have individual needs and wants and aspirations that require a climate in which there will be some opportunity for realization.

It is necessary for us to provide them with some protection against the economic hazards of modern life. But there is some danger in our preoccupation with security that may lead us to neglect opportunity. Our approach may become negative, rather than positive.

That is why the events that we commemorate this day are of such value to us. They remind us of the courage and self-reliance which made this Nation great. This is no time for us to rest upon the efforts of those who preceded us. This Nation has not reached the age of retirement. The worth of any people is measured less by its material achievements than by the growth of its intelligence and its character.

We cannot go back to those stirring days when men first tasted the fresh air of freedom. We would not want to go back. There are more of the good things of life to enjoy today.

But we of today need the spiritual fulfillment which was theirs.

It will not be found in complete dependence upon others.

When we finally complete the job of providing basic economic security for our people, I hope that we will then concentrate on bending every effort to encourage them with incentives.

This is the miracle ingredient in our way of life: the one that inspires extra effort and extra satisfaction.

The men and women of Concord and Lexington had it in abundance. We, in the years ahead that will test us as never before, will need this self-reliance at its best. For the whole is only the sum of the individual parts of which it is made. So, too, with a nation.

I pray that our people on this Patriot's Day and on every holiday that calls to mind our glorious past, will determine not only to emulate but to excel in the sturdy virtues of courage and individual effort for which there is no substitute.

That is the lesson to be learned from Concord and Lexington.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. CARROLL (at the request of Mr. MARSALIS), for this week, on account of official business.

To Mr. SHELLEY (at the request of Mr. SHEPPARD), for 10 days, on account of illness.

To Mr. MILLER of Maryland (at the request of Mr. BEALL), for today and tomorrow, on account of official business as a member of the Board of Visitors to the Naval Academy.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on April 18, 1950, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 6656. An act for the relief of Peter Michael El-Hini.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 20, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1387. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 4, 1949, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of report on, and a preliminary examination and survey of, Chariton River and tributaries, Iowa and Missouri, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on July 16, 1945, and also authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on July 24, 1946 (H. Doc. No. 561), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed, with three illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 4969. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Army to transfer and convey certain lands and thereby facilitate administration and give proper cognizance to the highest use of United States lands; with amendment (Rept. No. 1915). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 5913. A bill to authorize the exchange of certain lands of the United States situated in Ross County, Ohio, for lands within the Symmes Creek purchase unit in Lawrence County, Ohio, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1916). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3169. A bill for the relief of Agustín Cortés Martínez, his wife Guillermina Díaz de Cortés, his children Santiago Cortés Díaz, Agustina Guillermina Cortés Díaz, and Guellermo Augustín Cortés Díaz; with amendment (Rept. No. 1910). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6169. A bill for the relief of Mary Mitsuye Nishihama Yabe; with amendment (Rept. No. 1911). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6652. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Fujiko Chichie Imbert, wife, and Robert Imbert, Jr., son of an American soldier; with amendment (Rept. No. 1912). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7065. A bill for the relief of Kazuko Miyama Akana and Chang King Akana; with amendment (Rept. No. 1913). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7066. A bill for the relief of Setsuko Amano; with amendment (Rept. No. 1914). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DURHAM:

H.R. 8103. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H.R. 8104. A bill to provide reimbursement of expenses incurred in connection with the burial of those who served in the military forces of the Commonwealth of the Philippines while such forces were in the armed forces of the United States pursuant to the military order of the President of the United States dated July 26, 1941; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 8105. A bill to extend until July 1, 1951, import control powers with respect to fats and oils and rice and rice products; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1951—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7786, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday the Clerk had read down to and including line 7, page 137, title II, chapter V, of the bill.

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this is the twenty-sixth day of April and we have with us the first time in many weeks our distinguished colleague, MARY NORTON, of New Jersey, who has recently announced that she is not going to run again for Congress.

We welcome her back with very full hearts and we hope that she will be able to spend many hours with us before this session closes and that then for many years she will come back and be with us often and give us her wise counsel.

Mr. Chairman, there is not a woman now in this House, nor one who has been here during her long period of service to the people of the United States as well as to her district in New Jersey, who has not learned to love her, to respect her, to want the friendship with which she is so generous.

We women of the House feel a keen regret that we shall not have her with us in the coming session of the Congress. We wish her every possible and conceivable joy and satisfaction out of the many things that she has done for humanity, for her people, for other women and for so many children. We are deeply grateful for the example she has set to all women in America.

The kind of service she has rendered is quite beyond my power to put into words. We are united, we women of the House, and we know that beside us and behind us and around us the men of this body and of the other body would like to express something of their regard for the distinguished Congresswoman from New Jersey, MARY NORTON. I hope you will accept me as your spokesman on this occasion. I know that you will want to put your own words into the RECORD.

Mr. Chairman, when we go back into the House I shall ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to insert in the RECORD at this point those remarks which perhaps, if they were said now would be more than the gentlewoman from New Jersey, MARY NORTON could quite bear, with equanimity, because she is finding out how much we love her. She has been realizing that few people have as many friends as she.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, we women of the House are going to be wholly revolutionary because we want to give her a little token that is all hers just from us. As I leave this rostrum I am going to ask the Republican women who are here to go with me across the aisle that we may give to MARY on the floor of this House a tiny token that she will take with her as a continuing remembrance of our love and devotion to her as we recognize her consecration and devotion to the United States of America through her services in the House of Representatives.

MARY T. NORTON: A GREAT AMERICAN

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, my good friend, the lady from New Jersey, and I have served together in Congress for a quarter of a century, through years of peace, years of great tragedy, and years of great victory for our country. There has always been a close bond of friendship between us. All of us admire her for her great ability, her fine strength of character, and because she has always stood for the right. She has done well everything she has undertaken. Some of her philanthropies are known, but there are hundreds and hundreds of kind, thoughtful acts she has done of which the public has no cognizance. From time to time, in my own work, I run across these thoughtful acts accomplished so willingly and so unpretentiously by MARY NORTON. She has restored to many people a confidence in human nature by her unselfishness and her willingness to help them in their hour of need. She has made an excellent Member of Congress. We will miss her greatly here in the House of Representatives. She is a great woman, a great Member of Congress, and a great American.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments to the paragraph appearing on page 137? If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

National Institutes of Health, operating expenses: For the activities of the National Institutes of Health, not otherwise provided for, including research fellowship and grants for research projects pursuant to section 301 of the act; the regulation and preparation of biologic products; the purchase of not to exceed six passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; not to exceed $1,000 for entertainment of visiting scientists when specifically approved by the Surgeon General; and erection of temporary structures for storage of equipment and supplies and housing of animals, $15,750,000, of which not less than $3,600,000 shall be available exclusively for grants for studies with adrenocorticotropic hormone (ACTH) and cortisone (compound E), including development of other related compounds for treatment of arthritis, rheumatism, multiple sclerosis, and metabolic diseases, and including studies in the basic sciences related to such diseases.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEEFE: On page 139, line 2, after the comma, immediately following the word "sclerosis", insert the word "neurological", and on page 139, line 4, strike out the period at the end of the sentence and add the following: "and including not to exceed $200,000 for transfer to the Department of Agriculture for research into utilization of plant material and vegetable sources of cortisone."

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. I should like to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that at the present moment the chief producer of cortisone happens to be Armour & Co., the second largest packer in the world. Another large packer, Wilson Co., contemplates entering the field, and I am wondering whether the gentleman, through his influence on the committee, would bear in mind a move to bring about some form of a modest subsidy to permit other packers, like Swift, John Morrell, Rath, and many other lesser ones in this country, to go into the production of this magic, this wonder substance, without which this country cannot long continue its advance against disease, man's greatest enemy. And, I want to say this, if my good friend will indulge me, that we cannot expect these people to produce and to give away this precious substance entirely at their own expense, and it may be well, with a modest subsidy, to encourage them to produce it, because for the time being at least they are giving it away free for experimental purposes.

Mr. KEEFE. I thank the gentleman for making that inquiry. As I tried to explain yesterday in my general statement on this bill the committee has placed $2,500,000 in the bill, which is included in the paragraph now under consideration for the specific purpose of aiding in the research and in the work in connection with the production of ACTH and compound E.

Mr. DINGELL. It would cover what I have in mind?

Mr. KEEFE. I am certain it will. There is no desire to promote monopolistic trade practices so far as the production of these two miracle drugs is concerned. The whole objective of the Public Health Service in making funds available in the form of grants for further research and to obtain synthesization of these two wonder drugs is that we may obtain the widest spread of beneficial use rather than to have, as at present, the production of these drugs limited almost entirely to research projects.

Mr. DINGELL. I have in mind that it would be possible if this sort of money is used properly that these glands, as rare as they are, as little as they produce in cortisone by immediate reduction, might even—and this is only in my lay mind, and I suggest it for whatever it is worth—that these glands be kept alive after extraction by a method similar to that employed in the Lindbergh heart, so that these glands could produce more by continued life under artificial stimulation for a long period of time, and thus produce many, many times the amount of cortisone that is extracted from them through reduction immediately following removal. That is always in the realm of possibility in experimental work.

Mr. KEEFE. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin be permitted to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. I should like to proceed for just a moment on this subject.

As I noted yesterday, the Public Health Service and the research institutions throughout the country are fully alert and alive to the possibilities of the utilization in medicine of compound E and ACTH, the two miracle wonder drugs that are rapidly expanding in production to the point where I think it is not unsafe to say that they will be available for humanity generally in very largely increased amounts due to the aid and assistance which is contemplated in the appropriation contained in this paragraph.

The question was asked yesterday by the gentleman from Iowa as to what is being done in the matter of research in the field of multiple sclerosis. That question has been asked of me by many, many Members of the Congress. You will observe that the paragraph under consideration makes appropriations to the National Institute of Health. Included in the research work being done presently and to be implemented by this appropriation is research into the treatment of arthritis, rheumatism, multiple sclerosis, and metabolic diseases, including studies in the basic sciences related to such diseases.

When the language was drafted it was broad enough, of course, to include a specific program of research into multiple sclerosis. But it was not broad enough to authorize the National Institutes of Health to set up a program of research into neurological diseases. The matter was called to the attention of the chairman of the subcommittee by the Director of the National Institutes of Health, who sought to have broad enough authority in connection with their general research program to go into some of the fields of neurological research, which is directly related to the ever-increasing mental illnesses that are afflicting the people of the country so terrifically at the present time.

So the first part of this amendment is a very simple inclusion of the word "neurological" in the description of those basic matters which the Congress is directing the National Institutes of Health to investigate, and authorizing them to make grants out of the funds provided here to extend research to those fields throughout the country.

So far as that part of the amendment is concerned, I believe it is thoroughly acceptable to the committee. Is that not true, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. FOGARTY. Both parts of this amendment, I believe, are acceptable to the committee and there will be no dispute on either one of them.

Mr. KEEFE. The second part of the amendment is directly related to the subject which was discussed by my friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL]. The Committee on Agriculture, which is dealing with the matter of plant studies, had a provision in its portion of the appropriation bill under which it was contemplated that of the funds granted to the National Institute of Health $200,000 would be made available to the Department of Agriculture experts to enable them to search the world for new sources of cortisone which might be found in living plant life. Thus, it is proposed by the second part of the amendment to transfer to the Department of Agriculture $200,000 of the funds appropriated to the National Institute of Health in order that the cooperation of the Department of Agriculture may be assured in searching all parts of the world for new sources of cortisone which is the base by which ACTH and compound E are made.

I think that is a great step in the right direction. In order to carry out that purpose of the Subcommittee on Agriculture and the full Committee on Appropriations, I have offered this second part of the amendment which will enable us to carry on work which is already being carried on in Africa, Mexico, and in Central and South America by people who earnestly trying to find the sources of cortisone that may be utilized by which we may expect to ultimately receive a vastly increased supply of this basic material for the production of ACTH and compound E.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes that I may answer any questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman's amendment does not increase the appropriation, does it?

Mr. KEEFE. It does not.

Mr. STEFAN. It merely earmarks the appropriation for that particular purpose?

Mr. KEEFE. It merely authorizes the transfer by the Public Health Service of $200,000 to the Department of Agriculture and does not constitute any increase in appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

National Cancer Institute: To enable the Surgeon General, upon the recommendations of the National Advisory Cancer Council, to make grants-in-aid for research and training projects relating to cancer; to cooperate with State health agencies, and other public and private nonprofit institutions, in the prevention, control, and eradication of cancer by providing consultative services, demonstrations, and grants-in-aid; for the purchase of not to exceed six passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; and to otherwise carry out the provisions of title IV, part A, of the act, $20,086,000, of which not less than $5,000,000 shall be available exclusively for payment of obligations for research and training grants incurred under authority heretofore granted under this head.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEEFE: On page 139, line 18, strike out the period at the end of the paragraph and insert in lieu thereof the following: "; and in addition to the amount appropriated herein, the Surgeon General is authorized, upon the recommendation of the National Advisory Cancer Council, to approve applications for research and training grants, including grants for drawing plans, erection of buildings, and acquisition of land therefor, not to exceed a total of $3,000,000 for periods beyond the current fiscal year, and such grants shall, if approved during the current fiscal year, constitute a contractual obligation of the Federal Government."

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order. I raise the point of order that this is legislation on an appropriation bill; and, further, that the basic legislation does not authorize contract authorizations.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. KEEFE. Yes, I do desire to be heard, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be pleased to hear the gentleman.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the amendment is to give contractual authority for cancer research construction grants. The basic authorization for construction grants is found in section 405 of the Public Health Service Act, as amended, which reads as follows:

Appropriations to carry out the purposes of this title, cancer, shall be available for acquisition of land, or the erection of buildings only if so specified.

Under that language, Mr. Chairman, the Congress has, in identical language as in the amendment submitted by the gentleman from Wisconsin, accepted appropriations, and appropriations have been made with the identical language in fiscal years 1948 and 1949 appropriation bills. I think the language is certainly broad enough to authorize this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Rhode Island desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes, I do, Mr. Chairman.

The appropriation bill passed a year ago, on page 175, included practically the same language, it seems to me, when we said at that time:

And in addition to the amount herein, the Surgeon General is authorized, upon the recommendation of the National Advisory Cancer Council, to approve applications for research and training grants, including grants for drawing plans, erection of buildings, and acquisition of land therefore, not to exceed a total of $6,000,000, for periods beyond the current fiscal year, and such grants shall, if approved during the current fiscal year, constitute a contractual obligation on the Federal Government.

It seems to me that this language and similar language having been in the bill

in past years, it would be in order at this time.

I go along with the views expressed by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] that this is in order at this time.

Mr. KEEFE. May I say further, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me the basic act, under which this national cancer program was set up in the bill to which I have referred, constitutes basic authority for this proposal.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. COOPER). The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] has offered an amendment which has been reported. The gentleman from New York [Mr. MCGRATH] has made a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it contains legislation on an appropriation bill, in violation of the rules of the House.

The Chair has examined the amendment and section 405 of the Public Health Service Act referred to by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The Chair might comment on the statement made by the gentleman from Rhode Island to the extent of saying that although a provision of this nature may have been included in previous acts there may not have been any point of order made against it; so that could not be decisive in considering the question now presented.

The Chair is of the opinion that section 405 cited by the gentleman from Wisconsin does constitute legislative authority for the appropriation. The Chair invites attention to the fact that the pending amendment includes a provision for contract authorization beyond the present fiscal year, which, in the opinion of the Chair, would constitute legislation on an appropriation bill and would be in violation of the rules of the House. For that reason the Chair is compelled to sustain the point of order.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time so that I may if possible have our Clerk draw an amendment to this section of the bill which will be practically the same thing and so it will not be ruled out of order. I had hoped that since we had in past years had unanimous agreement on these public-health measures dealing with heart, cancer, and mental-disease research programs, that no member of our subcommittee this year would raise a point of order on such a question on which there has been unanimous agreement in the past 3 or 4 years since this program was instituted, and because of the results achieved from the money we have appropriated over the last 3 or 4 years.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. May I say to the gentleman that I served on this Subcommittee on the Labor Department and Federal Security Agency for approximately 4 years. I never previously saw disagreement between the members of our subcommittee with regard to items in this bill for public health.

Mr. FOGARTY. There has never been any disagreement until this year, and this present situation is one of my biggest disappointments since I have been a Member of Congress, to see a worthwhile program being scuttled and stopped in its tracks. If this were to be a continuing program that was going to run on for years and years and years with no estimate of how much it was going to cost in the end, there might be some reasonable argument against the appropriation of these funds. But when this program was instituted 3 or 4 years ago we had a definite time limit on construction of facilities for clinical laboratories, and so forth, to deal with this particular research in the cancer program. If we were allowed to continue, we would be out of the construction business in this particular program in another year and that would be the end of it and we would have accomplished more good by the few million dollars we spent in attempting to find the cause of this disastrous disease that no one knows much about at the present time. We can build all the hospitals in the world and fill them up with these cancer patients; it is going to cost in the end billions and billions of dollars unless we can find the cause, and the only way we are ever going to find the cause is to spend some money on research and get to the root of it.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. DINGELL. Is it not of utmost importance, does it not transcend all other considerations, the rules of the House to the contrary notwithstanding, that there must be an uninterrupted course of research regardless of objections or technicalities?

Mr. FOGARTY. Positively. The Federal Government today is spending about a billion dollars in research every year, yet only 10 percent of that billion dollars is going into research in the public-health system of our country. Why, we are spending at least $25,000,000 a year for research into diseases of plants and animals. I am for it. I think we should do that, and I think it should be continued. But why in the world, if we are spending that much on the diseases of plants and animals, can we not spend something to find out about the leading causes of deaths? This does not affect one segment of our economy, this does not affect one class of our people; it affects every living person in the country at the present time, regardless of from what walk of life they may come, regardless of what side of the aisle they are sitting on today. That does not make any difference. We are all susceptible to these diseases. If we have the opportunity now to do something about it, let us do it.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I would like to commend the gentleman from Rhode Island for the very excellent statement he has made. How much is involved in the construction program involving cancer, approximately?

Mr. KEEFE. For the initial program there is involved a contempltaed expenditure of $25,000,000. Sixteen million dollars has already been appropriated by the Congress. This amendment would carry that program forward only to the extent of $3,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, what the gentleman from Wisconsin stated is correct. The program involves an expenditure of $25,000,000 spread over a period of 3 years. We have already spent $16,000,000 on the program. As I remember, the Public Health officials asked the Bureau of the Budget for $9,000,000 to complete the program this year. If we were allowed to get that $9,000,000, the program would be complete, we would be out of the construction business and we would have something that all the world would be proud of.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. And we would have maintained an unbroken fight against disease instead of carrying on a desultory attack which every time we make a break in the progrm proves costly in lives and in further financing it.

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BURNSIDE. I commend the gentlemen for the excellent work they have been doing along this line. I would like to add that one out of every seven people in the United States is affected by this disease, and the paltry sum, and this is a paltry sum, of $9,000,000 covering one out of every seven in the United States is not too much.

Mr. FOGARTY. We are not asking for $9,000,000. The amount is $3,000,000. What we want to do is continue this program so that it will not be stopped. Why stop something that is going to be a future guaranty to the people of this country and the whole world that ultimately we are going to find out the cause of cancer, the second leading cause of death.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Can the gentleman advise the House as to how many public cancer hospitals there are in the United States?

Mr. FOGARTY. I cannot give those figures.

Mr. MCCORMACK. The only one I know of is in Massachusetts. I was wondering if there are any in other States, if there are any other public

cancer hospitals. We have a veterans' hospital, I think, in Brooklyn, but that is for veterans.

Mr. FOGARTY. The Memorial Hospital in New York is the oldest cancer hospital in the country.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. May I acquaint the Members of the House with the fact that in a community such as the Borough of Brooklyn, with a population of over three million, there is no cancer hospital.

Mr. McCORMACK. My understanding is, and this is rather interesting, that there is no public cancer hospital, and I say this with some reservation, outside of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. There is a veterans' hospital, they have some beds here and there. Certainly that shows the necessity for something being done. I know about the public cancer hospital in Massachusetts because I happened to be a member of the Massachusetts Senate in 1926 when a group of us got together, some in the house and some in the senate, and I led the fight in the senate for the passage of the bill that brought about the public cancer hospital that now exists in Massachusetts. If there is one field that something should be done in, it is the field of cancer.

Mr. FOGARTY. I hope the distinguished majority leader will lend his support to this proposition, because we need his help today.

Mr. McCORMACK. The majority leader certainly has been inspiring the gentleman as much as he could.

Mr. FOGARTY. The gentleman is doing a good job. Let us keep it up.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, it should be borne in mind that we are going to save millions and millions of dollars if we can lick this problem, because at the present time there is no doubt that a lot of public hospitals throughout this country are faced with a costly cancer problem that they have to meet.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. I also desire to commend the gentleman from Rhode Island for his excellent statement here this morning. I wish to state that I concur with his views.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Do I understand correctly that the National Advisory Cancer Council, composed of eminent medical, scientific, and prominent laymen, drawn from all walks of life, have endorsed this program, and are convinced, if it is continued, that we are making real progress toward solving the problem of the cure of cancer and saving the millions of dollars to which the gentleman from Michigan has referred?

Mr. FOGARTY. There is no question about that.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I, too, wish to commend the gentleman from Rhode Island for his statement in regard to this matter and to point out that the sum involved, insofar as cancer is concerned, is a paltry one when compared to the billions of dollars that this Congress has been appropriating for Marshall plan aid and other such aid to foreign countries.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. JONAS. In answer to the statement made by the distinguished majority leader, I want to say that there are a good many branches to hospitals in the country that operate under the name of tumor clinics, that are really not identified openly as cancer institutions, but these tumor clinics are part of these hospitals. There are a great many of those in this country that carry on this work.

Mr. McCORMACK. My statement related to cancer hospitals.

Mr. JONAS. Well, there really are none. The statement that the gentleman made to the House recently about the necessity of research work is the crux of the whole thing. I have had considerable experience with hospitals, the President of a hospital board that carries on research work now. Research is absolutely necessary in order to find a cure for it, otherwise you can fill all your hospitals and not accomplish anything.

Mr. FOGARTY. I thank the gentleman. That is the kind of testimony that I, as a layman appreciate, hearing it from men like the gentleman who has had that experience.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WIDNALL. Does the gentleman realize that we spend more money to store potatoes that nobody can eat than we do for this worth while program the gentleman is asking $3,000,000 for?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEEFE: On page 139, line 18, strike out the period at the end of the paragraph and insert in lieu thereof the following: "and in addition to the amount appropriated herein the Surgeon General is authorized, upon the recommendation of the National Advisory Cancer Council, to approve applications for research and training grants, including grants for drawing plans, erection of buildings, and acquisition of land therefor, not to exceed a total of $3,000,000."

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I know of no field in which the Government could interest itself to greater advantage to the people not only of America but of the world than the field which is involved in this amendment and two subsequent amendments which I shall offer to this bill.

Let us get the history of this situation. This Congress by an almost unanimous vote adopted the recommendation of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce some years ago and established the National Cancer Foundation, and provided that that organization, to be operated under the direction of the Surgeon General, should have as its advisory council a council consisting of the most outstanding medical people and laymen in America to direct its functioning.

This is not a new program, this is an old program that is a functioning program and has been in effect since 1938.

What was the thing we discovered all over America? Thousands of men and women devoting themselves as members of the National Cancer Society to going out to the people of this country to solicit millions of dollars to carry on the fight against cancer. Carry on the fight how? They have found that they are using that money and are compelled to use it principally for the care of cancer patients. The amount that is available for expenditure for research purposes is dwindling and dwindling and dwindling, just as it is in the case of poliomyelitis. The incidence of the disease is growing so rapidly and the necessities for care are so terrific that the money the people are spending in these drives is being spent for care instead of research.

The little money we provided in 1938 started a program that attacked this problem at the place where the men and women engaged in research in this country said was critical. What was it? They said, "We have been engaged in a program utilizing rats and guinea pigs and monkeys to try to find the cause and cure of cancer in human beings." I went around the country and talked to these great researchers at that time. What did they tell me? They said the bottleneck in the program, the thing that was stymieing the program, was the lack of clinical facilities. They were not available, as the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts so well stated. So this Congress decided to do something about it. We decided to establish a program of asistance to the research centers of the country that would make available these clinical facilities, that not only would provide care and treatment but would afford the researchers the opportunity for finding the answer, if possible, through their observation of human beings instead of monkeys and guinea pigs or orangutans or rats.

This Congress in 1938 set that program in motion, and you authorized and furnished the money to build this great research center at Bethesda, which in turn is hooked up with all of the other research centers in the country in the field of cancer. Great progress is being made in that field.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, what does the present amendment contemplate? A measly $3,000,000 with which to continue a program which has been endorsed not only by the Cancer Advisory Council but by every scientist in that field. Do they say only $3,000,000 is necessary? They say over $30,000,000 should be appropriated for this purpose if we are going to make a proper onslaught in the field of cancer.

We came into this subcommittee desiring to see to it that there would be expenditures limited to the very lowest level. We cut out of the public health part of the bill some $26,000,000 on other projects in order that we could take some of the money and apply it in the field of cancer, heart disease, and mental illness. It amounted to some $11,000,000 or $12,000,000.

The gentleman from Rhode Island and I voted for these cuts with the understanding that the money thus saved or at least a portion of it would be used to implement these programs which the people of America want.

Make no mistake about it but the work of the American Cancer Society, the American Heart Society, and the Institute of Mental Hygiene working nationally over the country generally have aroused the people to the necessity for some action on the part of the Federal Government to help them in their fight against these dread diseases.

You can turn it down if you want to. I have done my part. The chairman of the subcommittee has done his part. I realize how difficult it is when people get up here and say, "Oh, you are overwriting the budget $3,000,000—you cannot do that." Well, you remember what took place here yesterday. In the very same subcommittee they voted to cut the hospital construction program in two. When the vote came on the amendment to restore those funds the very members who voted to cut it in two walked through the tellers in support of the amendment. They had heard from home? I do not know. Perhaps they heard from the American people who are demanding that something be done in this field.

Mr. Chairman, as I said originally, it does not mean anything to me personally. I am going to leave the Congress. This will be my last service. This is my last effort in behalf of public health. You take the responsibility and carry on the fight. So I am not talking because I want to get votes. I am talking because in my heart I have the conviction there is nothing the Congress can do of more interest to human welfare than the promotion of these programs involving the fight on cancer, heart disease, and mental illness. If we do not make the fight the people are going to demand it and then you will face the prospect of State medicine. Make no mistake about it.

There are those who stand up here and decry socialism and the threat of socialism day in and day out. Yet when a program is submitted which is the very antithesis of socialism and which is the one program which is going to stop socialism in this field because of the few dollars involved, they will vote to defeat the program.

I cannot see it. I am not going to be bound by that sort of attitude in the remaining days of my service in this Congress. I have been here 12 years. I hope that the membership of this House will follow the leadership of the gentleman who is chairman of this subcommittee, who heard this testimony, not once but many times, and who is familiar with the problem, as is the gentleman who is now addressing you, and not take the word of someone who has never heard a word of this testimony which was given before the committee and who has heretofore shown no interest in this program that is so vital to the interest and the welfare of the people of this Nation. Do with it as you will. I have done my part. My conscience is clear, and outside of Congress I am going to carry this fight to the people, in an effort to awaken that great consciousness that controls all of it, in doing things for the people of America that ought to be done, instead of voting billions of dollars for other people, as have some of the people who oppose this little amendment.

Think it over, my friends, before you cast your votes on this amendment. It is in the interest of the welfare of the people of America for which I am pleading.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE]. I would like to pay tribute to him. I think I speak the views and the heartfelt feelings of I hope a great majority of the Members of this House for the Herculean effort which he has made in behalf of the health of the people of the United States, particularly in those critical fields—cancer, mental health and heart disease—which have so baffled medical science and have been so frustrating and so helpless to so many millions of Americans.

The gentleman from Wisconsin said today something that I did not know, that he is leaving congressional service. I consider that a great loss to the people of America, for this particular fight alone, if nothing else, and the gentleman has rendered distinguished service in many ways. I wish him long life and hearty years in which to wage this fight for the people's health that he has so nobly carried on on this floor.

There are really three amendments which we are considering now. The gentleman will propose them in due course. We are taking first the one for cancer. There will be another for mental health, and another for heart. This is the triology of frustration, frustration for medical science and frustration for human beings.

There are two thoughts that I would like to leave with you. The first is that we hear a lot from many distinguished gentlemen on the floor that we must be solicitous about the taxpayers' money. We must not waste the taxpayers' money. Of course, we understand that, and that is our duty. But what is so little said is that there are some cases in which the taxpayers want us to spend their money. They are asking us to spend their money, and to spend it wisely and well. That is one of those cases. The three appropriations for cancer, for mental health, and for heart, even when increased, as the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] will ask us to increase them, will amount to something in the way of $55,000,000. A recent survey conducted by one of the survey organizations showed that 79 percent of all the people interviewed on heart disease research alone said they were willing to spend $200,000,000 in order to find the causes and cures for that particular disease, which, incidentally is the No. 1 killer in our country. It kills about 650,000 people a year, of whom one-third are under 65. So let us not think that these people just die of old age.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. I want to say to the distinguished gentleman that the only fault I find in his amendment is the infinitesimal sum that it provides. It ought to be $30,000,000 instead of $3,000,000. It is the hardest thing in the world to sell healthy people a health program. I want to commend the gentleman from New York and the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin for their timely stand in this tragic legislation we have here that must be sold to the people and about the necessity of which the public seems to be entirely unconscious instead of realizing its importance. Let me say, based on a little experience I have had, that it takes from $1,000,000 to $3,000,000 to build up a good clinic for cancer research.

Mr. JAVITS. I had the pleasure of initiating the program for the National Heart Disease Institute in company with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON], and with the help of our colleague on the Democratic side, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS]. Here is a situation in the case of heart-disease research, I repeat again, where the taxpayers want us to spend their money; we are not forcing it from them; we are not exacting it from them involuntarily; they want us to spend it.

And now the second point, and it is very important: It so happens that one of the greatest leaders in the cancer research program and who has figured very prominently in it, is also a friend of mine. He and I served together in the Army for 4 years, Dr. Cornelius P. Rhoads. He is head of the great cancer research organization in New York City—the Memorial Cancer Center. Dr. Rhoads is one of those great medical pioneers who has demonstrated one thing which is true in all these three fields, whether it be cancer, heart, or mental health; he has pointed out that if we are to find a cure for any one of these diseases it cannot depend upon the scientist or the doctor working alone in his backroom laboratory. Discoveries have been made in this way in times past, but not soon enough nor surely enough—in the case of cancer it just has not happened; in the case of heart disease it

just has not happened, nor has it happened in the case of mental health.

Dr. Rhoads has demonstrated that if we are to make progress in these fields of medical research it must be by a mobilization of the scientific resources and with enough scientists and enough equipment where they can knock down theory after theory which may be wrong, and, with painstaking checking, build up conceptions which may be right. This can only be brought about by an adequate mobilization of scientists, researchers, and equipment. The result finally will be the saving of years and years of time because we are providing the men and facilities which otherwise could not be assembled. If we only do what the gentleman from Wisconsin asks us to do, support them, we will be taking advantage of the great advance which research science has made, that is the science of research itself.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. We must take advantage of these new principles in research. Nothing could be so short-sighted, as brought out by the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island, who has been an enthusiastic supporter of this program, as to curtail this program at this stage. Compared to the ultimate gain the cost is infinitesimal. Should we not, then, having discovered the secret of scientific research, the way in which to attack and solve a scientific problem, follow up the program with adequate support?

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. How much money is appropriated in this bill for this purpose?

Mr. JAVITS. Forty-five million dollars for the three programs, in round figures.

Mr. STEFAN. Was that the amount of the budget estimate?

Mr. JAVITS. May I ask the chairman of the subcommitee to answer that?

Mr. FOGARTY. On direct appropriations for the cancer part of the program we granted the exact amount that was allowed by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. STEFAN. In all three programs you allowed $45,000,000. That is, the budget estimate was allowed; is that correct?

Mr. FOGARTY. On each of the three programs we allowed what the Budget sent up to us.

Mr. STEFAN. And this is an increase of $3,000,000 over and above what the Budget allowed for that particular purpose?

Mr. FOGARTY. This in effect is trying to keep the program going which was started by this committee that the Bureau of the Budget cut out this year, a program which we have been following up for 3 years.

Mr. STEFAN. But you gave them the budget estimate in the bill; you did not cut the budget estimate?

Mr. FOGARTY. On direct appropriations.

Mr. STEFAN. And this is a request for $3,000,000 over and above what the Budget allowed?

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes.

Mr. JAVITS. What we are asked to do here, is to review the whole program including what the Budget Bureau did, and to express our view that we want the cancer, mental health, and heart disease research programs to go forward in full vigor. That is a question we must decide and, which the Budget Bureau cannot decide for us.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. BIEMILLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIEMILLER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. In view of the colloquy that has just taken place, if you consider one item in this multi-item bill and say that you are overriding the Bureau of the Budget with respect to that item, that may be true; but if you consider all of the items in relation one to the other, there is no overriding of the Budget and a very substantial cut below the budget estimate. I tried to make that clear and it was the intent of the chairman of this subcommittee that out of those cuts that were made, $10,000,000 for State and local health services alone, we would be able to take that money and apply it to these three programs to keep them functioning.

Mr. BIEMILLER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Chairman, there are certain points that ought to be made clear in this debate. As has been indicated, this is only the first of three amendments dealing with the question of construction funds for the Cancer Research Institute, the Heart Research Institute, and the Mental Health Research Institute. These are the diseases, particularly the first two, that affect older people, the co-called chronic diseases.

We have seen some rather startling advances in medical science during the last 50 years. We have seen the average life expectancy jump from 40 in 1900 to 67 today. During the Roman Empire the average age expectancy was 23. So that we have in 50 years advanced more than we did in 2,000 years in expanding the average-life span. We have done that because we have been successful with research techniques and the application of public health methods in cutting down on the diseases of children in infancy and curbing communicable diseases. We have begun to conquer those diseases. We have not done that with the chronic diseases that affect older people.

What we are endeavoring to do under the amendments now before this body is to make it possible for every human being to live longer. We think we are on the threshold of doing that through finding the cause of cancer, through finding out more about heart disease, and through the wonder drugs ACTH and compound E. We think that is a worthy objective of the Congress. We are only asking for a comparatively small amount of money to do that.

As has been pointed out before, the sum of money being requested for each of these three research institutes is simply to maintain existing programs. The funds are needed for that purpose and the funds will therefore be utilized in the most possible efficient way for the welfare of the people of all the country. I just cannot believe that anyone wants to stop this work from going forward.

Eminent scientists have pointed out one rather significant fact.

Mr. SCRIVNER. To what work is the gentleman referring?

Mr. BIEMILLER. Eminent scientists have pointed out one very important factor that seems to have been overlooked. In the animal kingdom the average life span of any given animal is six times the amount of time it takes that animal to reach maturity. Dogs take 18 months or 2 years. They live from 9 to 12 years, and so on. But a human being who reaches maturity at about 20 still has only an average life expectancy of 67. The reason for that is basically this: We have not licked these chronic diseases that affect old age. That is what we want to do and enable all humans to live longer.

I now yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. My inquiry was this: The gentleman made some statement about work being stopped. I was wondering what it was.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Expansion of the clinical facilities for cancer, for heart and for mental diseases is the work that would be stopped if these funds are not granted. I want to state again, as I did in my colloquy with the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], and I pay great tribute to him once more and to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] for the very fine work they have done, that these amendments have the backing of eminent medical scientists, eminent laymen from all walks of life who give their time and energy on the various research and advisory councils. They have, as a matter of fact, recommended a larger sum of money than is being brought before this body today. I think we can afford to accept the opinion of eminent doctors who are on the various advisory councils and of the laymen who serve unselfishly on the councils, who give of their time and energy to this work.

For the welfare of the people of America, for the health of the people of America, and for the broadening of the life span of all of the people of our country, and last, but not least, for the effect that this kind of research will have upon the good will of the peoples throughout the entire world, I think there is no greater contribution that America can make toward the peace of the world than being the discoverers of those methods that

will expand the life span of all peoples—I hope, for these reasons, that we will pass all three of these amendments.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, 2,000 years ago the greatest healer of all times went about the world doing good and curing the diseases of that period. Leprosy was the great scourge of mankind in those years. Today the No. 1 killer, and equally as hateful to the human race, is cancer. Only those whose loved ones have been taken by this terrible disease can appreciate all of the agonies and pain which the victims go through before death. It is a creeping death. They die by inches. Yet, with all of our great abilities and men of science, we have been unable to exact or to discover more than a temporary halt of this dreadful disease.

I was reading an article not long ago which said that the cure is within the grasp of mankind due to the advance of science, and it may be from 2 to 5 years that we will have within our grasp the ultimate cure of this terrible malady. It behooves us then to leave no stone unturned, to take every possible step within our power to eradicate and eliminate once and for all the greatest eliminator of mankind that the world has ever known. So, with this great research which is being conducted daily—and as I understand there are various groups of scientists and medical men who are devoting themselves, their every waking hour to different phases toward the conquest of this disease—it behooves us to stop, look, and listen to the possibility of doing everything that we can within our power to aid and to help find a cure of cancer, and as to these other great diseases we are equally dedicated and devoted to their eradication and to their cure and to the successful conquest of them. But, at the moment, the real target of the medical profession and of all of the science of mankind must be geared or must confine itself to the conquest of this awful killer. As I have said, in the opinion of those closest to the wrestling for a cure of this disease, we seem to be within 2 to 5 years of a successful culmination of arriving at a cure. If we are so near and yet so far, we certainly owe it to our fellow citizens and those generations yet unborn to carry the fight to the last ditch and finally to conquer this No. 1 killer of mankind, cancer. I believe it is within our grasp and I hope that we may be able to put over that final step that will lead to successful culmination.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding the comments that have been made heretofore, I am quite sure in my own mind, looking at this calmly and judicially, that the action of the committee as reported in the committee report was a proper action, and that the action of the committee as reported should be sustained. I am sure you understand that as one minority member I did not write the report.

I am quite sure the gentleman from Wisconsin did not mean to indicate that I was one of the gentlemen who might oppose this amendment because I had not heard the testimony. I have heard it. I am sure, too, that, knowing my record as he does, he did not mean to indicate to any Member here that I have been voting money for people overseas and am now trying to reduce expenditures for our own folks here at home, because that is not my record. There is not any idea, there is not any intent, there is not any purpose, there is not the result of scuttling any program by this action.

Look at the committee report. We heard the testimony, all of it. Incidentally, I had always assumed that the majority leader was to carry out the President's program here on the floor. The action of the committee was in keeping with the recommendation of the President by his right arm, the Bureau of the Budget.

If you will turn to page 100 of the report you will find that notwithstanding the urgent need for economy allowed the full budget estimate of $20,086,000. Every Member of this House and every taxpayer in the Nation knows there is need for economy. We are running $6,000,000,000 in the red this year and it will probably be $7,000,000,000 next year. Economy must start some place. We treated all these as fairly and equitably as was humanly possible to treat them.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise, and on that I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. McGRATH and Mr. KEEFE.

The Committee divided; and tellers reported that there were—ayes 16, noes 89.

So the motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JONAS] makes the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The vote discloses the presence of a quorum.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, the committee realized there was need for economy. The committee says it has not imposed any reduction against the budget estimate of $20,086,000 for the work in the field of cancer. That is not scuttling a program. Further than that the report shows the Atomic Energy Commission is allocating sizable sums to this very purpose of research in cancer. Together with the work of other Government bodies and the National Cancer Society and all these other societies a considerable sum of money is being spent for this particular purpose. For the benefit of some of those who might have some questions may I say that this $3,000,000 does not build any public cancer hospitals. It is for clinical research development building solely.

As far as the Congress and this committee is concerned we have been very liberal in this program since its beginning. If you will turn to page 1357 of the hearings you will find where I have reviewed what happened. It started out in 1946 with $548,000 which is about a half million dollars. In 1947 the sum was trebled to $1,772,000. In 1948 that sum was multiplied almost 10-fold to the amount of $14,500,000. Here we now have $20,000,000, an expansion of 4,000 percent in a few short years. In view of those facts there can be no accusation justly made against this committee or the Congress that we are trying to scuttle the cancer research program.

The same is true with respect to heart disease and mental health. This committee has given these agencies every single cent which the budget approved and the budget represents the President's own financial program.

There are times when of course these programs appeal to the heart. There is no question about that. It has a tremendous heart appeal, but there are times when the cold facts of life and the condition of our own Nation, rapidly going down the road to bankruptcy, where every dollar you can possibly put off spending today until some future date—and that is all the action does—must be delayed.

There has already been somewhere in the neighborhood of sixteen or seventeen million dollars made available for these research facilities. That is no small figure in any program. While those agency officials were there, of course they were bound by the President's budget. As far as I can recall, there was not any specific statement made as to what program would be followed or where this money would be spent.

I was thoroughly in accord with making available the two and one-half million for research in cortisone and acth, because those have been sold to the American public as great miracle drugs. I am quite realistic, and I was not swept off my feet by all those claims, but I realize it is a great advance in science and that we should get into this program to let the public know what these remedies will eventually do.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has again expired.

Mr. HEDRICK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRIVNER. These items, compound E and ACTH, have been represented that—and I was thoroughly convinced by the testimony given to us—they would play a great part in the cure and relief of many diseases with which the American public and people throughout the world are now suffering. The source of these drugs is very limited. You can only get it from ox bile, and in some cases from the bile of hogs. We

were told that if we had all the bile available from all the cattle that it would only furnish a small amount needed. Therefore, we felt that if there could be developed some process by which we could get those drugs in a synthetic form, it would be a great contribution to the advance of medical science. So, while we have done that, I think it shows that the committee, in consideration of these items, was acting as fairly and impartially as it was humanly possible to do, despite the pull at our heart strings that these claims have. I was quite happy to read that the cost will soon be cut in half, although even then it will still be high.

As you come down to these other programs, it is anticipated they will each have a similar amendment. In mental health we granted every single cent that the budget had approved; that the President's right arm had approved. The committee realized that somewhere, somehow, sometime the increase of spending must cease. The same thing is true of the National Heart Institute. This entire budget estimate was allowed. We realize that heart disease takes its toll, but, at the same time, if you will read the hearings, you will find that this is another program that has progressively increased, step by step and million by million, each year. You eventually arrive at a time when you have got to figure how much you have to spend, and try to allocate it as impartially as you can. That is exactly what the committee tried to do.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. The point has been made that they have asked the budget for more than the budget gave them. Is it not a fact that every division of every department that comes before the Appropriations Committee is asked how much they asked the budget for, and invariably they asked the budget for more than the budget gave them? But in this case the committee gave these divisions every penny that the budget allowed them?

Mr. SCRIVNER. That is exactly right. I am looking for the time—perhaps I am too optimistic in this—but I am looking for the time when some government agency will come before an appropriation subcommittee of this Congress and suggest that they could get along with less than the budget allowed. We know from practical experience that these agencies always ask the budget for more than they really figure they are going to be actually allowed.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield.

Mr. FENTON. I wonder if there is anything in the testimony to show how much the public is giving voluntarily to all these programs—the heart program, the cancer program, and the mental program.

Mr. SCRIVNER. My recollection is that Dr. Johnson was talking about that particular point. I cannot tell the gentleman the page in the hearings where that was being discussed, but he pointed out the amount of money being made available through all these programs. It was pointed out in the hearings that somewhere in the neighborhood of $25,000,000 or $35,000,000 was being raised by the National Cancer Society, the amount of money that is being raised through the Damon Runyon program that is spark-plugged by Walter Winchell—they are all doing a fine job, and that is the way it should be; these programs should be supported by the people voluntarily, and if they want them badly enough they will voluntarily contribute their dollars. These great organizations have been doing a magnificent job in this field.

In this connection I might point out that there is another scourge that affects a lot of people, poliomyelitis, infantile paralysis. There are several civilian groups carrying on marvelous work in the infantile paralysis program. They have not appealed to the Government making any request for Federal funds, for which they are to be highly commended. They will not appeal to the Federal Government if that program is carried on in every part of the country like it is in my home town of Kansas City, Kans., under the leadership of Joseph McDonald who makes the infantile-paralysis program his hobby. He is doing a magnificent job, putting in long and arduous hours. It is all being done with voluntary contributions. What this organization has done surely others can do.

Mr. HEDRICK. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we can agree on time for limiting debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto, say 20 minutes, the last 5 to be reserved to the committee.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I am in no way trying to delay this bill. I was perfectly willing to sit here until 7 o'clock last night and if necessary every night to get this thing through, and I am willing to come in at 10 o'clock every day if necessary to complete it on schedule. But this is a very important subject and part of the bill. I have not objected when Members have sought an additional 5 minutes to present their arguments. I think the debate on this subject should run along for a little while and see how we get along with this particular amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair might state that there are only four Members standing. With the limitation of 20 minutes that would mean 5 minutes for each Member.

Mr. CANNON. If only four Members desire to speak, would not 20 minutes be ample time?

Mr. FOGARTY. The reason I offer that suggestion is that we have been very liberal under the 5-minute rule in granting an extension to all those who wanted it, and on this particular amendment the two last gentlemen asked and received additional time. There are other amendments to follow this one. If this were the only amendment I could see that if only four desired to speak there would be no necessity for more than 20 minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Would the chairman of the subcommittee be willing to agree that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto end when the four who desire to speak have been recognized?

Mr. FOGARTY. I might agree, if the last 10 minutes could be reserved to the committee.

Mr. CANNON. Is the gentleman for or against this amendment?

Mr. FOGARTY. I am for the amendment.

Mr. CANNON. The committee, of course, is entitled to close, and the committee reserves the last 5 minutes against the amendment.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I object to any consent request at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. No consent request has been submitted.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, we ought to have two facts in front of us and remember them very distinctly. Last year there was an appropriation of $19,000,486. This year the budget estimate was $20,086,000, an increase of $1,085,514. There was a contract authorization last year of $6,000,000 to permit the granting of allotments for construction to different institutions.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that when we give an increase of $1,000,000 over last year's appropriation we are doing as much as we ought to do at this time. You cannot appropriate a lot of extra money to anyone of these agencies and have them absorb it efficiently and effectively at any given time.

I want to see this cancer proposition followed through. However, the most interesting fact about the cancer-research situation is not this appropriation, nor is it anything fostered by Federal grants. According to my understanding, it is the discovery of a small-town doctor who set up his own laboratory and did his own research. That seems to be the thing that has been most productive. In other words, it is the inspiration that comes to a man who is in this sort of thing, who feels that it is his hobby and that it is something he wants to work out.

These grants are all right, but, perhaps, they are being scattered over too big a field to be extremely effective. It seems to me that $20,086,000 is a lot of money. We are progressing. The Government is getting into this situation just as far as the funds that have been provided will permit. On the other hand, there is not in the testimony on the subject which I just finished reading a story of great advance. The great advance comes outside of the Government. I hope that great advance will continue and that the discovery that has been made will be very effective. I hope that some of these grants that are being made by the National Institute of Health and the Cancer Institute will prove effective in finding something that may be of real service in stopping cancer.

I believe if it is used effectively that we will have accomplished something by this $20,000,000 appropriation. I do not think that it is going to add materially if we stretch ourselves too far in going beyond the budget estimate. I have never known the budget, in all of my

experience with them over 20 appropriation bill I have listened to, to be niggardly in approaching any such financial problem. I believe they have offered enough.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. HEDRICK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proced for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. If I did not believe that they had done as much as they should do, and have given every opportunity to increase the funds, I would be willing to consider it. But, I do not believe that it can be effective in getting any more results by adding more money to this appropriation.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that in this total appropriation that he has referred to there is not one dollar provided for construction for research facilities?

Mr. TABER. I am; and I am also aware that what construction facilities have been provided run into a lot of money and that ordinary business judgment would require us, in approaching this problem, not to spread ourselves out, but to encourage the institutions that are already engaged in it, and see if we cannot get some results out of it.

The thing I was most impressed about in the testimony, and I read it all, was that there was no report of substantial progress on the part of these institutions. That is tremendously disturbing. I like to see these agencies of Government produce, and I believe that they would produce more by not spreading out into more construction. Now, there are an enormous number of these institutions, according to the hearings, and the table that was put in the record showed requests for grants of $12,000,000. There are an enormous number of those institutions that I believe could get the funds for any necessary construction that they want by an appeal to those people who would take an interest in that sort of thing. I believe if we concentrate our activities on the ones that are already at work, and do not do any more spreading out, that we might get more results out of this situation instead of less. Now, that is the thing that disturbs me tremendously. In other words, the poor devil off in the corner goes to work on his own hook, in his own private laboratory, and produces something, and the whole Government set-up, with $19,000,000 appropriated for grants for research and $6,000,000 for grants for construction, does not accomplish anything, and they have nothing to show for it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, during the Seventy-eighth and Seventy-ninth Congresses, under House Resolutions 30 and 45, a subcommittee was set up of the House Labor Committee to make a study of aid to the physically handicapped. I had the honor of being chairman of that subcommittee, which made an exhaustive study of the physically handicapped. Almost 500 witnesses appeared before the committee, among them doctors, scientists, and medical experts. Of the many disabling diseases studied by the committee were cancer and heart disease, with which we are dealing today.

My extreme interest in this matter stems from the information gathered by this committee. In the final report issued during the second session of the Seventy-ninth Congress, many recommendations were made and much factual information expressed. One statement referred to these two diseases, and I wish to quote it from the report:

> Twice the number of people living in the State of Texas have heart disease; as many as live in Peoria, Ill., die every year from cancer.

This means that some 13,000,000 people have varying forms of heart disease, and 165,000 people die every year from cancer. Finally the report made this recommendation, which faces up squarely with what the Appropriations Committee is trying to do today:

> Research related to problems of health and disease should be centered in the United States Public Health Service, and the Public Health Service should continue to inform the Congress of the progress being made, and of the developing needs. The Health Service should be authorized to make use of universities, State agencies, and other mediums of research, and should be provided liberally with funds for such work.

It is of great comfort to me, as chairman of that former subcommittee, to see the vigorous efforts the Appropriations Committee has made in promoting this research, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], and the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] are to be complimented on their great interest in it.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I have had to do some maneuvering in the past 15 to 20 minutes. Everyone in the House knows I am for this amendment. I thought, regardless of whether I was for or against the amendment, that being chairman of the subcommittee I would receive the consideration of being the last speaker, to close debate on the amendment. I thought I would at least receive that consideration. Apparently, however, in view of the parliamentary situation, I am forced to speak at this time, and leave to the opposition to the amendment the last 5 minutes, although the chairman of the subcommittee will be on the other side of the amendment.

I concur in everything my colleague from Wisconsin has stated to the House this afternoon on these matters. In my humble opinion, there is not a Member of this House who knows more about the public health programs of this country than does the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE]. This is not the first time I have made that statement on the floor. This is the fourth year in a row I have made that very same statement.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. In my opinion, the words of the gentleman from Rhode Island are entirely correct. I served for 6 or 8 years with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] on that committee. I believe, as the gentleman from Rhode Island does, that he has done more for the general public health throughout the United States than perhaps any other one man.

Mr. FOGARTY. I do not believe I have ever known a man who has put more time or more effort into a single subject than the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] has into the problem of the health of the people of our Nation. I think he deserves a tremendous amount of credit for the work he has done for the past 10 years since he has been a member of this subcommittee on appropriations.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I was a member of the Labor-Federal Security subcommittee for 8½ years, and I served with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] from the time he went on until I left the committee in 1947. During all the time I have been on the committee, no abler man has ever served on the committee than the gentleman from Wisconsin, and that goes for his services on the entire Appropriations Committee. He has been particularly interested in social security and public health and has made a great contribution in those fields, which no one has equaled in my time in Congress.

Mr. FOGARTY. I thank the gentleman.

I hope the gentleman from Michigan and the rest of his colleagues over on that side of the aisle who feel the same as he does and who have just listened to the gentleman's statement as one who knows the gentleman from Wisconsin so well and knows of the work he has done in this field will support his amendment when it comes up for a vote in a few minutes.

For the benefit of those on the other side of the aisle, may I say that I as chairman of this subcommittee am wholeheartedly supporting the amendment the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] has offered. I sincerely hope we will have the support of the members on this side of the aisle for this most worth-while amendment.

Mr. Chairman, a year ago when we had this appropriation bill before us in committee for consideration, after hearing all the testimony, after sitting for weeks, we began to mark up the bill, and we agreed unanimously that there was not enough money being appropriated in these three categories of public health, namely, cancer, heart, and mental health. So in order to bring in a presentable bill, one we could justify on the floor of this House, and at the same time show some economy, we agreed to cut other items in the public health field and elsewhere in the Federal Security Agency, where we felt that could be done, and, by so doing, we reallocated some of the funds to these three categorical programs.

We came out with a bill a year ago which had the unanimous approval of the committee. I was under the same impression this year, that we could get along as we did a year ago. I am sure if we could have worked our will in the marking up of this bill only a couple of months ago we would have had a bill on the floor of the House yesterday which would have been practically a unanimous report from our subcommittee as it was a year ago. Instead of going into our second day of debate that bill would have been read for amendment and would have been disposed of on yesterday and we would not be up here before you this afternoon unnecessarily prolonging this debate as it is being prolonged. We started to mark up the bill. I thought we were going to follow the same procedure that we did a year ago. As we went through the various items of the Public Health Service I agreed with the rest of the membership of the committee who wanted to show some economy in cutting certain phases of the public-health program to cut much more than I ordinarily would if I had thought for 1 minute that we were going to be outvoted on our own subcommittee on the reallocation of some of these cuts which were made all down the line to put back some of this money to continue these health programs. In the Public Health Service alone the committee bill reduces appropriated funds by $34,054,000. We had hoped we could reallocate within the over-all sum two or three million dollars for research in cancer and two or three million dollars for research in heart disease and two or three million dollars for research facilities in the mental-health program. But when we reached the marking up of the bill I must be frank and say that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] and I were outvoted and out-maneuvered on those particular programs. Let there be no mistake about that.

At that time the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] made known to the committee that he was going to offer these amendments when the bill was read for amendment. I made it known at the same time that I, as chairman of the subcommittee, would support the amendments. That is why I am in the well of the House now speaking to you in support of what I believe beyond question of doubt in anyone's mind is one of the most important phases of our economic life.

I know every Member of the Congress is conscious of the drive for economy. I do not blame you for being for economy. I do not think I know of one person in the Congress who is not in favor of economy. But I think you are making a mistake when you carry it too far and are going to economize against the millions of people who are suffering from that disease this very day as well as Members of the House who may be afflicted by this dreadful disease this year or next year or within the next 10 years. How can we sit here this afternoon as human beings and legislate humanely and not give these great medical scientists who are spending 18 and 20 hours out of the 24 the help they need in their efforts to find the cause of this disease? If you cannot see your way clear to give these great men and women the paltry sum of $3,000,000 I think you had better think about it a second time.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimons consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. The fact of the matter is that with the influence of the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island, contributed to by the gentleman from Wisconsin, we cut appropriated items in this public health bill for the Public Health Service nearly $35,000,000. Is that not true?

Mr. FOGARTY. That is correct.

Mr. KEEFE. And did so in items that were approved and submitted by the Bureau of the Budget, in order that we might have these funds available for transfer to these items of construction of facilities in the research program in cancer and in heart and in mental illnesses.

Mr. FOGARTY. That is true.

Mr. KEEFE. I ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that when presentation was made to the Bureau of the Budget, the National Science Foundation bill was pending in the Congress?

Mr. FOGARTY. That is correct.

Mr. KEEFE. And the Bureau of the Budget took the position that if the National Science Foundation bill was passed in the form that they expected it to pass, construction funds would be appropriated to the National Science Foundation and not to any branch of the Public Health Service, and therefore they left these construction funds out of this bill on the anticipation that funds would be provided to the National Science Foundation for construction of its facilities. Now, that did not occur, and the Congress, in its wisdom, left this whole matter to the Public Health Service, and we now find ourselves in the position that no funds are available to provide construction facilities in connection with this research program.

Mr. FOGARTY. That is correct.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] verify what I have said?

Mr. PRIEST. In every respect, and to state further that the conferees agreed this morning on the conference report on the Science Foundation bill. It was never intended that there would be any construction funds there. There are no construction funds in the Science Foundation bill.

Mr. KEEFE. And under that misapprehension—I talked with the Director of the Budget, and I know what I am talking about on this subject—we find ourselves completely out in the cold as a result of that transaction, and the construction of clinical facilities is going to be abated and stopped, and these research programs will be stopped, as far as providing facilities are concerned, unless these amendments are adopted. Is that not true?

Mr. FOGARTY. You are absolutely correct.

The membership of this House who votes against the amendments offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] will be voting to stop this program right in its tracks. Let there be no mistake about it. We have supplied in this bill the cash to meet the contract obligations that have been incurred during the past 2 years. If that is allowed to stand, and Mr. KEEFE's amendment is not adopted, we are in effect stopping this program right here and now. That is something that I believe none of us wants to see done.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. I understand, from what the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] said, you had reduced the amount requested by the Bureau of the Budget $35,000,000, and that if we adopt this amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin, which asks for $3,000,000 more, you will still be $32,000,000 below the Bureau of the Budget estimate.

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. And as a matter of economy, you are still doing a good job.

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes, sir.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. The gentleman spoke of the fact that this was a new attack on this problem, a mobilization of resources on a national scale; something that could not be done from a philanthropic standpoint. Is that true?

Mr. FOGARTY. I do not know whether I got the gentleman's point or not, but I do know that by the Federal Government's taking the lead in this field that people of means are willing to give a tremendous amount of money each year to these various programs. It was decided in our committee to include multiple sclerosis. When we tried to find out some information on what has been done about multiple sclerosis we were sur-

prised to find out that there were no statistics to give any idea how many men, women, and children are afflicted with multiple sclerosis. There has been practically nothing done on research in that field.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. It was testified before our committee only 2 months ago in that regard that there was a man living in New York City who was willing to contribute $10,000,000 to a research fund for multiple sclerosis, but there had been no fund set up, no step taken in this field. That is why the committee decided, as written in the bill, that multiple sclerosis should be included along with neurology that was included in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], which was just adopted. If the Federal Government takes the lead, of course, we are not going to be spending all the money for the program but we will only be assisting in the over-all fight. Others will give vast sums of money to keep the program going.

Mr. JAVITS. And tremendous scientific resources will be available.

Mr. FOGARTY. Positively. It has been said many times that we can spend millions and millions of dollars on research and not get anywhere, but you and I both know research is a very costly thing. What would have happened with those people suffering from malaria, typhus, and similar diseases if it had not been for research? The cause of those diseases was not found overnight, but only after years and years of research. Today, as a result of that research of many years, we have those diseases under control. If we can do it in those diseases, we can do it with heart disease and cancer as well; but it is going to take time, and it is going to take money. There are many outfits in this country that spend tremendous sums of money on research. The Standard Oil Development Co. expended about $20,000,000 a year to develop better fuels, and that is only one single laboratory. All the way down the line industry has to spend money on research to keep alive, to keep competitive. What we are asking you to do is to provide this small amount of $3,000,000 to keep alive this cancer construction program that was started by this committee 3 years ago. It is not going to be a continuing program; as I stated before, there is going to be an end to it. It would have ended in this fiscal year had the Bureau of the Budget allowed the $9,000,000 asked for it, and we would have been out of the construction business as far as research, clinical facilities, and laboratories were concerned on cancer research alone. We are trying to end a program now that was started. We have spent already in the neighborhood of $16,000,000 on this program. Are you going to stop it and let some of the progress be lost, or are you going to go forward with it and finish it, and tell the people of this country that you are interested in doing something about finding out the origin of these leading causes of death?

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. I hope the gentleman is not carried away with the program against these particular diseases, cancer and heart disease, important and dangerous as they are. I would point out to the gentleman what has been done in the field of tuberculosis and urge him to take comfort from the fact that the same arguments that are today being used against these great programs were then used against the program to combat tuberculosis. Through many years various programs of tuberculosis were coordinated and integrated into a program of counties, cities, State and Nation, until, as the gentleman knows, this disease has been practically wiped out. The same thing will have to be done in the case of cancer and heart disease.

Mr. FOGARTY. That, of course, is what we are trying to do; that is what we are urging, centralized programs of research; and that is what we will have if we are able to continue adequate support. They have $12,000,000 in applications from leading universities throughout the country pending at the present time for cancer construction grants.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Constant reference has been made to the voluntary funds that are being raised to fight various diseases, including cancer, heart, and so forth. Is there not ample testimony that the overwhelming percentage of the funds so raised goes for care and alleviation and very little of the funds go into research? What we are trying to get here is funds for research so that the other funds may be used for care and alleviation.

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes. Let me make this point, and I am quoting from Dr. Rhodes of the Memorial Hospital of New York, who I think is one of the outstanding men in this particular field, as has been stated by other gentlemen who have spoken this afternoon. I know from the experience of meeting him during the past 4 years that he is not one who wants to see this country go broke but he does have a sincere desire to see money spent where it will do the most good.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, he wants to see this money spent where it will do the most good and he is convinced above everything I can say to you this afternoon that this is absolutely necessary. He gave a little example in justification of such an expenditure for research. He said:

> I can give you one example of this situation. You as Members of Congress are committed to the care of veterans. Under the present circumstances something in the range of from 2 to 3 millions of veterans will be hospitalized or will be entitled to hospitalization for cancer. They will be in the hospital for an average of 1 year apiece. It will cost the taxpayers around $3,000 per case and you are already committed to the expenditure of something in the range of $3,000,000,000 for the care of these people unless advances can be made to reduce that financial burden.

What does he mean by that? The only way that we can reduce that financial burden is to find the cause of these diseases. We can appropriate millions and billions of dollars to build hospitals and staff them, but what good is it going to do if we allow these veterans, for instance, to stay in there for an average of a year at a cost of billions of dollars from now until time immemorial? Is that economy? That is what I term false economy if we attempt to vote down this amendment and ignore such examples as that given by some of our outstanding physicians, not only in our own country but in the world, who testified before our committee, man after man. They were not connected with any bureau here in Washington. They had no Government connections. They were speaking their own minds from their own experience and from the experience they had gathered through previous appropriations that this Congress had made to this end. I am willing to take their word for the need for continuance of this program. Not one man appeared before our committee, not one witness ever appeared before the committees since I have been a member of them for 4 years, who testified that this money is not needed, that this money is not essential, that this money is not necessary at this time.

O, Mr. Chairman, I know some people belittle research and talk about this or that discovery having been made by this little fellow working in a laboratory in a small town somewhere, perhaps out in the Midwest or somewhere else.

I do not say that many discoveries have not been made by individuals giving their lifetime to research out in some small country town, but I guarantee to you that if you were to go out and ask that individual that has been quoted here this afternoon who had made those discoveries if he thought it was necessary for the Federal Government to participate in a program like this, he would say, "Positively, we need more of it; there are not enough of us; we do not have the proper clinical facilities; we do not have the proper laboratory facilities. Give us something to work with and we will find the answer quicker than we will by working in the hole that I am working in at the present time." That is what we are attempting to do. We are attempting to justify this work that these individuals are putting into this cause that they are fighting for and working for by giving them the tools to work with to

make these facilities more accessible to them. Is that asking too much of the taxpayers of this country? I do not believe it is. I am convinced beyond anything I may have said here today that if this issue were put up fair and square to every individual paying taxes into our Federal Treasury, that 98 percent of them would say, "Positively, I want that program continued; I think it is one of the best programs I ever heard of."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has again expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I object, unless there is an attempt made to restrict debate on this particular amendment. I have been here for an hour now, and we have had no vote, and we have been given no time. I agree with the subject matter, but I think the time has come to restrict the debate, and I object unless there is some attempt made to restrict it.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

Mr. FORD. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think one of the most regrettable statements I have heard was made today when my very distinguished colleague, at whose feet I sat as a new Member here, and with whom I labored so much, the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] is to leave this body. I have been asked by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HEDRICK] to express to him our sincere regrets. Unfortunately, today we find ourselves on a different side of this question, but we do not differ with it fundamentally. I recognize that concer is a dread disease. I know that it stalks along with death and reaches into many families, and I know that there are two approaches to this question: One is the emotional and one is the realistic approach. It is a popular thing to stand here and talk about cancer. It is a popular thing to say, as the distinguished majority leader said, "Something must be done about it," and the inference from that remark would be that nothing is being done, which is not the fact. I would love to agree with the very charming gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] for whom I have the utmost esteem, but now let us look at this question and see what are the facts.

The budget estimate was granted in full—$20,086,000. That is what the testimony in the record substantiates, and your committee by a majority vote granted the full budget estimate. That proves that something is being done on this question.

In addition to that I call your attention to the fact that $14,000,000 has been given by the American public for cancer. Now it has been proposed by the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER] that a great deal of that amount is not given for research. The fact is that five milion plus out of the $14,000,000 fund is used for cancer research. In addition to that, the report, substantiated by the testimony, is that the Atomic Energy Commission, the Public Health Service and other agencies are working in this field. Heretofore the Congress of the United States has appropriated an additional $14,000,000 for contract authorizations. One of the great criticisms of the Appropriations Committee has been that it goes into the field of legislation. I have heard Members from both sides say, "You have no right to do that," and we have no right to do it. Because of that, a point of order was raised which was sustained. In the basic legislation no provision was made for contract authorization. I say to the Members of this House, if you want to change the basic law, if you have a quarrel with it, the remedy is not to appropriate more money here, the remedy is to change the basic law. This committee has gone through this matter carefully and by a majority vote decided that $20,086,000, the full budget estimate, was the amount that was proper.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGRATH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I have been looking over the testimony on pages 523 and 530, and I find a very large number of institutions that have already had grants are included among those that have applications for additional grants for construction purposes. That looks like a rather unusual procedure.

Mr. McGRATH. I thank the gentleman.

Now we come to the question whether money and money alone is the answer to this question. Of course, a certain amount is necessary, and this committee tried to reach the amount that was proper. You cannot have a rule-of-thumb, but there is something that is more important than the dollar sign, and that is the human brain and the will to do things. I could cite on this floor many instances where, without one cent of Federal funds, great contributions were made to the field of science, Goodyear with the vulcanization of rubber, the monorail electric line, the sewing machine, the submarine, the reaper, the telegraph, and Coca-Cola. Listen to the story of penicillin.

The story of penicillin from the first delicate frond lifted from the growing mold by its discoverer, Sir Alexander Fleming, to the pure crystaline drug now ready for the purchaser, is more dramatic than any fiction. As related by J. D. Ratcliff in his book Yellow Magic, it is a story of headache, heartache, hard work, eased slightly by one fortuitous event.

This fortuitous event was the bit of mold that drifted through the open window of Alexander Fleming's workshop at St. Mary's Hospital in London in the fall of 1928. It settled onto a Petri dish and ruined one of the doctor's cultures. He was ready to discard the plate when he saw the green fragment. In his notebook he wrote:

For some considerable distance around the mold growth the staphylococcal colonies were undergoing lysis [being dissolved]. What had formerly been a well-grown colony was now a faint shadow of its former self.

Fleming's chance mold was penicillium notatum.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. HEDRICK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York be permitted to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia ?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEDRICK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close at the end of the remarks of the gentleman from New York.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGRATH. So, Mr. Chairman, I close these remarks with this thought. I ask you to keep in mind that if you vote against this amendment you are doing no injustice to those who are suffering with cancer. We are giving the full amount recommended by the President's budget. This additional $3,000,000 was never talked about in our committee as far as authorization was concerned. You can go back to your people with your head high and your conscience clear, and you can say, "I voted for the necessary funds for the people of this country, and I did not go over and beyond that." If you do that, you will have discharged your duty and your obligation both to those who are ill and to your National Government, which today has a serious fiscal problem.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGRATH. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. We did discuss the $3,000,000 on this construction facility.

Mr. McGRATH. I repeat, I said on authorization. It was only discussed from the question of contract authorization. I said in my statement we did not discuss it in terms of authorization. The gentleman is correct when he refers, however, to contract authorization.

Mr. FOGARTY. Does not the gentleman agree that the first time we discussed this he agreed at first to go along with the continuation of this contract authority for this construction?

Mr. McGRATH. We discussed it but we did not agree definitely. From a fiscal viewpoint, we cannot prejudge any one item until we determine what the entire bill contains. Then, when you have the sum total, you must compare it with the national income. That is the only sensible way to handle appropriation matters.

Mr. FOGARTY. Will not the gentleman admit that what we are trying to do this year, as members of the committee, is the same thing we did a year ago when we came in with a unanimous report? Did we not work it out that way, the same as we tried to work it out this year?

Mr. McGRATH. That is true. I assure the gentleman that, although we find ourselves in disagreement, I am

supporting the majority of the committee.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGRATH. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. I commend the gentleman for the sound statement he has made on this amendment. As one who has had a good deal to do with cancer, both as a patient and a physician, in reputable and highly respected medical institutions, may I say that one's natural tendency is to vote more money, in the belief that just to provide more money will somehow solve the problem, which is what everyone wants. I believe that is not the right way to approach the problem. The right way is the one that the gentleman has discussed here, and that is to provide whatever amount is necessary to carry on a balanced and well-thought-out and well-managed program that is what the budget estimates and the committee have suggested. I believe the advice that the gentleman has given to the committee is the correct advice and if followed is the way to bring about the greatest progress in conquering this, one of our greatest health and human problems.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KEEFE and Mr. ROONEY) there were—ayes 49, noes 83.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mental health activities: For expenses necessary for carrying out the provisions of sections 301, 302, 303, 311, 312, and 314 (c) of the act with respect to mental diseases, $9,944,000, of which not less than $2,375,000 shall be available exclusively for payment of obligations for research and training grants incurred under authority heretofore granted under this head.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I had intended to offer amendments to this section relating to mental health activities, and also with respect to the amount to provide facilities for research into heart and the diseases of the circulation.

It is perfectly obvious, in view of the discussion in connection with the amendment first offered, that there is no possibility of securing any favorable consideration by this House at this time for either of the increases that would be asked for in cases of mental illness research and heart disease research.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. PRIEST. Does the gentleman intend to offer his amendments, nevertheless? I hope he will.

Mr. KEEFE. No. I shall not offer them.

During my membership in the House I have never tried to do what appears to be a futile thing, just merely to make a record. So I want those who have been so very kind as to join in an effort to put this bill in shape so that it will properly and truly represent the interests of those who are interested in those programs to know that I appreciate their help. I shall not offer the amendments, but I shall defer to anyone else who desires to do so. I do not want to take the time of the House in prolonging the debate, because it is perfectly obvious that the House is not in any mood to increase this bill by one single penny. If there is any other Member of the House who is interested in this program who desires to offer these amendments, I will defer to the gentleman from Rhode Island in that regard.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, even though the gentleman from Wisconsin and I have not agreed on this amendment, and some other matters, I do want, as best I can in my humble way, to pay a tribute of respect, high regard, and great esteem to him. The gentleman from Wisconsin is not only a fine American but he is also a great legislator. He has contributed much, not only to his State and to his community but to this Nation. If it were just a matter of personal feelings for the gentleman from Wisconsin, I would gladly have gone along with any reasonable increase that he might have suggested. It has not been because there has been any lack of regard or warm friendship for him that has caused me to take a position differing from his.

I feel sad in my heart that he is leaving the Halls of Congress where he has done such a magnificent job. The gentleman from Wisconsin, in my opinion, is without a peer in debate among the men on this floor. If I could just express myself, if I could just get over to the House and to the American public my points of view with the forceful eloquence that he does, I would indeed be very happy.

So it was with deep sincere regret, Mr. KEEFE, that I learned you have found it necessary to leave this service in the House of Representatives. As you go you can always rest assured that during the remainder of your life you will have following you my very best personal wishes.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I had hoped that my colleague from Wisconsin would offer the other amendments, but apparently in his judgment it seems futile at this time to attempt to get this House to do something for these particular programs of public health. The next amendment that he was going to offer touches one of the most sorry predicaments we find ourselves in in the country. I wish only that all Members of Congress could have listened to the more than 20 outstanding men in the field of mental illness in this country who testified before our subcommittee. I am sure that had the entire membership of this Congress been able to listen to the testimony of other physicians and leading medical scientists throughout the country during our hearings they would have voted for the last amendment. I am amazed to think of such inattention to this matter of mental illness. It is one of the most depressing things that the people of the country are facing. About 60 percent or so of all hospital beds today are taken up with mentally ill patients. Some of these people linger there at least 10 years; they are forgotten; nobody ever goes to see many of them, and nobody seems to care about most of them; nothing much is being done for them. You will find that in practically every State of the the Union the mental hospitals are the poorest State-owned shacks there are. Once a person gets in there he seems to be forgotten.

It was not until 2 years ago that this subcommittee again attempted to take the lead in this field and provide money for traineeships, for fellowships, and for scholarships in order to get more trained personnel into this field. That is the same attempt that we have been making in the field of cancer and heart.

But in view of the tremendous number who voted against the last amendment perhaps it is useless to offer the amendments and take up the time of the House. I think, however, the facts should be brought out and drawn to your attention because, if in some future weeks you have the opportunity, you should visit the mental institutions in your own district and see how conditions are there, see how the people are being treated. Then come back here and I can guarantee that you will want the Federal Government to do something, because the States are not taking care of the situation. Make no mistake about that.

By unanimous consent, the pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Construction and equipment of treatment building: For construction and equipment, including administrative expenses, of a treatment building (providing separate male and female facilities), and demolition and removal of those buildings designated as Oaks and Toner Buildings with their appurtenances and attachments, within the grounds of Saint Elizabeths Hospital, $1,500,000, to remain available until expended; and, in addition, contracts may be entered into in an amount not to exceed $3,938,000 toward completion of such work at a total cost not to exceed $5,588,000: *Provided*, That the appropriation in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1950, for preparation of plans and specifications for two treatment buildings, shall be consolidated with this appropriation, to be disbursed and accounted for as one fund which shall be available for all of the foregoing purposes, and any part of such consolidated appropriation may be transferred to the General Services Administration.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to highlight a statement made by the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island who called attention to the fact that in this country today over 60 percent of all hospital beds are occupied by mental cases. What are we doing about it? I see my friends who are so economy minded raising no question about the millions that are in this paragraph entitled "St. Elizabeths Hospital." They are perfectly willing to go on year in and year out to build buildings out there, vote to care for these mentally insane, but they are not willing to vote for a dollar to increase the research facilities that might ultimately empty those hospitals and reduce the tremendous expenditure that is here before you now.

Look at the expenditures to maintain St. Elizabeths Hospital, if you please, one item $1,948,000, $100,000, $406,000, $1,500,000, $3,998,000. Those are the appropriations for St. Elizabeths Hospital, year in and year out duplicated in every mental institution throughout America. The tragedy of it all is the utter futility of getting Members of the Congress to see how absurd these so-called talks of economy are in the face of that situation. Why, I can say to you that in one State today due to the utilization of new discoveries in the use of penicillin for the treatment of syphilis, congenital syphilis, if you please, they are lifting out of these institutions people who have been there consigned for life as incurable mental cases and restoring them to an active place in society. The research in that field has just started.

But, no, in face of all the medical testimony of all the great scientists of this country, we listen to some pseudo-scientists and doctors here on the floor of the Congress who discount all they say and say they have not accomplished anything, therefore we must not spend any more money.

All I have to say is that I am glad I have been able to play a small part in an effort to try to relieve that situation.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. Does the gentleman recall the account of the recent mental institution fire in Pennsylvania, a fire in which many patients perished because they were chained to concrete floors due to the fact they could not provide adequate help?

Mr. KEEFE. Why, the story is so tragic I hate to talk about it. You can repeat it in every State throughout the Union. We have been fighting year in and year out to build up a program that will do the research necessary to relieve your veterans' hospitals and your other hospitals of this ever-growing cost to the taxpayers of America.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. What do we find? Thumbs down. Well, I hope the other body will display more genius in its attack on this problem than has been indicated here today. I want to stand on the proposition that the Congress of the United States inspired in a nonpartisan, bipartisan manner, if you please, in the past under the leadership of the gentleman from Rhode Island, contributed to by the gentleman from Wisconsin, who has played a part in the development of this program. Those who want to see it stopped can accept that responsibility.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. I just want to make one observation that this program was instituted by the gentleman speaking in the well of the House 2 years ago when he was chairman of the subcommittee, and I have just followed along with the program which was initiated and started by him. I know that he has played no small part in the building up of this program. He has played a tremendous part in it, and I do know of so many things that he has done that it is unheard of. I know there are Members of Congress that have come to him for information and help, something that they could not get from the ordinary practitioner. I know that he had an experience in his own family where the ordinary practitioner did not know anything about the case at all, but because of the gentleman's knowledge of the subject and his knowledge of these other men that he had been in contact with and had secured information from, that he was able to take care of two or three very dire situations. I think he deserves the commendation of this House for the tremendous part that he has played in building up the program that has been initiated by this committee.

Mr. KEEFE. Well, the gentleman is very, very kind, and I have no regrets, because you mark what I tell you. The people of America are going to demand that this program go forward, and will hold responsible those who have curtailed or hampered it. Make no mistake about that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to say that only this morning I was talking with an official of the Veterans' Administration when the gentleman from New Jersey mentioned the hospital in Pennsylvania where, I think he said, some 10 patients were burned to death. Five of those ten were women veteran patients. They were hospitalized there because there were no other beds. I rejoice that the House in its wisdom passed the bill for the construction of 16,000 beds just the other day.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. Since I made my observation regarding the institution in Philadelphia where they had a terrible fire, I have talked with some of my colleagues of the Pennsylvania delegation who tell me that the State of Pennsylvania itself has a most forward-looking program in this regard, and I want to be recorded as reporting their comments.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am very glad to hear that. I would also like to state that in research work it is just as important to know the cases that will not be helped by penicillin or aureomycin and the other powerful drugs. It is just as important to know that as it is to know the cases that they will cure, because sometimes, in certain instances, those powerful drugs hurt people very seriously, and that is why the research work is so terribly important. Medicine is not an exact science. We are always learning.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. I would just like to say to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey that for the first time since he has been a Member of the House has he made a statement which was not based on the fact. I realize that that information was merely given to him. Now, I must, out of an abundance of caution, point out that by no means is the State health program and mental institution program of the great Commonwealth of Pennsylvania forward looking. The contrary is the fact.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think the gentleman did not mean that it is not forward looking, but that the buildings were inadequate and not fireproof, and that is true with a great many places. Unfortunately, some of our Army and Navy hospitals are not the kind of construction in which to take care of mental cases. I think that probably is the point the gentleman from New Jersey is bringing out. He did not mean to say the care of mental cases is backward in Pennsylvania. But we are learning every day about the care of mental cases, of cancer cases, and the other very serious cases.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have remained here on the floor since this bill was started. I have voted for every motion to cut and I have voted against every motion to increase. I am not one of those who blames all the ills of our deficit on the Appropriations Committee. I think we are inclined to kick them around too much. There is something more far-reaching, and that is our basic opinions and convictions concerning government.

We do not pay enough attention to authorization bills. We do not determine well enough what functions of Government should be left to the States and localities and what ones can be undertaken by the Federal Government.

About 3 or 4 years ago the question of putting the Federal Government into the hospital business was before this Congress. We need hospitals in this country. I felt then and I feel now, however, that the localities, private individuals, and the States, were better able to do the job financially than the Federal Government. I voted against that authorization bill. I voted against the ex-

tension of it earlier in this Congress. It was supposed to be a $75,000,000-a-year program. That has been doubled. We are going to go on and on and on, and there is no end to it. We have to decide which ones of these things are Federal responsibilities and which ones are State responsibilities.

We are about to read that section of the bill pertaining to social security. I call your attention to an item that is noticeable by its absence. There will be paid out in benefits under the old-age and survivors insurance program this year $725,000,000. It is not mentioned in the bill. I think perhaps that is the wrong procedure. It may some day be challenged in court. But I am not going to talk about that now. I want to get back to this business of authorizing.

When this social security program of ours matures, when another generation stands where we stand now in this House, making appropriations, they will have to appropriate somewhere between 12 and 20 billion dollars a year to pay for that program. It is a contractual obligation. This Congress has taken action which will require the expenditures of a minimum of 12 billions a year for social security 40 years from now. The taxpayers of that day will not have anything to say about it. The Congress of that day will not have a voice in the amount. It is in the nature of a contractual obligation. Do not misunderstand me—our old people are entitled to generous care. But the point is we have no right to legislate at this time fixing an obligation on future generations which they will have to meet. We are alarmed over the deficit this year. Authorizations have been put through which will call for a budget in the years that lie ahead many billions of dollars more than it is today. Present trends indicate the expenditures of the Federal Government will go up and not down. The Congresses to come after the present Congress will in many fields find themselves helpless because of programs that have been started.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. Do I understand the gentleman to say that the old-age survivors insurance program is not financially self-sustaining under the tax formula which our committee approved and which the House passed?

Mr. CURTIS. I am delighted that the gentleman asked that question. I hope I may have time to answer it. We have no assurance that the progressive tax rate provided for will go into effect. That is number one. Secondly, when we get that money in what shall we do with it? If we keep it in cash in the Treasury the effect on our economy is bad. That cannot be done. If we authorize the Administrator of Social Security to invest it in other than Government bonds he would soon control all the industry of the country or at least a great portion of it. That leaves but one place to put this so-called reserve of Social Security. That is in Government bonds. Let us assume that 20 or 40 years from now there are so many bonds in this reserve.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, the recipients under social security have to be paid in dollars. The old gentleman or widow or orphan who qualifies for benefits has to be paid in dollars. I am sure the gentleman will agree with me on that. There are only three ways to get dollars to pay those benefits, just three ways. First, taxation in the particular year involved. Second, issue more bonds and borrow money from the people to pay those bonds, or, three, some form of inflation or printing-press money. It does not make any difference whether you have 1 warehouse or 20 warehouses of Government bonds in your reserve—when the benefits are due you have to pay the benefits in dollars which means either more taxation, more borrowing, or some form of inflation.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. The point I wanted to make to the gentleman was that this body had an opportunity to pass upon that issue. Only 12 members of the Republican Party voted against it and only 2 Democrats. I ask in that bill, H. R. 6000, whether or not it is a fact that the tax formula was set up to make this program financially self-sustaining. Is that not true?

Mr. CURTIS. I think that depends on definition. I do not think so but I respect the gentleman's opinion when he says it does.

Mr. CARROLL. Well, is it not true that insofar as the employer is concerned there is an excise tax levied upon him and upon the employee there is a gross income tax. The merging of those two taxes, assuming that future Congresses accept their responsibility by maintaining the tax formula will make this program financially sound.

Mr. CURTIS. No, I do not accept the statement of the gentleman as a sound proposition. Neither do the exponents of social security. Mr. Altmeyer has for a long time advocated one-third of the benefits being paid out of the general Treasury. At times he has increased that to one-half, I believe.

The individuals receiving these benefits now have not paid for their benefits. Take a banker in my district who this year reaches the age of 65. Under this bill, he and his wife can draw $100 a month. His life expectancy is 12 years and hers is 14 years. Do you know how much he has paid in under this Social Security Act? Three hundred and ninety dollars—less than 4 months of the benefits that he and his wife will draw for a period of 12 or 14 years. The other people are not paying for their benefits.

This program stands today where the old-time assessment insurance companies stood when they started. They were taking in a lot of members. They were young men. The death rate was low. There were few claims. The money rolled in. They had a big reserve. But the time came when they could not pay, and when the older people were frozen out. Out of every five people over 65 years today only one draws insurance benefits. So they say, "Look at the huge reserves we are building up." The day will come in this program when five out of five people over 65 will be eligible to draw benefits. That is when the program will mature, and that is when the Congress will have to secure, somewhere, somehow, $12,000,000,000 or $20,000,000,000 to pay those people.

I think it is a serious question whether or not the Government can maintain a reserve system of this volume. I think there are some obstacles to it that we should consider.

Let me say again, I do not think we should be harsh with the old people. My answer to it is this: The people today who are blessed by having good health and a job should take care of those who are unable to produce for themselves today. We should leave to other generations the same responsibility, but we should not fix now upon the generations to follow a contractual obligation, an insurance contract that they cannot carry out with solvency.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] has expired.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not rise to pose as an actuarial expert, but to point out some simple fundamental facts which I think the Members may have gotten a misapprehension about from the remarks made by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

It has been stated for many years that the social security fund has been raided for the general expenses of the Government. That is not inherent in what the gentleman said. I rise only to correct any impression that the Members may have gotten in that regard, and to request permission to extend, as a part of my remarks, a radio broadcast I made recently, in which I quoted from the Wall Street Journal upon this subject, giving the reasons for its belief that our social-security fund is entirely sound. I believe that article appeared in the Wall Street Journal on February 9 of this year.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACOBS. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. The gentleman is absolutely correct. I read that article. It is a very well-considered article. But in addition to that there was appointed a joint committee, composed of leading men of this Nation, and they submitted a report, which is a congressional document, which has presented the same theory as stated by the Wall Street Journal and all other thinking editorials on this subject, saying, of course, that the building up of this reserve and the handling

of it under this trust fund was proper and followed the same procedure as that of all great insurance companies.

Mr. JACOBS. That is correct; in other words, it amounts to exactly the same thing as an insurance company; an insurance company having funds to invest invests them in Government bonds. When the time comes to pay the benefits under the insurance policy issued by this private insurance company, the private insurance company does not have the money in its vaults to pay the benefits; it has bonds, exactly like the social security fund has bonds.

The Government has not raided the social security fund. If any mistake has been made, the mistake was made when we failed to collect adequate taxes during the war to pay the expenses of the war as we fought it.

Mr. CARROLL. The gentleman from Nebraska, I think, made a very good point, and we ought to recognize it and clear it up. After having established this tax formula under House bill 6000 and the Congress fails to go ahead by way of failing to continue a progressive tax it is true that there would be a deficit, and it is true that eventually some day out of the Treasury we shall have to appropriate huge sums of money. That is why Congresses to come must not fall into the mistake they did before when they froze that tax.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACOBS. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the gentleman for his fairness. I do not want to be misunderstood. I have not shared the criticism of others that these social security taxes were misappropriated when they were placed in Government bonds; I think that is the only thing that could be done with them. They could not be retained in cash. I do not want the Social Security Administrator investing them in outside securities. But I do believe that we shall have to agree that as benefits are to be paid out they are going to be paid in dollars and that it becomes a moot question how many bonds are in the reserve account, because to get those dollars they will either have to sell more bonds, or through current taxation, or else do it through some funny inflation deal. I do not believe you can come to any other conclusion.

Mr. JACOBS. Under leave to extend my remarks I ask to have printed in the RECORD a radio broadcast over radio station WISH, Indianapolis, for March 18, 1950:

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. ANDREW JACOBS, OF INDIANA, SATURDAY, MARCH 18, 1950

One of the great public controversies of the day is the question: "Is social security a fraud?" Some say it is; others say it is not.

Of course, there are those people who claim that your Government has been a complete fraud ever since the Democrats took over. But we will disregard those folks as partisans. I am addressing myself, not to those partisans who would see nothing but evil in anything this administration does, but rather to those folks who are interested in the truth, and who reject partisanship as an evil sufficient unto itself.

In what respect do these folks claim social security is a fraud? In the first instance, they claim that it is fraudulent because the benefits are not paid to anyone who earns more than $14.99 per month in covered employment. This prohibition remained in the law under the terms of H. R. 6000, the bill to amend Social Security, in the form in which the measure passed the House, but the amount was increased to $50 per month. They claim that since the beneficiary paid for his old-age and survivors insurance, he is entitled to it regardless of how much he earns.

This assertion seems reasonable on its face. However, we must take into account the terms of the insurance. In other words, when you buy insurance from a private company, you had better read the fine print. In this case you don't have to read fine print, for the terms are all printed in the same size print.

And here it is. People who study insurance questions are known as actuaries. They know that a certain number of people will die each year; a certain number will have living husbands and wives at a certain age; that a certain number will be still able to work and occupied in trades and professions where their services will be still in demand at retirement age, etc.

We know that those persons engaged in trades and professions wherein they can still earn a substantial livelihood at age 65 will not retire for the small benefit they will derive from old-age and survivors insurance, unless they are otherwise disabled.

So this is one of the factors considered in fixing the premium charged for the insurance. The premium in this case is generally known as pay roll deduction.

In other words, the terms of this insurance could be changed so that those who continue to work could draw it. However, in such case the premiums or pay-roll deduction would have to be more.

This is true because the premiums or pay-roll deductions must be large enough to pay the benefits.

If those who are able to, and continue to work, draw benefits, then the outgo from the fund would be greater, and the pay-roll deductions would likewise have to be more.

If the Government changed the plan and thus changed more premium, the same people who are stirring up distrust, because those continuing to work do not draw the benefit, would then attempt to stir up animosity because the premiums were raised.

However, the Government has no choice in this matter. It must do one or the other because the old-age and survivors' insurance program is a sound program financially.

And this brings us to the next complaint which has served to confuse the public. Senator CAPEHART has used this assertion more frequently than any individual of whom I know. He has said that the social-security program is a fraud because the Government spends the money collected as premiums on unrelated projects. In other words, the Senator's assertion has been that the Government takes the social-security funds and spends the money on general Government activities and consequently the money is all gone—it isn't there any more for the beneficiaries—and the people will have to be taxed all over again to pay the benefits. The difficulty is that the Senator just doesn't understand the matter at all. Rather than use my own reasoning and logic to answer him, I would direct your attention to an article that appeared in the Wall Street Journal on February 9, 1950. This article blows the Senator's argument into a cocked hat. It appears on the editorial page and is written by Mr. F. A. Korameyer, who says:

"Letters to this newspaper from subscribers, among other things, show that misunderstanding of the reserve fund of the old-age and survivors' insurance of the Social Security Act is still widespread. Many persons still believe what some insurance company officials asserted in the middle 1930s, that the accumulation of a pension reserve fund invested in United States bonds was purposeless, that the reserve was a fiction and that it could actually result in the cost of pensions being paid twice over. Those insurance company men have long since realized their error; a sort of vicarious recantation came in 1945 from a committee representing the 3 principal associations of life companies. The committee said, in part:

" 'The first step in understanding this problem is to agree that pay roll taxes are collected so that workers may currently make a contribution to the support of the OASI system from which they hope later to benefit. The money might conceivably be held in the form of cash to be used when needed. However, the Government must currently borrow large sums, and will later need large amounts for refinancing at least some of its rapidly maturing obligations. It is reasonable for the OASI system, if it has funds available, to take advantage of this opportunity to earn interest on its money by purchasing Government bonds.

" 'Furthermore, the apparent double taxation does not involve an avoidable burden if it can be assumed that the excess of income over outgo is used by the Government for some essential purpose, and does not by its existence and availability stimulate unnecessary expenditures. The purchasing of bonds by the OASI system means that, later on, when it needs money in excess of pay-roll tax receipts in order to pay benefits, the interest on the bonds (raised, of course, by general taxation) will be available to meet the additional benefit load. However, if the bonds had not been bought by the system but were in the hands of the public, then not only would the interest on the bonds have to be raised by general taxation, but additional general taxes would have to be levied to cover the deficit in OASI operations. Current pay-roll taxation to create a reserve fund, therefore, makes possible the use of interest which the Government has to raise by taxation anyway for a purpose which would otherwise require further general taxation on its own account'."

Mr. Korsmeyer then comments that Brookings Institution of Washington had recently published a work incorporating an article which "unfortunately repeats the now stale errors about the alleged illusion (i. e., misbeliefs) of an old-age and survivors insurance trust fund." He points out that the Brookings Institution, by a foreword, actually disclaims responsibility for the article. That is to say, Brookings Institution published the article but obviously disagreed with it, as did Mr. Korsmeyer, who refers to it as a "weirdly untrue statement."

He further says about this article:

"The authors do not support their assertions that the Government bonds in the pension reserve have less value than fresh toilet paper."

Mr. Korsmeyer than concludes by saying:

"There is much that is open to criticism in OASI and the changes therein proposed by pending bills. But it is impossible to assert rationally that part of the national debt is rubbish and the rest is prime investment."

Then is social security a fraud? These charges must stand or fall on the facts. Senator CAPEHART says that pay-roll taxes have been collected for social security and that "the Government has used the money for other purposes." Thus he charges in effect that your Government has embezzled the social security trust fund.

Now what are the true facts? The Social Security Act provides that all taxes collected to finance the old-age and survivors' insurance program must be transferred to a trust fund and kept separate. The Secretary of the Treasury is the trustee of this fund. He is directed by law to invest the money, not currently needed, in interest-bearing Government securities.

This is exactly what the Congress of the United States directed and it is exactly what the Secretary of the Treasury has done.

The social-security program is an insurance system. Thus, by investing its reserve in Government bonds, it has done exactly what private-insurance companies and trustees have done, generally by legal direction. Of course, the Government will be required to collect taxes to redeem all of its bonds. These taxes are for the purpose of paying the Government's debt, whether it be a debt to the social-security fund, or to a private-insurance company, a bank, the administrator of an estate, or you as an individual bondholder. The obligation is exactly the same in each case.

The charges of fraud are based upon this reasoning: "The Government must now collect income taxes, etc., to redeem bonds owned by the social security trust fund. Therefore, the Government is collecting taxes to pay your social security for which you have already been taxed by the pay-roll tax." Therefore, say the opponents of this administration, the social-security fund is in debt to you and has nothing with which to pay its debt to you (its ownership of Government bonds being momentarily disregarded).

All right, let's apply this to your insurance company. You buy a policy of insurance. You pay premiums. Thousands of others do likewise in the same company. The insurance company accumulates a reserve from these premiums. It invests this reserve in Government bonds. It owes you the benefits provided in your policy, but it, like the social-security fund, doesn't have the money (also momentarily disregarding its ownership of Government bonds) to pay these benefits.

You pay income, excise, and other taxes to the Government, and the Government uses that money to redeem bonds owned by your insurance company.

Question: Are you being taxed to pay the benefits due to yourself from your insurance company?

The truth of the matter is you are being taxed to pay your Government's debt. Your Government incurred this debt by borrowing the money from your insurance company, from you, your bank, your neighbors, and your social-security fund; to pay its expenses, principally the costs of the war, including current preparation for defense. The cost of the war would have to be paid whether these bonds were held by the social security trust fund, or by some bank or insurance company. The Government's borrowing of the money through the sale of bonds is not and never was in any way dependent upon the existence of the social-security program. Had there been no social-security program, the same amounts of money would have been borrowed by the Government from other sources. The social-security fund derives additional revenue from interest on the bonds, which interest would otherwise go to private investors. Would these critics expect the social-security fund to remain uninvested?

The war cost about $350,000,000,000. The cost was higher because of inflation. Huge profits and earnings resulting from war work and scarce civilian production caused inflation.

The Government borrowed $210,000,000,000 of the three hundred and fifty billions with which to pay the costs of the war. Had the Government raised that two hundred and ten billions by taxes, inflation would have been whipped and our public debt would be $210,000,000,000 less today. Your Federal debt is $256,627,417,985 and this includes the amount of bonds held by the social security trust fund, as well as your own bonds.

No, the fraud is not with the Government, rather the fraud is found in the argument. The mistake was not made by the social-security trustee. The mistake was made by the Government in not convincing the people they should pay more taxes out of their abnormal war profits and earnings during the war so as to have paid the costs of the war rather than to have left it a burden to the returning veteran and future generations.

And the blame, to a great extent, must rest upon the people themselves for resisting higher taxes at a time when such taxes would have reduced inflation and the public debt.

Watch carefully those who charge this fraud against social security. You will observe that they will never mention the war-incurred debt, which is the other half of the truth.

The most vicious falsehood is generally a half truth.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

(Mr. CURTIS and Mr. JACOBS asked and were given permission to revise and extend their remarks.)

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses, Children's Bureau: For necessary expenses in carrying out the act of April 9, 1912, as amended (29 U. S. C. 18a), and title V of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 7, subch. V), including personal services in the District of Columbia and purchase of reports and material for the publications of the Children's Bureau and of reprints for distribution, $1,500,000: *Provided*, That no part of any appropriation contained in this title shall be used to promulgate or carry out any instruction, order, or regulation relating to the care of obstetrical cases which discriminate between persons licensed under State law to practice obstetrics: *Provided further*, That the foregoing proviso shall not be so construed as to prevent any patient from having the services of any practitioner of her own choice, paid for out of this fund, so long as State laws are complied with: *Provided further*, That any State plan which provides standards for professional obstetrical services in accordance with the laws of the State shall be approved.

(Mr. BOLLING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point of the RECORD.)

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Chairman, during the past decade the birth rate in this country has risen rapidly. Inevitably we must be concerned with what the future holds for these millions of children who will become, as they grow older, the inheritors of our democracy. At a time when all the world is in chaos, we cannot afford to lose sight of the fact that the basic strength of democracy lies in the vitality and well-being of each succeeding new generation.

While the birth rate of the United States has reached unexpected heights, the appropriations of that division of government charged with working directly with the problems of children has lagged behind. This year, for example, the appropriations for the Children's Bureau recommended to the House by the Committee on Appropriations is for $1,500,000, which represents a decrease of approximately $20,000, from the sum recommended in the President's budget. While the budget recommendation itself appeared on the surface to provide an increase of approximately $40,000 over the previous year's budget, it actually represented an increase of less than $3,000, because of salary increases established by law. The end result, if the figure of $1,500,000 is approved, will be a net loss in funds available to this important agency. I, for one, do not propose to be panicked by cries of economy into failing to discriminate between trimming off the fat and cutting into bone and sinew. In my judgment, money spent for the betterment of our children's health and welfare is the best investment that this country can make. There is no substitute for strong and healthy citizens.

A small fraction of the sum spent for a single improvement on a river or in a harbor would make possible research of the highest importance. Here is one example of the kind of return we can expect from an investment in the work of the Children's Bureau; approximately 40,000 premature babies are born each year. Of this number about one-third die in their first year of life. There is good reason to believe that research into the causes of prematurity would repay the investment a hundredfold in lives saved.

It is urgently necessary that now, when the demand on our resources throughout the world and the United States is so great, we exercise our best judgment in choosing those fields in which money can be spent most profitably. In my judgment, the Children's Bureau is one of the agencies in government doing a most valuable and essential job, and I earnestly hope that its appropriations will keep pace with its increased responsibilities.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time in order to continue for a moment the discussion participated in by the gentleman from Nebraska and the gentleman from Indiana. I think the gentleman from Nebraska observed that he would not want these funds invested in so-called private securities. If there were no Federal debt at the present time, in what would our present life insurance companies invest their reserves?

Mr. CURTIS. I think the gentleman will have to realize that a Government insurance program, a social insurance program, covering 150,000,000 people, and that insurance company having the power to tax and the power to spend for all other things, the parallel with an insurance company is not an accurate one.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Let us assume now that the social security proposal absorbs all Government bonds outstanding. If we are ever going to get on a sound financial basis that migh happen. Would the gentleman care to comment on a situation of that kind?

Mr. CURTIS. That is why I advocate a pay-as-you-go program and let us do as good a job as we can today for the old people of the present time and pay for it now. Let us make no promises for the future. I am sure those who follow us will do the same thing.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is what I wanted the gentleman to get in the record. Let us go one step further. Let us assume this reserve fund reaches $45,000,000,000. That is within the concept of the proposition, is it not?

Mr. CURTIS. The social-security program goes on forever.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Let us take the figure that was discussed in the com-

mittee, $45,000,000,000. That is not a big figure is it?

Mr. CURTIS. No; it is one-fourth of that now.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Let us assume we create a reserve of 45 or 60 or 87 billion dollars, which is within view we will say, what is to prevent a Congress at that time disposing of the securities then in the hands of the Social Security Administration to raise money for some other emergency of the Nation, taking those securities in that fund at that time and selling them on the open market for the people to raise funds for some other purpose? What is to prevent that?

Mr. CURTIS. I do not know.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Well, there is not anything in the concept to prevent it, is there?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes, I think so.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Is there?

Mr. CURTIS. These bonds belong to the social security trust fund.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is true.

Mr. CURTIS. How many bonds there are is a moot question.

Mr. CRAWFORD. When this reserve fund gets to the point where it can absorb all Government issues outstanding. That is the point I am making.

Mr. CURTIS. There are those who believe that that was the reason this particular plan was adopted, thinking they could pay off the national debt with it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I would like for someone someday who believes that such a thing is possible to take the floor and demonstrate on cross-examination that any of these schemes that have ever been proposed in connection with social security is sound from an economic standpoint.

Mr. CURTIS. Lest we be in danger of making an attack on the old people, I want to point out that, under the bill the House passed, 10 years from now there will be almost as many people over 65 outside these insurance benefits as there are now. At the present time there are about 8,400,000 of our people not eligible. Ten years from now there will still be 7,200,000.

Mr. CRAWFORD. You have millions of people all over the United States who at no time have been permitted to participate by making contributions for their own benefit.

Mr. CURTIS. Why, it is definitely a lottery.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Certainly.

Mr. CURTIS. Some people are getting a 40-to-1 shot.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman from Nebraska said that those who are now producing should support those who are now not producing.

Mr. CURTIS. Not able to produce.

Mr. VORYS. I want to bring up the point that the only people in the country who can support those who are now not producing are those who are producing and unless that support is expressed through taking from those who are now producing part of their produce by way of taxes currently we are getting into an inflationary situation where we are trying to get something for nothing.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. The able gentleman from Nebraska when he was making his presentation mentioned a situation with which we would be faced when, instead of one out of five of the people drawing benefits over age 65, five out of the five would be drawing them. Now I rather think that that situation would never arise, as I understand the picture, because—and I address my question to the gentleman from Nebraska—is it not a fact that even under the social-security program now envisioned there would never come a time when more than, let us say, two out of the five would be drawing benefits?

Mr. CURTIS. I think a more correct statement would be the time when five out of five are eligible for benefits. Now if they do not choose to retire, that is a different thing, but about 40 years from now they will be eligible, and that is when your costs will be up.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the chapter be considered as read and be open to amendments at any point thereof, and subject to points of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, the chapter includes through page 155; is that correct?

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes.

Mr. BIEMILLER. And the request does definitely preserve my right to raise a point of order against any section in the chapter?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FLOOD. At this time, in view of the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island, if I have a point of order to make against any section of the chapter, am I permitted to make that point of order if the unanimous consent request is granted?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on page 154, line 8, against the language from the colon to the period on line 13 on the ground that this language constitutes legislation on an appropriation bill in that it repeals existing legislation; that it goes beyond the scope of this bill, and that it goes beyond the appropriation provisions of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Rhode Island desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, this language in the appropriation bill was put in here by the Bureau of the Budget and is a problem that we have been trying to deal with during the last 3 or 4 years in arriving at an estimate of military credits that were due to those men working on the railroads that went into the military service. As I remember 2 years ago we asked for an estimate of the total amount due, and the Bureau of the Budget refused that estimate, and we went along with the Bureau of the Budget and did not allow anything in that particular bill a year ago, but the Senate did allow the full amount. We worked out an agreement in conference with the Senate a year ago to spread this full amount over a period of 4 years, 1950, 1951, 1952, and 1953, to pay off these military service credits. So, the committee is being consistent again this year as it was a year ago in following the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget, and we have gone along with this language.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania has made a point of order against the language appearing in the bill on page 154, as quoted by him. The Chair has examined the language and notes that it carries a provision repealing existing law, which of course would clearly be legislation on an appropriation bill, in violation of the rules of the House.

The Chair sustains the point of order.

Are there further points of order to this title of the pending chapter?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against section 202 on page 149 that it involves additional duties on the part of the Federal Security Administrator and is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Rhode Island desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, this is the same situation we were up against yesterday. I guess I am in the same position I was yesterday. I will have to concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York makes a point of order against the language appearing in section 202 on page 149 of the pending bill. The gentleman from Rhode Island concedes the point of order, for the reasons stated on similar points of order heretofore made.

The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, a further point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on the same grounds against the language appearing on page 150, lines 1 to 5, starting with the words "payment in advance" and ending with the words "to the general public."

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Rhode Island desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. FOGARTY. I think it would be a waste of time, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, a further point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I make the same point of order against the language appearing on page 153, lines 17 to 20, starting with the words "payment in advance" and ending with the words "to the general public."

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Rhode Island desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. FOGARTY. I guess the same condition exists here, Mr. Chairman. I will say no more.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Are there further points of order to the remainder of this chapter? If not, amendments are now in order.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FOGARTY: On page 149, line 14, insert the following language:

"SEC. 202. Appropriations under this title available for salaries and expenses shall be available for expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the function or activity for which any such appropriation is made."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, my amendment remedies the defect in the language which was stricken on the point of order raised by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be adopted.

Mr. KEATING. The proposed amendment has to do with the activities of Mr. Oscar Ewing, the Federal Security Administrator. If adopted it will permit the continuation of practices in which he and others in his administration have been engaging in going about the country spreading the doctrine of socialized medicine and compulsory health insurance programs. The views of many of us as to the undesirability of a compulsory health insurance program are well known. We prefer that encouragement be extended to the promotion of voluntary health insurance plans through tax concessions or otherwise. I am not disposed to get into a debate on that subject although I am ready and willing to do so. Whatever our views may be on socialized medicine, however, there should be no difference of opinion among us about the impropriety of spending the taxpayer's dollars to propagandize for any legislation.

I simply feel it should be abundantly clear to the Members what the issue is which is involved in this amendment. If it is desired by the Members on either side to curtail the activities of the Federal Security Administrator in any respect here is the opportunity. I shall oppose the amendment not only because of my opposition to socialized medicine but because I feel neither this Administrator nor the head of any other Government department or agency should be attending meetings all over the United States at the expense of the taxpayers to promote some particular program which happens to be a favorite of his or of other leaders in the present administration.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

The question was taken; and, the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided and there were—ayes 47, noes 51.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. FOGARTY and Mr. KEATING.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 65, noes 66.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 148, line 7, strike out "$2,383,100" and insert "$2,145,000."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment to cut $238,100 from the administrative expenses and salaries, Office of the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency. I have done this because the amount carried represents an increase over last year, and because I believe that a very considerable saving can be effected if the Administrator will cut out this propaganda-chasing around the country and will organize his office on a more businesslike basis. I hope we will save the $238,000 and that the Committee will vote for the amendment.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Is the figure that the gentleman has suggested equal to or more than was allowed last year for this activity?

Mr. TABER. No; it is not. It is below, but the amount that the committee recommended is above the figure that was allowed last year. The figure allowed last year was $2,316,000, and I am proposing $2,145,000.

There is no reason why this amendment should not be adopted. In the analysis of traveling expenses, the present picture is that the Federal Security Agency is listed for $3,000,000 of traveling expenses this year; and the budget estimates for next year carry $4,000,000, indicating an absolutely unnecessary increase. We could therefore proceed to cut down on the amounts that are provided for the Federal Security Administration and the whole of this agency where they are available for traveling expenses, and I hope that the Committee will adopt this amendment.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. And I want to call the attention of the gentleman and the rest of the committee members to the fact that under the proviso in this particular paragraph, which seems to me an unusual one, the Administrator is authorized to take out of other appropriations, funds which are to be advanced to this appropriation to finance regional office activities; in other words, money can be taken out of other activities under the Office of the Federal Security Administrator which, I understand, includes Public Health Service, and be transferred into this provision for administrative expenses which is headed "Salaries in the Office of the Administrator."

Mr. TABER. That is, he can do it for the purpose of financing the regional offices connected with the constituent organization.

Mr. KEATING. That is true, but it is a rather unusual provision.

Mr. TABER. It is very unusual.

Mr. KEATING. I hope this amendment will be adopted.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think I should say for the benefit of my friend, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. TABER], and to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] that complete reorganization took place in the Federal Security Agency 3 years ago under the leadership of this committee and under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE]. I fought it on the floor of the House because I did not think it would show any economy. But I had to say 2 years ago, and I did admit on this floor, that I had been wrong the previous year; that the action taken by this committee under the leadership of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] did show better coordinated activities in the field and getting people out of Washington into these regional offices; they made a tremendous showing of economy by that so-called reorganization and I admitted it on the floor of the House.

The action which was taken 3 years ago by this committee was for that purpose. I think the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] missed the boat, and also the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], when they talk about all this propaganda of Mr. Ewing in behalf of compulsory health insurance. You sure missed the boat when you had a chance to vote for a $3,000,000 appropriation for research into cancer, because that is one step you could have made in the direction of opposing compulsory health insurance if you sincerely do not want compulsory health insurance.

Now, we cut this particular item a total of $135,800. That is, the committee did. Every new job that was requested was refused. It is true the bill shows $66,893 more than was allowed them a year ago. We state in our report that none of the regional offices shall be cut. The bill as reported, after taking account of Ramspeck promotions, pay act costs, and other mandatory costs, will require a cut in personnel of 12 or 15. They will have to be taken out of the Washington office headquarters here. They will have a cut of perhaps 12 to 15 below what they had for the fiscal year 1950. If your cut is allowed to go into effect it is going to be

here in Washington, it cannot be spread out through the regional offices because we have directed Mr. Ewing in our report that the cuts have to be made at the Washington level. If this cut is made you are going to wreck the office. You do not know how far you are going. This committee went as far as it could in cutting to the bone the Office of Administrator when we marked up this bill.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. Is it not a fact that when we reorganized this situation 3 years ago and set up the consolidated regional offices and consolidated activities in the Office of the Administrator, we did so by combining in the Office of the Administrator many functions that formerly were appropriated for in separate items?

Mr. FOGARTY. Right.

Mr. KEEFE. And that accounts for what appears to be a large sum of money for the Office of Administrator?

Mr. FOGARTY. That is correct. To repeat, we cut this right down to the bone. We cut out all the additional positions they asked for—and there were several. They will have to decrease their personnel because the $66,000 increase allowed means nothing when you take into consideration the mandatory increases involved in the pay acts and other such things. They will actually have less for personnel than they had in 1950.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Would the gentleman point out to us where in the bill are these savings which are offset by the increased figures in this office and the parts of the bill that are reduced to make up that figure?

Mr. FOGARTY. I cannot show it here because that was a reorganization started 3 years ago. They reorganized 3 years ago. We were able to show it 2 years ago and again last year. They are completely reorganized. As the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] stated, this program started 3 years ago.

Mr. KEATING. It looks to me as if all of the provisions all through the bill are in excess of last year. There are very few that are less than last year.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MARCANTONIO: On page 151, line 5, after the period, add a new section:

"SEC. 209. No part of any appropriation under this title shall be paid as grants to any State or educational institution in which, because of race, color, or creed, discriminatory practices deny equality of educational opportunity or employment to anyone to pursue such educational courses or employment as are provided by such a grant."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane and that it is legislation on an appropriation bill. I do not see how those conclusions can be escaped. It is clearly legislation on an appropriation bill, and an attempt to interfere with and direct the affairs of every State in the Union and of every Territory. The point of order should be sustained.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Yes, I do, Mr. Chairman. I refer the Chairman to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 8, 1948, page 2356. This identical amendment was offered by me on that day and a point of order was made by the gentleman from Mississippi, against the amendment. It is the same amendment, word for word, to the same section of the bill, and the point of order was overruled. It is definitely a negative limitation.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I just want to state in reply that because one Chairman makes a mistake does not bind the House for all time to come. There was an error on the part of the Chairman, 2 years ago.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule. The gentleman from Mississippi knows that the present occupant of the chair is bound by the decisions and precedents of the House.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] has offered an amendment which has been reported, and the gentleman from Mississippi has made a point of order against the amendment. The Chair has examined the amendment and has compared it with the language appearing in the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York on March 8, 1948, against which a point of order was made by the gentleman from Mississippi on the same grounds as stated by him on this occasion. At that time the Chair ruled that the amendment was a limitation on an appropriation bill. Of course, it is the duty of the occupant of the chair to follow the rules of the House and the precedents and decisions of the House. So, in view of this decision the Chair is compelled to and has no other recourse than to overrule the point of order.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. For the purpose of limiting debate on this amendment?

Mr. CANNON. With the gentleman's consent I would like to submit a unanimous-consent request. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. BIEMILLER. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is an important amendment. It is not offered just for the sake of making the record. It is offered in a sincere endeavor to bring about results in a situation which is crying for results everywhere in the country. This Congress must be judged by the status of civil rights in the Nation; it must be judged by its record on civil rights. As a matter of history, the character of any period or of any institution must be judged by the status of civil rights. As long as oppression of the Negro continues, aided and abetted by government, then that government is a retrogressive and reactionary government. I am shocked and I think the American people are shocked at the neglect, the indifference, the calloused indifference with which this Congress has been dealing with this subject. The majority of this Congress was elected on the pledge of civil rights enactment. There are no more than about 110 Members who come from below the Mason and Dixon's line. They do not constitute a majority in this House. That is a mathematical fact. Yet, we have not been able to pass a single piece of civil-rights legislation. The FEPC bill? That was not FEPC at all.

Every time an amendment of this character is offered in the Committee of the Whole, what happens? Only last week I offered a similar amendment with respect to the District of Columbia. I noted what happened on the vote on that amendment. Fifty percent of the Members present remained in their seats and did not vote. The Dixie Democrats did not remain in their seats. They voted. They voted against the amendment. They voted in accordance with the manner in which they campaigned. They campaigned against civil rights and they voted against civil rights. Yet, the minority becomes the majority in this House because the majority, which campaigned on the proposition that if elected it would enact civil-rights legislation, is reneging, reneging on its campaign pledges.

I submit that this is a matter of conscience. The civil rights issue must not be a political football. Civil rights are a challenge to the dominion of white supremacy. By virtue of what law, by virtue of what legal right, by virtue of what ethical right, by what morality do you take the money of the taxpayers, Negro taxpayers as well as white taxpayers, and with that money, with these grants that you make in this bill, grants to States and grants to institutions, place the stamp of approval on the doctrine and practice of white supremacy? You place the stamp of approval, and you do it with Federal funds, on segregation, discrimination in jobs, and discrimination and segregation in education.

How do you justify it? You cannot put up the States' rights argument on this one. You are taking Federal funds, and when you take Federal funds you take those Federal funds subject to the conditions under which the Government gives you those funds. There is no States' rights proposition involved here, although I have never had any respect for that kind of argument, the use of so-called States' right to defeat civil rights. You cannot advance it on this kind of proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. These are Federal funds, and the Federal Government has a right to say to the recipient States or institutions how these funds are to be spent.

This is supposed to be a civil rights Congress. I am calling on this Congress to say to the State or to the institution, the recipient of these funds, "Look, you cannot spend this money for the purposes of segregation or discrimination in jobs or in employment."

You cannot answer this argument except by asserting the racist arrogance of white supremacy. That is the only basis upon which you can vote against this amendment. Honesty, morality, decency, and law, yes, the Constitution, requires that this House adopt this amendment.

Yes; the Eightieth Congress, the Republican Congress, did nothing on civil rights.

What is this Democratic Congress doing? Where is the leadership of this Democratic Congress on the issue of civil rights? What explanation are you going to give the 14,000,000 Negro people? Oh, you are going to say, "It was the Dixie Democrats." Yes, but they are only a minority. People can add and subtract. They are a minority. We expect them to be against us. Where is the majority? Where is the leadership of the majority? Where is the Democratic Party that said, "Elect us; let us take over, and we will give you civil rights." You have had an opportunity to answer time and time and time again. Here is another opportunity to answer. Are you going to dodge this issue by not voting? Go ahead. But the American people will judge this Congress as a Congress which will go down in history as the worst betrayer of the Negro people.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, since the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] has not said anything, I do not care to take up the time of the House. His attacks on the South are not only silly but stupid. He and his communistic followers do not give a tinker's dam about the Negroes of the South and the Negroes know it. I ask for a vote on his communistic motion.

I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MARCANTONIO) there were ayes 17, noes 49.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to this chapter of the bill?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, in order that the RECORD may show how many Members are present, and how many voted on the amendment, I now make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and forty-seven Members are present; a quorum.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that these men rushed in from the cloak rooms were not on the floor a while ago when the vote was taken. There was no quorum present at that time, or the vote against the Marcantonio amendment would have been much greater.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair counted everybody who was on the floor at the time the Chair counted.

Are there any further amendments to this chapter of the bill?

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we have now considered about one-third of the one-package appropriation bill of $29,000,000,000. I think this bill was reported to the House early in March, and I accepted the new procedure with an open mind, but with some reservations. Now I am convinced that this arrangement is not going to prove very satisfactory, and if we proceed in the future and future sessions of Congress undertake to have a one-package appropriation bill of this size, I believe we will have to arrive at some method by which the President will be permitted to act on separate items in the appropriation bill.

This bill is only one-third approved by the House at this time. It is evident that considerably more time will be required for the House, possibly 2 weeks or more. Then the measure must go to the other body. How much time the other body may need to properly consider this measure, I have no idea. However, after that it will have to go to conference, and it occurs to me that it may be late in June before a conference report is finally approved.

I have no disposition, of course, to anticipate what the President of the United States, in his wisdom, may do that would not be respectful. It sems to me it would be hard for any President—I do not mean President Truman, because I have no criticism of him—it seems to me that under this parliamentary procedure we are getting into a situation where any President will find it difficult to veto an appropriation bill of this kind late in June, when the new fiscal year is ready to start. I think that eventually we will have to come to some arrangement which will permit the President to scan and consider separate items, and perhaps veto separate items in a bill of this size. I am of the opinion that there ought to be some way for the Members of the House to vote on separate chapters of the bill.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I do not think I can agree with the gentleman that we should give the President the right of appropriation. That is what the suggestion of the gentleman would be.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I have never been for the proposition of giving the President a chance to veto parts of one bill and approve other parts of the same bill, but it seems to me we are getting ourselves into a position where we are likely to come to that very thing. Of course, I would not be in favor of it with any other kind of a bill.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I do think as we finish a chapter provision should be made to go into the House and finally decide on any amendment which might have been offered. Of course, under the present system, we are up against the peculiar situation of perhaps waiting 3 weeks after debate on a particular amendment, and consequently everybody will forget the discussion had on the amendment.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I think the gentleman has a good point there, but we are not proceeding by that method. We are eventually going to get to the point where we will have to consider the bill in its entirety and eventually we may have to permit the President to veto one separate item of the bill.

A little later we are going to take up the chapter devoted to agriculture. I think the committee has tried to do a good job on the whole. The committee has reduced the amount of money that is available for research and experiment in connection with the European corn borer, which is a scourge and a devastating insect in the corn area of the Middle West. At the proper time I will offer an amendment that will give a little more money to meet the corn-borer threat in the Middle West, which took a hundred million bushels of corn in Iowa alone last year.

(Mr. LECOMPTE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BAILEY: Page 151, line 21, strike out all of lines 21 to 25 on page 151, and lines 1, 2, and 3, inclusive, on page 152.

(Mr. BAILEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes, at the conclusion of the gentleman's remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Five minutes in addition to his?

Mr. CANNON. No; at the conclusion of the gentleman's remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

[Mr. BAILEY addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be again read for the information of the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk again read the amendment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that lines 21 to 25 on page 151 and lines 1 to 3 on page 152 be read for the information of the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the matter referred to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BAILEY) there were—ayes 17, noes 69.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks during the debate on the amendment providing $3,000,000 for the Cancer Research Institute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there abjection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, the appropriation bill now before us is disappointing in that it fails, in my opinion, to fully appreciate the importance of the research work now being done by the National Institutes of Health in Bethesda, Md., now consisting of six institutes: Experimental Biology and Medicine, Microbiological, Cancer, Heart, Dental Research, and Mental Health. The Institute of Mental Health was transferred to the National Institute of Health in April of last year. From these six institutes, important contributions have flowed into the world-wide stream of medical science.

The testimony of Dr. Leonard A. Scheele, the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service is extremely revealing and encouraging as given before the Appropriation Committee of the House. I wish the time available would permit me to make an extended review of the same, but this I cannot do in the limited time. Hence a mere reference to the wonderful work being done.

Expanded medical research means an increased need for trained personnel. The Public Health Service programs for the training of research scientists and of clinicians in certain special fields are already paying valuable dividends to the Nation. In the past year, 437 research fellows received help in 97 institutions in 30 States.

The Public Health Service program of financial aid to scientists in universities, medical schools, and hospitals also has produced valuable new medical knowledge. At present, more than 1,300 research projects are receiving our support. These projects are carried out in more than 200 institutions, located in 44 States and the District of Columbia. We have been gratified to find that expanded Federal support has stimulated, rather than replaced, private expenditures for medical research. There is every indication that this healthy division of effort will continue.

Mr. Chairman, I wish now to make a few remarks relative to the voluntary health agencies.

One of the outstanding contributions to the health of our Nation is being made by the voluntary health agencies in their fight against disease. Working in close collaboration with the United States Public Health Service, these agencies have established an enviable record over a long period of years.

Inspired by the energy of small groups of leaders interested in a specific disease such as cancer, heart, tuberculosis, and polio, national organizations have come into being. They have kindled the zeal of countless thousands at the grass roots, where nourished in the soil of public opinion, the health agencies of the Government have joined with them in seeking the cause and cure of specific diseases.

The peoples of the Nation have indicated their desire to seek the cause and cure of our chronic and crippling diseases. They have set the pace for the fight in their annual drives for funds. These contributions express the voluntary giving of the public to the cause best known to them.

There has ben tabulated for me an over-all summary of the general funds and research funds contributed by the people of the United States to the 18 leading voluntary health agencies. I intend at another time to enter this tabulation in the RECORD.

The Members will be interested to know that these agencies—the American Cancer Society, American Foundation for the Blind, National Council To Combat Blindness, National Society for Prevention of Blindness, American Diabetes Association, American Hearing Society, American Heart Association, American Social Hygiene Association—national, Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation, Maternity Center Association, National Association To Control Epilepsy, National Committee for Mental Hygiene—national, National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, National Foundation for Cerebral Palsy, National Multiple Sclerosis Society—AARMS, National Society for Crippled Children and Adults, National Tuberculosis Association, and the Planned Parenthood Federation received contributions totaling $55,899,184 in 1948. Of this sum, $6,306,000, or about 11 percent, was allocated for research. It is interesting to note that the American Cancer Society, which devotes one-fourth of all its contributions to research in the field of cancer, allocated $3,300,000, or over one-half of the combined total of all the 18 agencies. The encouraging research reports coming to light in the field of cancer more than justify this mass attack.

While we note the dollar magnitude of the effort these 18 agencies are putting forth, let us not lose sight of the task ahead and how much this effort means to those who die and suffer from these diseases. Mr. Chairman, 1,082,116 people died in 1948, and an additional 36,199,959 were disabled by the group of diseases. In terms of averages, this means 1.41 per death due to heart, 4.31 per death due to tuberculosis, 17.39 per death due to cancer, 4275.20 per death due to polio. We recognize that polio is a crippling and not a fatal disease.

Since the average cancer case requires about 100 days of hospitalization at an average cost of $15 per day it is evident that this $1,500 coverage cancer cost can be an economic catastrophe to most families. With cancer deaths in the United States in 1948 estimated at 188,000, it is at once evident the cause and cure must be sought out with all the speed possible in keeping with the trained manpower and research facility available.

It is interesting to note in this study that there are three national organizations in the field of blindness with little or nothing being spent on research in this problem, which disables 250,000 annually. We find no research being conducted in hearing by the American Hearing Society, yet we all face a decline in the acuteness of our hearing.

Congress has before it many bills within the broad scope of public health. Many of my fellow Members have taken part in the creation of the Institutes of Public Health at Bethesda, which now include cancer, dental, heart, mental, microbiology, experimental biology, and medicine. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] has introduced a bill which would meet the multiplicity of bills now before the House for the establishment within the United States Public Health Service of various institutes for these specific diseases where these institutes do not exist. This bill would empower the Surgeon General to create an institute within the United States Public Health Service for a specific disease when the need became apparent. I hope the Members of the House will have an opportunity to act favorably on this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I had the pleasure and good fortune to endorse the National Science Foundation bill in this and previous sessions of Congress. I am informed the conference committee is now ready to report this bill to the House. I hope it will receive the favorable action of the House tomorrow. The need is more pressing than ever. The Division of Medicine within the Foundation would undertake the broad basic studies on man which must be solved before the problem of the specific diseases can be successfully conquered.

I want to take this opportunity to publicly acknowledge this praiseworthy work of these voluntary agencies and to urge the Members of Congress to support them in this effort.

But, notwithstanding the admirable work that has been done by voluntary agencies and individual contributors, there still remains a tremendous amount

of work to be done. It is at this point that there arises an obligation, or duty, upon the part of Government, to supplement the work of private sources and make available funds that will assist in fundamental research.

I am convinced that the Appropriation Committee of the House has made a serious mistake in failing to provide more substantial Federal aid to these great undertakings in research. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] to increase the amount for cancer research is meritorious and should have the support of the membership. Similar amendments are in order for additional funds to other research projects, such as relate to the heart, mental, dental programs. The objective is worthy and the good already done and expected to be done entitles each to the favorable consideration of this House.

And, may I say that there is no one who has rendered more intelligent and aggressive leadership in this great cause than the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE]. His work in this particular will ever stand out as a monument to his zealous endeavor to advance medical science to benefit the people of this Nation.

I do hope that the Members of this House, knowing of his fine service, will follow his leadership in the effort to supply adequate funds for all of the worthwhile research programs now being conducted.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, when human lives are the stake economy becomes the accomplice of murder. There is a proper place for economy in our consideration of items of Federal appropriation the same as there is in the consideration which any housewife must give to the items of household expenditures. But I have never known a mother or a father at the bedside of a gravely ill child withholding from getting every possible medical aid and attention because of fear that the household budget would not balance. I wish to commend the distinquished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] for the historic fight which he is making in this Chamber to save us from becoming the accomplices of murder by putting economy in priority to the saving of human lives through research, expansion of hospitalization facilities and other ways. I have heard the gentleman state that he is retiring from the Congress, not being a candidate for renomination and reelection. I wish to say to him—and we have disagreed on other matters and are of different political thoughts—that in the fight he has made on this floor today, and on yesterday, for the placing of human lives high above narrow consideration of the principles of a false economy he is closing his long congressional career in a blaze of glory which will make long remembered his name.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent request heretofore agreed to, not to exceed 2 hours of general debate are in order on chapter VI.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that when the Committee rises today general debate be considered as ended and that the bill may then be read under the 5-minute rule upon convening tomorrow. I may say that there is no intention of cutting off anyone. We have had no requests for time other than from members of the committee and it would be my purpose to stay here until all those who want to speak have had the opportunity.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. My understanding is that it is the intention of the chairman of the subcommittee that general debate will proceed as long as there is demand for it within the 2-hour limitation, and that at the conclusion of debate a paragraph probably will be read, but that no amendments will be considered tonight.

Mr. WHITTEN. Insofar as we are concerned on this side, I would like to announce that it will be our intention to move that the Committee rise upon the reading of the first paragraph, in the event we get that far now.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. I heard the gentleman say there were no requests for time. I did not know this matter was coming up at this time and therefore I had not requested time, but I would like to have 15 minutes.

Mr. WHITTEN. Of course, it will be my purpose to recognize members of my subcommittee first. I did not mean to say there would not be any time, but I used that expression to illustrate that there was not too much demand for time, and I will be glad to recognize the gentleman from Texas later.

Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 25 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to preface my remarks by paying tribute to my colleagues on this committee. The gentleman from Oklahoma, BILL STIGLER, and the gentleman from Indiana, ED KRUSE, are two of the outstanding Members of this House. They are able, sincere, and, above all, courageous and independent. The Republican members, the gentleman from Minnesota, CARL ANDERSEN, and the gentleman from Washington, WALT HORAN, are able, sincere, and are leaders of their party in the House of Representatives. We have joined to try to do a good job in handling this problem of recommending to you this chapter on agricultural appropriations. In our work we have had the services of a fine administrative secretary, Ross Pope, serving his first year but doing a fine job.

In preparing this chapter of the bill our committee was faced with the necessity of trying to strike a balance between the urgent need for many activities of the Department of Agriculture and a National Government which owes more than $256,000,000,000, and which is now operating in the red. We have tried to meet that responsibility and to provide for new programs started last year covering also the expansion of certain existing programs based on prior commitments of Congress. These mandatory allowances involve new programs, such as rural telephone, rural housing, reforestation, and fire protection, which were started during fiscal year 1950 and now must be provided for on a full-year basis in 1951. They also provide for the establishment of an estimated 150 new soil conservation districts in 1951, cover increased costs for marketing quotas and acreage allotments necessary to prevent surpluses and to return land to non-soil-depleting use, provide for the extension of the Federal crop insurance program to 240 additional counties in 1951, and cover the conservation and use of agricultural land resources program announced last year and to which the Government is committed. In addition, the pay increases pursuant to Public Laws 359 and 429 will cost the Department approximately $6,568,000.

For these programs the Bureau of the Budget recommended some 2,600 additional employees for 1951. The committee has eliminated such additional employees and has allowed increases only in sufficient amounts to permit the Department to continue positions authorized for 1950 on a full-year basis in 1951.

On a comparative basis with the present fiscal year, the amount recommended in this bill represents a decrease of $9,250,917. If pending 1950 supplementals totaling $7,085,000 are taken into consideration, the total reduction in the 1950 programs on a comparative basis is in excess of $16,300,000. To cover the new and expanded programs mentioned above in 1951, there is provided $41,955,011, which makes a total in this bill for direct appropriations of $764,032,701. This is $42,245,745 below the amount proposed in the 1951 budget estimates. In addition, the committee has reduced by $199,990,000 the revolving fund for resubscriptions to the capital stock of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, and has approved a reduction of $125,000,000 in the revolving fund for subscriptions to the capital stock of the Federal land banks.

Attention is directed to the fact that direct annual appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for each of the 3 years preceding the last war were in excess of $1,000,000,000. The amount appropriated in 1940 was $1,543,000,000, more than double the amount for 1951 carried in this bill.

Our subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations spent more than 2 months in day-long hearings on the chapter on appropriations for the Department of Agriculture. These hearings began at A and went through Z so far as the operations of this Department are concerned. In approaching our job there were many conditions of which we were cognizant. We realized that the Federal Government now has a debt of approximately $256,000,000,000 and that at the present time apparently we are

to lack several billion dollars of meeting expenses. At the same time we had to keep in mind that many millions of people are dependent upon agriculture as their means of livelihood and further that the entire Nation is dependent upon agriculture for the health and well-being of our people, and in addition the welfare of agriculture and those engaged in it are a key part of our economy with the soil our chief capital asset to which we must look if we are to ever meet our national debt.

In addition to these duties, the committee has the responsibility of investigating by its examination, the work of the Department and of recommending such changes as will eliminate waste and provide the maximum results for the money expended.

Last year the Department requested and the Bureau of the Budget approved the sum of $250,000 to construct a refrigerated building for research on the use of fuels. The committee directed that this sum be held up pending an investigation by the Department of the use of such a building that the Department of National Defense at Eglin Field, Fla. The Department found that the Department of National Defense had such a building and further that they would be glad to arrange for this work without cost. Now it develops that there is such a building available just out of Washington.

Also last year I felt that there was too great a difference in the results obtained by some soil-conservation districts as compared with others. This question was developed fully and the facts we uncovered showed that in the case of two similar districts, organized about the same time and in the same State that one district had done twice as much work or produced twice as much results as the other. The committee directed that a standard of minimum work progress be set up by the Soil Conservation Service. That was done and the Soil Conservation Service reported this year that there has been a hundred percent increase in the progress of its work under this program.

Last year I served temporarily on the committee which then handled the requests for various control programs of the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine. The justification appeared to be inadequate, and when this matter was transferred to our committee for this year we had our investigators to investigate the operations of the Bureau. The results of this investigation were startling in the evidence of waste and bad management. It disclosed inadequate planning, the maintenance of a large permanent office in the field for emergency programs with those whose jobs were at stake determining whether an emergency existed. Quite naturally they have found an emergency existed each year since 1935. Other faults were the payment of exorbitant amounts for rental or aircraft, the withholding of old automobiles and trucks from being traded in when new ones were bought, the maintenance of numerous offices in the same city handling related or similar work and actually the separation of pieces of equipment so that it would not be sought by other branches of the Department, together with the holding of huge amounts of equipment, all in violation of the directions of the Department. These facts were carried by the press, and I am sure you are familiar with them. As a result of these disclosures we have substantially reduced the funds for this work and have directed an over-all planning, and the Department is making a thorough survey of its operations to see that such practices are eliminated.

For several years the committee has tried to keep straight the operations of the Department with regard to funds for research under the Research and Marketing Act of 1946. We believe in that act and the work contemplated by it. We believe in the committee system whereby it is contemplated that those in the industry shall have a say in the work selected to be done. We believe in the directive in that act that "where feasible the work shall be done with the facilities of the Department." However, the testimony this year convinced us that in many instances the Bureaus of the Department had doubled their permanent personnel to do this work. We do not believe that was intended. The facts we were able to develop also convinced us that the former practice of setting up a separate sum for research under this act was an invitation to every Bureau to get in on the work and there is much to indicate that those allocating these funds were unable to hold back and to judge a request solely on its merits but to some extent allocated funds to each bureau to keep it satisfied. The same was true of the special research fund. In this bill we have consolidated those funds that the Congress may review each project on its merits without regard to the bureau; that we may insist on certain projects being done by contract so that when the particular project is completed we will not have all this permanent personnel on the Department's hands. In taking this action it is the determination of the committee that work under the Research and Marketing Act, the use of its commodity committee system and its contract provisions shall not be reduced but actually strengthened.

Our committee has provided funds for loans for the housing program. We have provided funds for the printing and distribution of plans. We have not approved the millions requested for "research in farm housing." The Congress has provided funds for such research for years. The Department has more than 75 plans and bulletins on farm housing which it has prepared. Notwithstanding this fact and the further fact that the Farmers Home Administration has charge of this program, just about every bureau in the department wanted to get in on this "open sesame." The Bureau of Human Nutrition wanted to take a census. The extension department, notwithstanding the fact that they have millions to do their job which includes farm housing education, use of materials, and so forth, wanted an additional $750,000, and so on through the department. We have denied these requests. We feel the housing program should not be delayed, while every bureau does over again what they have been getting money to do all along. They should use the plans they have.

It is the opinion of a majority of the committee that the various agricultural agencies too frequently want to be complete in themselves; that they do not properly make use of the services of other branches but too frequently try to develop their own "technical" aids. We have directed that such practices be stopped and the services of the various divisions be properly utilized. Separation of services can be worse than duplication.

We have directed that the Department, in view of the facts developed by our committee, make a thorough study of its operations to remedy these faults. However, I wish to assure the membership of the House that we are requesting a thorough investigation by our own investigatory staff. By taking this action I do not mean to indict this Department or say that it is worse than any other. In many ways I think it is far better run than most Government departments. However, its field of operations is so vast, it is bound by the civil-service regulations, whereby if they get rid of an unsatisfactory employee, when they expand another program the same individual is sent back to them by the Civil Service, it is dependent upon annual appropriations and cannot tell until just before the beginning of the new year just what funds are available, and I relate these facts that you may be assured that we, on this committee, are doing our best to get a dollar's worth for each dollar spent. And in this effort we have the help of the many fine and able people in the Department of Agriculture.

The records disclose many disturbing facts which have developed the last few years. For instance, the income of the farmers of our Nation in 1948 dropped more than 20 percent below that of 1947. In 1949 the income dropped 15 percent below that of 1948. The outlook at the present time for the current year is that the income of our farmers will be approximately two-thirds as much as in 1947. Since 1947 gross farm income has fallen more than $2,000,000,000 and during the same time cash expenses have gone up more than $1,000,000,000. The farm-family purchasing power in terms of 1947 dollars has already dropped since that date by $4,000,000,000, and it is anticipated that it will drop more than $2,000,000,000 this year.

These facts are disturbing not only as to their effect upon those engaged in agriculture, but the history of depressions in this country in years past would show that the first break has been in prices received for agricultural commodities and that the fall in such prices has pulled down the income of those engaged in other activities. These facts which I have mentioned are particularly disturbing when it is realized that 3,300,000 families or about half the families living on farms in 1949 had incomes of less than $2,000, and that a fourth of all farm

families had less than $1,000 income for the whole family. I mention these facts in view of the attacks that have been made in recent months on the farm support-price program. In this connection I would like to also call attention to the fact that most of our farm-surplus problems arise from the fact that during the war the farmers of our Nation were urged to expand their production to the limit in order to supply our people and our allies. They expanded their production just as industry expanded its production and now we are faced with the necessity of cutting back to peacetime production rates for many reasons, among them the need to not needlessly exploit our soil. This need presents a terrific problem, already resulting in controls which have been approved by the farmers for many crops and in my judgment such controls will follow with regard to other crops. During this period when the farmers are faced with this necessity as has been pointed out, prices received by farmers have dropped 23 percent and yet the prices paid by farmers have come down less than 4 percent.

The Congress has tried to meet this problem through its price-support program financed by the Commodity Credit Corporation the funds for which are recomemnded by this committee. It is interesting to note that throughout the operation of the Commodity Credit Corporation the total cost of all price-support programs for the last 10 years has been only approximately $1,000,000,000, less than one-fourth the amount spent on consumer subsidies on a few commodities during the war. Of course we have on hand many commodities in which the Government now has invested something like $3,500,000,000, a reserve of commodities that could be a blessing in case of conflict or even in the event of a disastrous farm year. Complaints appear daily in the press about this program. It should be noted that the records show that the Federal Government spent about $6,800,000,000 in enabling industry to reconvert after industrial capacity had been expanded to meet wartime needs and sold and additional $3,900,000,000 of real property to industry for $1,250,000,000. The Congress approved excess-profit tax reductions totalling nearly $5,600,000,000. This is in addition to authority for corporations to receive certain tax credits for their operation during wartime. While these benefits apparently went to industry the prime reason for such action was to maintain employment for the millions of workers in such plants.

These facts are mentioned not to justify spending any money on agriculture which we can get by without, but to show that the total expenditure in the support of agricultural prices during this period of adjustment is much less than the money spent for adjustment in industry. The hearings before our committee disclose that as a result of the price-support program that the drop in agricultural prices has been nothing like as drastic as the drop after the last war when we had no such price support. Certainly it would appear that such price supports have been the factor which has saved the situation, and have contributed materially to the present welfare of the United States and to the fact that we have not yet, at least, gone into a tailspin of depression. I mention these facts because a number of persons through the press are continuously making attacks on the whole price-support program for agriculture commodities. Certainly these programs are justified though of course the present method of handling potatoes and certain other commodities cannot be justified and the Congress has corrected that for next year. It is likely that corrections will have to be made in regard to other commodities where there is no control of supply or which cannot be satisfactorily stored. It appeared in the hearings that some changes would have to be made so that surplus commodities will be made more readily available to charitable institutions and others who are unable to pay the support price for many commodities. The fact that these changes may be in order, however, should not be taken as evidence of the need to strike at the whole price-support program.

It has been argued many times that the law of supply and demand should operate with regard to agriculture. It is said that people do not get all the food they could use. In this connection I point out that the law of supply and demand has been repealed insofar as labor is concerned by minimum-wage laws and by the bargaining power of labor unions all of which is reflected in higher prices for manufactured articles. It can just as readily be said that the people do not get all the refrigerators, automobiles, or other manufactured articles they could use. Yet it is not argued that industry should sell its products below the cost of production. I think almost all will agree that minimum-wage laws and labor unions, even with their excesses on occasions, have resulted in prosperity for our Nation and I know of no one that would go back to the old days when the law of supply and demand was completely operative with regard to labor. Farmers cannot organize to the same extent as labor and it will be dangerous for them to organize to the extent that they could absolutely control the food supply. But since the law of supply and demand has been repealed with regard to labor costs that go into the cost of consumer goods, it of necessity follows that unless some floor is put under the basic raw materials that the high cost of the other elements that go into consumers goods will run the price paid for raw materials down to the ground with the resulting effect of forcing this Nation into another terrible depression from which I do not know that we could recover. Many people ask why we do not export our farm surpluses. That is easier said than done. Where formerly this Nation spent millions of dollars in other countries which gave to such countries dollars to buy from us, today we are largely self-sufficient.

At one time we bought thousands of tons of cryolite from Greenland. During the war we built up a synthetic industry and now we do not need to buy.

Before World War I we got practically all our nitrate fertilizer from Chile. But today we can manufacture in the United States twice as much as we need.

In 1913, Germany produced 80 percent of the world's dyes and furnished the ingredients for the remaining 20 percent. Today we make our own dye.

In 1940 we bought 1,800,000,000 pounds of crude rubber. During the war we built up our production of synthetic rubber to more than 2,000,000,000 pounds. Vital to the production of radio, radar, electric generators and insulators is mica. Before the last war we obtained 95 percent of our supply from India. Today we manufacture a synthetic at home. From Formosa came millions of pounds of camphor, now we make camphor from turpentine, more than we can use.

Thirty-five years ago our optical glass came from England, France, and Germany. Today we produce 95 percent of all we use.

Formerly we bought $10,000,000 worth of cigarette papers annually from France. Today we produce our own. We bought eighty to ninety million pounds of silk from Japan. Today we use nylon or orlon made in the United States of America.

We then bought sugar and soybeans, figs and dates—today we produce or can produce surpluses at home.

We formerly obtained tungsten from China or Bolivia, shellac from India, hair bristles from China, now we produce synthetics and it is estimated that we in the United States are 94 percent self-sufficient. In one way that is fine, but it does mean that since we no longer buy from other countries to any great extent, we cannot sell to any great extent. It means that we must avoid production of large agricultural surpluses, for there is no substantial outlet to foreign countries, and if sold on the domestic market the price of the surplus tends to become the price for the whole supply of the commodity.

This is only another of the problems we face, for according to many economists, supported by the records of the Department, each depression has started first with a drop in farm prices. According to these records, a drop in farm prices shows up about seven times that amount of drop in national income. Through the farm-support program we have retarded such spiral. After World War I agricultural prices dropped 50 percent in 12 months. For 2 years after World War II the drop has been less than half as much for twice as long a period. In addition to that many of the charges made against the farm program have been relative to the increase in cost of various consumer goods. And yet the record shows that in the case of bread, for instance, during the period October 1947 to October 1949 the cost of the ingredients in a loaf of bread paid by the baker went down from 5.9 cents to 4.7 cents. Yet during that same time due to the high cost of labor, transportation, and other elements in producing the finished loaf of bread, the retail price to the consumer increased from 13.3 cents to 14.5 cents. Evidence before the committee showed that with regard to some

foods going into New York City more than half the retail cost of some commodities were added after the commodities crossed the Hudson River.

These matters are not mentioned to strike any argument with those that come from nonagricultural areas but is to point out that there is a real need that proper attention be given to agriculture. Our Nation is extremely fortunate in the world today to be able to produce more in the way of food than we need. Most of this surplus production was built up under the wartime need. And yet we can see that if we are to enjoy peace further demands are going to be made upon agriculture and upon the soil. The records show that during the last 10 years our population has increased by 19,000,000 people. If that same rate of increase is followed for the next 50 years you can easily see that the demands on our soil will become greater and greater. We, as a nation, need to use only that which is necessary, in soil-depleting crops, and to place the balance in grass or to other uses that will save and restore this most vital natural resource.

It makes us aware of the fact that our soil, which is perhaps our greatest natural resource and on which the Nation is dependent, is the basis for the real security of our people in the years to come. Certainly a study of other nations throughout history will show that once agriculture has been permitted to take more from the soil than is put back in, so that in effect more is being extracted than is being replaced, eventually it has led to the destruction of such nations. You can look around the earth today and any country that has paid attention to the fertility of the soil and to other natural resources you will find a prosperous nation. You can look then to Greece, Palestine, China, India, and to any of the other countries where the people are having a terrible time existing and you will find that behind it all is a depleted soil structure and wasted natural resources. In other words this Nation should have foresight enough to know that we must include as a part of the cost of food, shelter, and clothing a reasonable amount to be set aside for the restoration of our production plant, our soil. No business would think of failing to set aside for maintenance and repair of its plant. The soil is the nation's plant.

Dr. Bennett, Chief of the Soil Conservation Service, has testified before this committee that we have today 70,000,000 acres of lands in the United States that have been wasted and will have to be restored before they could contribute anything to the Nation's food, clothing, or shelter. A few years ago Milton S. Eisenhower, who has served as Assistant Secretary of Agriculture and president of Kansas State College and who has spent a lifetime in contact with agriculture and its problems stated in an article appearing in Collier's magazine that throughout the world there was approximately 2 acres of land which was keeping each person alive, that originally this 2 acres had an average of about 7 inches of top soil which stood between you and starvation, but that in many places on the earth this 7 inches has been reduced by erosion and neglect to 5 or 3 or 0; that in the United States we have more than the 2 acres of land. That is where we are fortunate. But as the years pass and the population increases at the rate which it has in the last 10 years we too will reach that point unless the problem is met through the years.

In one way of looking at it we have done a wonderful job of production in this country. Through research by the Department of Agriculture and others we have learned to make two stalks of wheat grow where one grew before and so with regard to other plants. Through this means we have increased materially the production per acre in this country. It is a matter in which we all can take pride. But when we consider the matter from another viewpoint no nation in history has wasted its natural resources through the same period of time to a greater extent than has the United States. It was testified that it would take an increase of approximately 85 percent in the appropriation for the Forestry Service to adequately meet their needs in the way of reforestation and to properly supervise and protect the forests which we have remaining. Of course in view of our present financial situation that is impossible. I mention it to point out the real need that we have. We could well spend 10 times the amount of money involved in this chapter on appropriations for agriculture and the money would be well spent if we had it. We do not have it.

This depletion of our natural resources is easy to understand. When our forefathers settled this country, land was the cheapest thing available. It was good business insofar as present income was concerned, to drain the land of its fertility and then to clear more. Our forefathers followed that practice and succeeding generations grew up to believe that was the way to farm. Then in many States we became dependent on one crop, in my own area, cotton, not simply because cotton would grow well in our States, but for the further reason that we had no cash markets for much of anything else. In other areas it was tobacco, in another wheat, and so on. As all now know, this depleted the soil and in most cases financial returns were so small that the money was not to be had to protect or restore the soil. Recognizing that the Nation and future generations had an interest in this great natural resource, fertility of the soil, the soil conservation program was set up by the National Congress. Under the program the National Government said to the farmer that if he would follow food soil practices and if he would restore his soil, the Nation would make a contribution toward the costs. This Federal contribution has averaged about one-half of the money cost with the farmer putting up his labor in addition to his half of the cash outlay. The Nation must see to it that our soil is preserved. You may say the farmer should do that on his own. He has not and there are only two ways to see that he does it, one is through our present system of leadership and aid or to make him do it by law, and that is not the American way.

There is no question but what the great natural resources of our Nation have been the real basis of our high standard of living. Therefore, all our people have an interest in our soil fertility, in its productivity. The fewer people it takes to provide shelter, food, and clothing for the rest of us, the greater the number of people left to produce radios, cars, refrigerators, and the thousand and one things for all of us, luxuries to most of the world, but taken by our people to be necessities.

The people of our towns and cities have a real interest in the fertility of the soil in the adjoining areas. The merchant has an interest, the doctor, the lawyer, yes, and the preacher. They have a real interest in the methods of farming employed by the farmers of the country though the farmer owns his land and has the legal right to farm it any way he wants, for all prosper only as the area around them prospers, the Nation prospers only as all its areas prosper. Let the farm production go down, let the land become exhausted and half the people will have to move out of our cities and the half remaining will have more of a struggle to make a living. Let that happen over the whole Nation and more and more peole will have to be employed in the production of food and clothing and fewer people will be left to provide the manufactured articles that all enjoy. That has been the situation which helped to bring about the low standard of living in much of this troubled world today.

In spite of the concrete results we have obtained through our soil programs, this program will have failed unless our people continue this change in their way of farming unless they continue to take care of the soil, rotate their crops and preserve in the land the ability to produce not only for today but for future generations. This program was started because of the tremendous need. In view of the cost it was believed that the Federal Government should institute such program, contribute toward its cost in order to awake a consciousness in the minds of our farmers of the very real danger that we would, in a few years, find all our soil gone. The Government has helped to finance practices only to bring about such practices by the farmers themselves. Whether that course was wise will be determined by what our farmers do on their own initiative in the future. We must guard against any thought that it is an obligation of the Federal Government to pay our farmers to do right by their own soil. Such a feeling would destroy our initiative and independence.

Our committee, of course, in preparing our recommendations to the Congress had to keep these problems in mind and at the same time to recognize that the Nation already owed $257,000,000,000 and was not meeting expenses now. Where to draw the line, where to stirke the balance has been our problem and we have tried to meet our obligation in this bill. We hope that we have provided reasonably adequate appropriations for

the Soil Conservation Service and the Production and Marketing Administration so that at least the Nation will continue to maintain the present level of fertility and in the hope that we may restore some of the damages that have been done to our natural resources in years past.

For many years it was taken for granted that the farm people couldn't expect to have electricity or the same conveniences that others in our Nation have had. The Congress a few years ago realizing that farmers were a part of our national economy, set out to enable the farmers to help themselves by making available electricity through the Rural Electrification Administration. We made it possible for farmers to secure loans to buy farms and made it possible for farmers to do many things for themselves with full payment to the Government for services rendered. At that time, in 1935, only 743,950 farms had electricity. Since that time, through the Rural Electrification Administration, the number has been increased to 4,850,000 farms, not on a gift basis but by the use of Government loans which are being repaid, and on which the Government actually is experiencing no loss. It may surprise you to know that less than 0.6 of 1 percent of REA cooperative borrowers are delinquent as much as 30 days on the amount due on these loans. This has actually freed these farm families from drudgery and has made the situation such that we can expect in the future a sufficient number of our people to be interested in farm life to stay on our farms and supply the food and clothing for the rest of us. As fine as that program has been, it still means little to the 16 percent of our farmers who still do not have electricity available to them. And the committee has constantly urged area coverage. During this same period many thousands of farmers have been enabled to buy and own a farm home, and here, too, we find the record of repayment to the Farmers Home Administration is excellent. In other words, we have helped the farmers to help themselves. These programs have both been considered by our committee, and there again it was our problem to determine a reasonable basis on which these programs could be carried forward and the overhead expense kept at a minimum. Already both of these programs have reached the point where more money is paid in each year than is loaned under the loan authorization carried in this bill. We have started similar programs for rural telephones and rural housing, for which the farmers will pay the entire cost.

In this chapter on the appropriations for the Department of Agriculture we deal with the research activities of the Department. Some may think that in view of the present surpluses it is well enough to drop research. Nothing could be further from the truth. The history of the world will show that as nations get old and as land is used through the centuries, in all too many cases diseases that destroy plant life become more prevalent. In our own Nation we have seen the chestnut tree go, the victim of disease. We have the problems of the white pine blister rust and recently oak wilt. The thousand and one diseases that strike at our tree and plant life at the present time must be retarded and if possible controlled. Except for research on the part of the Department and others today we would not be growing wheat in this Nation, but would have to import it, for periodically disease has struck down the wheat which we plant and it is only by the development of resistant varieties that we have been enabled to keep up our production of this important food. The same is true of practically every product which is grown. There is a never-ending fight by the Department and those engaged in agriculture on behalf of the plants which supply us with food and fiber against the diseases which attack and will destroy.

We must ever wage the battle against diseases being brought in from other areas. We are all familiar with the Japanese beetle, brought in years ago from that country on plants imported here. We are in the midst of a fight now to prevent the fruitfly in Hawaii from coming over here and destroying our fruit which is so vital to the well-being of our citizens and which plays a great part in the financial well-being of many areas. Today we are spending millions of dollars in Mexico in an effort to eradicate the foot and mouth disease of cattle which if it ever got started in this country would wipe out the cattle industry. When such industries are wiped out it is not only the farmer in the business who is ruined, but the millions of consumers who are dependent on the farmer for food suffer just as greatly. These problems tend to become more urgent in view of the airplane and the rapid means of travel and the number of planes which move to and from foreign countries. In this bill we also are faced with providing funds to meet the problem of preventing diseases in animals within our own borders and eradicating and preventing diseases which from time to time have threatened to wipe out our food supply. Notable is hog cholera which the Department managed to wipe out years ago, but from time to time new types spring up. We have had the same experience with other animals and I am sure these bureaus could well use more money than is provided in this bill.

If, today, all the cattle we have in this country were the types which our early forefathers had, we would not have half enough meat. The same is true of corn, wheat, hogs, cotton, fruit, and of practically everything connected with agriculture. In our country we take such progress for granted, but behind it is the continual study, research, and experiment led by our splendid Department of Agriculture. Funds must be provided to continue this work. We have in this chapter the farm credit structure so vital to agriculture and the Nation. These agencies are now on a sound basis, but we must provide funds to properly supervise such activities that they will remain in a strong condition. Throughout the consideration of all these various problems which face agriculture and the Nation, our committee has had to try to balance the need against the national financial situation and to try to see not only what the need was but what it appeared that we could afford to spend in meeting these needs. I am sure we have not done a perfect job in that connection but we have made a determined effort to hold down expenditures on the part of this Department, being conscious always of the fact that the entire Nation is dependent upon agriculture for its food and for its future life and that our overall financial condition is dependent upon the well-being of such a large segment of our population.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. PACE. Unfortunately some of the most bitter critics of the farm program today are among the very groups that the gentleman has mentioned which received out of the Treasury between $10,000,000,000 and $12,000,000,000 to bring about an adjustment of industry following the cessation of hostilities. And that is exactly what the Secretary of Agriculture has been trying to do over the past 2 or 3 years at a total loss in the support-price program of less than $500,000,000.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank the gentleman. Unfortunately the statement the gentleman has made is correct as to the sources of many of these complaints. I would like to believe these complaints are made because the people who make them are not informed. I think in most cases that is exactly the case.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I am very glad to hear the gentleman bring out the analogy between the minimum-wage law and what many of us have been fighting for years for on this floor, parity for agriculture. After all, if the minimum wage is fair and just to the laboring man of this Nation certainly nobody should kick about the theory that the farmer is entitled to 100-percent parity for that which he produces.

Mr. WHITTEN. Proceeding further, it has been asked: Why do you not sell your surplus in foreign markets?

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. I wonder if my colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi, would care to say anything about the fact that ECA funds have been used to build up synthetics in France, and this has depleted our cotton market over there.

Mr. WHITTEN. In this connection—and I do not want to appear local and provincial in my handling of this committee—but that is a thing that disturbs me. Last year I was one of two who started out in the Appropriations Committee to reduce our commitments made to ECA through appropriations and was taken severely to task by some of my southern friends on the basis that the ECA said we could reduce the amount of cotton you exported under the ECA. My answer to that was that they spent

only about 5 cents out of a dollar for cotton, that it would be cheaper to give the cotton away than to have them spend 5 cents out of the dollar for it; further, that the record showed that in Italy with ECA aid, rayon and synthetics went up to more than 50 percent above prewar use and cotton was down to 40 percent; and that was done with ECA dollars. But I do not want to get into that. There is no reason but what we have to support the ECA, but it does mean that that is not entirely an agricultural outlet, and it can easily be shown that they have used much of that for the purpose of getting these countries started again rather than as an outlet for our commodities.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman will recall that Mr. Wells testified before our subcommittee. For the information of the House, I may say that Mr. Wells is the chief of the bureau that has to do with economic investigations such as the collection of statistics relative to agriculture. Mr. Wells testified before our subcommittee about 2 years ago, if you recall, to the effect that even in the year 1947 a laboring man paid something like 22 percent of his total earnings, whereas in 1939, prior to the war, that same laboring man with a lesser income paid only 1 percent more; that is in 1939 he paid 23 percent of his total income for food; and, going back 6 or 8 years later, in 1947, his percentage for food had dropped 1 percent.

So I do not think the laboring men can kick.

Mr. WHITTEN. I do not either and I do not want to put these things into a competitive category. I am going to be frank. It is my view they are one and the same, that agriculture is depending on a high income in industry; on the other hand, I think it is a two-way proposition and that industry also has something to do with it.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. May I say that no Member of the House is held in higher esteem than the gentleman from Mississippi and we all appreciate the fine work that he and his committee has done on this agricultural chapter of the general appropriations bill.

Mr. WHITTEN. I appreciate the fine statement of the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to compliment the gentleman from Mississippi for his presentation which has been very interesting and informative. It shows that the gentleman has given deep study and attention to the agricultural problem, and I join with the other members of the committee in thanking him for his very interesting talk.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. I would like to say to the gentleman that I think we all appreciate the fine work that this committee has done. In my experience in the House I do not recall when there has been any antagonism to amount to anything as between the city dweller, or the Members who represent people in this House from city areas, and those from country districts. I think we have had unusually fine support from the city people.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I interrupt the gentleman to say, and I am glad to point this out because my remarks may have been misunderstood, that there has not been better support for the farm program than we have had from the city Members in the Congress. My remarks were directed to the press and certain other people, but not the attitude of the Members of this House, and I appreciate the gentleman giving me an opportunity to clarify that.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. KERR. I call attention to the fact that the farmers of this country are benefiting the whole world under the reciprocal trade agreements in that the farmers of America purchased $28,000,000 of supplies from other nations last year.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I just want to add my remarks of commendation to the statement that the gentleman has made. As a Representative from one of the three or four greatest cities in the land, the city of Los Angeles, Calif., I want to say that I subscribe entirely to what the gentleman has said, particularly in regard to the mutuality of interest of the workers in the cities and the people on the farm, and I realize very deeply the significance of the balancing of the income of the farmer so that he can buy the products of the city worker and the balancing of the income of the city worker to get the purchasing power so that he can buy the products of the farm. I am glad that the gentleman's remarks did include a recognition of the fact that there has been on this matter of agricultural interest almost unanimous support, at least on this side of the aisle, and I am not saying that disparagingly, as well as the other side of the aisle, of those things that are of benefit to the agricultural districts of this country, and we realize that mutuality of interest.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank the gentleman. I want to say that he is one of those that has contributed to that program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

[Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE].

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Chairman, the American farmer is again in the news. But to some he is no longer the hero he was during the war when his all-out production of food and fiber meant the difference between our Nation winning a war or suffering a defeat. Unfortunately, the farmer is now pictured by a few as the tool of the politicians, as a leech on the Federal pay roll. Yes, and I regret to say there is a growing indignation against the American farmer—and all because certain people of our Nation are interested in making political capital out of a difficult situation. In other words, the farmer is becoming the scapegoat for a condition which is not his fault.

Yet amid it all, the farmer continues his daily chores from sunup to sundown to provide our Nation of 150,000,000 people with food and fiber—products without which they could not survive.

It is unfortunate that some of our leaders cannot rise above their bickerings and concentrate with sincere interest on doing something constructive for the America farmer and his family.

A lot is happening to the American farmer today. He is in an insecure position, and he knows it. He can still remember the 1930's. He does not know from one day to the next what to expect in the way of agricultural programing. He does not know if there will be a reasonable market for his crops next fall. Besides that, as an annual worry because of the vagaries of weather, drought, and disease, he is not sure that he will have a crop by harvesting time. He figures that if things break reasonably well, he can get back his expenses with a little extra for his labor. He hopes that this little extra will be enough to give his family a reasonable standard of living for another year, at least until the next harvest comes around.

All of this does not mean that we have failed to help our farmers. Congress has done a great deal in recent years for the farm families of this country. We can be proud of the help we have given. We have gone far in providing farmers many of the same opportunities which those who live in our cities enjoy. There has been some questioning of why our State and Federal Governments have had to take the lead in providing these opportunities. I believe, however, that anyone who understands the business of farming realizes that some group—and in this case it was the State and Federal Governments—had to assure the responsibility of making these opportunities available to our farm people.

We have been able to do much in the matter of better educational facilities for our farmers. The State and Federal extension services jointly are carrying out their programs of getting the latest findings of research and other agricultural information to our farmers through their county agents and other extension employees. Without question all of us have benefited from this great

program. It should be expanded and encouraged.

We have also benefited as a result of our soil and water conservation programs, better credit for our farmers, rural electrification, better rural roads, and our vocational agricultural programs. We have gained, too, by our crop price support programs. Farmers have had a reasonable purchasing power to buy the products produced in our cities by labor and industry. We know well the damage which reduced farmer-purchasing power has on city employment. In addition, we have had more good food costing less of our income than ever before.

Among many fine programs, there is one which is doing and can do much in helping both our farmers and our Nation out of our present difficult agricultural situation. That is our soil conservation district program. To some, soil conservation may seem of little consequence at this time other than conserving what good land we have left. We should recognize, however, that the type of conservation work being done by soil conservation district cooperators does more than primarily save our land resources. It is a long range program. It not only enables a farmer to diversify his production by putting his eggs into many baskets instead of one, but it also enables him to reduce the cost of production per-acre, per-bale, and per-bushel, and so on. I believe that modern conservation farming reduces the problem of surplus crops without destroying farmer income more than any other individual program now being carried on by our farmers. It is a boon to the security of our farm families, and passes along many benefits to every family of the Nation.

A survey conducted among 618 soil conservation district cooperators in Arkansas revealed that as a result of applying their soil conservation district farm conservation plans these farmers in the last few years have reduced their acreage of corn nearly 16 percent and their acreage of cotton more than 19 percent. When these conservation farm plans help reduce acreage of crops which are in surplus, every segment of the population gains. But this type of conservation farming does even more. These farmers also increased their acreage of hay and pasture 54 percent on the average in the same period. Numbers of dairy cows increased 70 percent, beef cows 178 percent, and feeders 154 percent. As can be seen by this, modern conservation farming not only reduces the acreage of crops which are in surplus, but also enables the farmer to maintain or better his income by increasing his production of beef and timber crops which our Nation has in relatively short supply.

If every acre of farmland in this country were being cropped according to the way it could be used best economically and permanently, our surplus problems would be far less than they are now; and less than they promise to be in the next 2 years. In fact, proper land use is the No. 1 job that soil conservation districts are undertaking. This is not necessarily because of the surplus problem, but rather because proper use of every acre is also the basic job in bringing to a stop the loss of our soil and water resources.

Through our soil conservation district programs, farmers throughout the Nation are well under way in reducing their acreage of cultivated land on the average by more than 9 percent, increasing their acreage of permanent hay nearly 150 percent, pasture or range 15 percent, and woodland crops nearly 5 percent.

But with proper use of our land, there is also the job of treating each acre with the various other soil and water conservation practices to aid in the fight against erosion and loss to our water resources. To do these jobs properly takes more than guesswork. It takes a careful study of such factors as the slope of the land, type of soil, precipitation, degree of erosion, and other land and water factors. Such information has now been inventoried on more than 300,000,000 acres of our Nation, and is being obtained at the rate of about 30,000,000 acres a year in our national soil conservation program.

Modern conservation farming is also helpful to farmers because it reduces operational costs. Friends of soil conservation believe that it is cheaper to farm the conservation way. There is less loss of seed, fertilizer, and productive soil that uncontrolled run-off carries away with it, they contend. Fewer crops are washed out and destroyed. Fewer gullies means less breakage of equipment. Farming on the contour takes less gas and oil for the tractors; there is less wear—all of which costs money. The end result is less expense and thus a greater net income for the farmer and his family.

These are but a few of the major reasons why our national soil conservation district program has moved ahead so rapidly. When we realize that this program enables farmers to take full responsibility and leadership in soil and water conservation, it is no wonder that the program holds such an important place in farming. More than 2,200 of these districts have been organized in the United States. They cover more than four-fifths of our farmland. I am naturally proud that Arkansas was the first of the 48 States to pass legislation enabling farmers to organize these districts as legal parts of their State government, and is now practically 92 percent covered by districts.

We hear a lot of talk and read a lot these days about the so-called threat of Federal dictation and regimentation in national farm programs—and what it will do to destroy the farm family as such. Those who fear such a development should very definitely give attention and support to the soil conservation district movement devised by the Congress for the Federal Government to help farmers with their problems and yet leave the full administration of the program completely in the hands of the farmers themselves. Our farm programs must be kept in the hands of the farmers themselves. As you know, the contribution of the Federal Government to the farmers in this conservation program is through the Soil Conservation Service which assigns conservation technicians to these districts to help farmers with their conservation problems. This is only done, however, when the soil conservation district supervisors request such assistance. These technicians are well trained in the art of soil and water conservation. But even though the Federal Government furnishes this help of the Soil Conservation Service, the district farmer-supervisors themselves actually administer all phases of their soil and water conservation programs with the farmers of the district. The farmers themselves are in control at the district level.

In other words, the farmers have this program under their own control—as any farm program should be. They are assuming their rightful responsibility in bringing a stop to the wasteful erosion and loss of valuable water resources of this Nation.

As a member of the Public Works Committee of the House, I have had a special opportunity to learn the importance of soil conservation districts and soil and water conservation in our national flood control operations. Flood control to many means dams, reservoirs, and other large constructions on the lower part of our rivers. Effective flood control is much more than that, however. It begins where the rains fall and runoff starts. It involves many conservation measures to get maximum absorption of rainfall, and the construction of storage basins and detention reservoirs in the upper reaches of the watershed. This is where approximately 75 percent of all flood damages occur, along the headwater tributaries where soil erosion and runoff are excessive. If left uncontrolled, this eroded soil soon becomes sediment in our river channels, thus reducing their water carrying capacity. Reservoirs also soon become useless because of sedimentation. The storage capacity of these reservoirs is being damaged at the rate of $50,000,000 each year because of this sedimentation.

We are especially cognizant of this in Arkansas because, primarily, of various forward-thinking associations and organizations such as our conservation districts and the river valley associations in the State whose leaders and members understand our soil conservation and flood-control problems and are getting the facts before the people. Such groups as the Keep Arkansas Green Association, Friends of the Land, and other business, civic, professional, and social organizations also have done much to support our soil conservation district work and to spread the gospel of soil and water conservation. Our flood-control results would be negligible were it not for this teamwork.

The Nation is awakening to the reasons why it is important for everyone to put his shoulder to this conservation wheel, and why we must continue to recognize and support the two most basic factors in agriculture—the farm family itself, and the conservation of our soil and water resources. More and more this modern conservation is receiving widespread support because it means the conservation of our land resources, a better income for our farmers, a better balanced

agricultural production, fewer crop surpluses, and relief from heavy expenditures in our crop-price support program without it being at the entire expense of the farmer himself.

Add to this most valuable soil conservation district program the accomplishments being made in better farm credit, better rural roads, rural electrification, and the educational programs of our State colleges and our State universities and we see a better way of life and a higher standard of living for the farm families of our Nation—which is a direct objective of most of our Federal farm programing. All of them make the farm a better place to live, a better life for our youngsters who will carry on where we leave off.

It is therefore essential that we never lose sight of the real objectives of our national farm programing—and strive continuously to see that everything we do in agricultural legislation will in some way add to the accomplishment of these objectives and not to their destruction.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER].

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, no nation is stronger than its natural resources. We must never forget that simple, basic fact. If the United States is to maintain world leadership, if we are to be prepared for any emergency, we must be sure that our natural resources are constantly increasing rather than dwindling.

I wish to call your attention to our forest lands. I want to raise the question as to whether a dollar spent on these forest lands today may not be returned to us manyfold. I should like to consider whether a stringent economy in the protection, management, and use of our forests may not be very short-sighted indeed—whether it does not actually impair our national strength.

In the United States, we have approximately 624,000,000 acres of forest land. Three-fourths of this land is privately owned. The other fourth is in public ownership.

By and large, our total forest resources are on the downgrade. Each year three trees of saw timber size are being cut or destroyed for every two that are being grown. Fire, insects, and disease are taking their toll. The quality and size of our timber are deteriorating. Large areas that could grow good timber now have only low-grade hardwoods or scrub growth.

Let us look back to World War II for a moment. From 1941 to 1945 inclusive, we used an average of 36,800,000,000 board feet of timber each year. We reached a peak of 43,800,000,000 board feet in 1942. We were able to produce this much lumber by importing some of it from Canada and by drawing heavily on our lumber stock piles.

What would our lumber needs be in the event of another emergency? Possibly nobody knows exactly, but it is almost certain they would be considerably higher than they were in World War II. I think we should bear this in mind.

I am distressed to see that the appropriation bill, as it now stands, carries a cut in funds for most of the protection, management and use programs for our national forests.

On these national forests we have about 600,000,000,000 board feet of saw timber, or about 30 percent of the Nation's total volume of saw timber. Many sawmills and communities are dependent on national forests.

The yearly cut of timber from national forests, on a sustained yield basis, now runs around 4,000,000,000 board feet. If we had more access roads to remote areas, this timber yield could be increased by at least 50 percent. Many trees in these remote areas are over mature. They should be harvested. It is a good dollars-and-cents investment.

Reforestation is needed on some 3,000,000 acres of national forest land. Most of this land was cut over or burned over before it became a part of the national forest, but it will never be very productive unless it is replanted. An additional million acres is so poorly stocked that fill-in planting is needed.

The same thing applies to grazing land in national forests. From three to four million acres need reseeding. The demand for grazing priviliges exceeds the available range, and we should do everything possible to see that our national forests produce more forage for livestock.

National forests protect the watersheds. The provide water for power and for the use of farmers and city people. More than half of the total stream flow in the 11 westernmost States, for example, comes from national forests.

Consider the matter of recreation. Last year, 5,000,000 Americans went to the national forests to hunt or fish. More than 26,000,000 Americans who wanted to enjoy the glories of nature went to the national forests to camp overnight, picnic, climb mountains, enjoy winter sports—or just to relax.

These are important values, I think, even if we cannot measure them in money terms.

Instead of cutting appropriations for national forests, we actually need to increase them. We should have more adequate fire protection. We need more access roads. We should replant range and forest land at a faster rate. For better management, we need to acquire some lands within national forests that are not now under public ownership.

I am not asking for an amendment to the appropriation bill. I do believe, however, that we should support any increases recommended by the Senate and that the House conferees should go along with the Senate increases.

Money spent now for the improvement of our national forests is a guaranty of our future strength and security.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I have been very much interested in the rural telephone program. May I say to the committee while it has not given the rural telephone program as much money as many of us think that organization might well use, I know that the United States Treasury is not inexhaustible and I recognize that the committee was torn with the problem of trying to be fair to the taxpayers and at the same time to provide adequately for these needed programs. I wish that it might have been possible to have provided at least $50,000,000 for telephone loans. I think that with less it is going to be impossible to meet much of the need for loans. I understand that REA now has applications pending which ask for more than $50,000,000. So far loans are being made to practically no one except existing companies. I fear that it is rather unfair to the local cooperatives who have, under the terms of the amendment put on the basic legislation last fall, had to wait a year to present their applications, to be told that they cannot expect to even get their applications considered.

If I had my way I would provide more money for telephone loans. I fear that without it many Members of Congress as well as rural citizens are going to unfairly blame the REA for its inability to provide the needed loans. On the other hand the committee had a hard job and I have no disposition to condemn. I know that every member has tried to do a fair job.

I am especially disturbed about administrative funds. It appears at least possible that the wording of the report might limit the Administrator of REA to the expenditure of $900,000 in administering the rural telephone program.

I am afraid that that would greatly hamper the program and if it did not hamper the program it would result in loose administration which might mean a loss to the Government of the United States. I wish the chairman would explain to us whether it is the intention of the committee that the entire $8,150,000 that is made available to REA for administrative purposes may be used for the rural telephone program if need be?

Mr. WHITTEN. I would like to say to the gentleman that the funds for the administration of REA and the rural telephones are carried in one figure in the bill. Insofar as the intent of the committee, it is that the employees in either ageney can be used to meet the needs of the rural telephones with the understanding that if used on rural telephones that their charges would be charged up to rural telephones. And, I would like to add this, too, that in recent years there seems to be a whole lot of argument as to who is the father of REA, and so that there will be no argument in the years to come as to who is the father of rural telephones, the gentleman from Texas is the father of the rural-telephone program.

Mr. POAGE. I thank the gentleman for his generous statement. I am proud to have had a part in the rural-telephone legislation but it became law only because a majority of the Members of this House supported it. I understand the Chairman to say that if the Administrator, in carrying out the REA program, finds that he needs to use a man maybe for 2 weeks on the telephone program and maybe for 2 weeks on the electric program, that it is not the intention in this appropriation bill to say that that man must be assigned to only one job, and

that it is not intended that when any specific amount, whether it be $900,000 or some other amount, is being used in telephone work, if it is still within the total appropriation, that the REA cannot do any more for telephones, but it is intended that the limit is all over for all of the work of the REA—that is, it is for electric and telephone work combined.

Mr. WHITTEN. That is my understanding.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. I want to say that it was brought to our attention many times that the prophecy that the gentleman made when the rural-telephone bill was on the House floor, that it would automatically extend more lines into the immediate area where they could be served, has already come about, and it is very encouraging to us.

Mr. POAGE. While it is my understanding that there have only been six loans made up to yesterday, I think there have been many thousands of rural telephones already connected that would never have been connected had it not been for the Congress making this loan program available. The more rural phones the private companies will provide the less the Government will need to loan. It is telephone service we want.

Mr. HORAN. That was our observation.

Mr. POAGE. I thank the gentleman. He has been most helpful in the fight to get this program going. I know that had he and his committee felt that it was possible they would have provided more money.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STIGLER].

(Mr. STIGLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Chairman, after approximately 2 months of hearings, the House Appropriations Subcommittee for the Department of Agriculture concluded its deliberations and marked up the bill. During these hearings more than 250 witnesses were heard including representatives from the Department, Members of Congress, and the public. With few exceptions, not a single witness asked that we reduce appropriations, but practically all urged increased funds for this or that agency, depending on where their interests lay. This made our task extremely difficult and most trying.

Before discussing some of the various items which make up the Agriculture appropriation bill, I wish to state that this is my second year on this subcommittee and I continue to find it a source of rich and new experiences. It has been a genuine pleasure to work with the other members of the subcommittee.

I doubt, Mr. Chairman, if any committee could have a more capable, conscientious, fearless, and experienced chairman than we have in the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN]. He has a great grasp of agricultural economics. I have found his attitude quite sympathetic, yet his inquisitive and investigative mind always demands a full exploration of all subject matters which come before our committee. I want to take this occasion to salute this great friend of agriculture and publicly express my own appreciation for the privilege of serving with him on this great committee.

I, too, would pay tribute to my other colleagues on this committee: Messrs. KRUSE, of Indiana; ANDERSEN, of Minnesota; and HORAN, of Washington. My association with these gentlemen last year was extremely pleasant but as time goes by that association becomes more delightful as one witnesses their deep understanding of the problems of agriculture. In all our deliberations, I never heard any word of partisanship uttered by any member of our committee.

I cannot let this opportunity go by without paying well-deserved praise to our executive-committee clerk, Mr. Ross Pope. This is his first year with us, but his splendid assistance enabled us to report out such a well-balanced bill as we did.

The bill came to us with a budget-approved request of direct appropriations totaling $806,278,446, as compared with $731,328,607 for the fiscal year 1950, or a net increase of $32,704,094, but a decrease in the 1951 budget estimate of $42,245,745.

Last year Congress appropriated for the present fiscal year the sum of $731,328,607. For 1951 we recommended $722,077,690 plus the following:

Salary increases (Public Laws 359 and 429)	$6,568,000
Capital improvements (nonrecurring):	
Improvement and acquisition of preperty for operating purposes	690,450
Flood-control and water conservation projects	1,915,000
New programs approved last session of Congress:	
Reforestation and fire protection	1,275,000
Rural telephone	600,000
Farm housing	550,000
Expanded activities based on prior commitments:	
Conservation and use of agriculture land resources	25,456,561
Federal crop insurance	1,800,000
Other new programs:	
Acreage allotments and marketing quotas	2,100,000
Soil-conservation operations	1,000,000
Total increases	41,955,011

The amount recommended in this bill represents a decrease of $9,250,917 as compared with 1950 appropriations after taking into consideration the mandatory increases as stated above. If 1950 supplements totaling $7,085,000 are taken into consideration, the total reduction in the 1950 programs on a comparative basis is in excess of $16,300,000. To cover the new and expanded programs for which Congress provided last year, there is provided $41,955,011, which makes a total in this bill for direct appropriations of $764,032,701.

As was further pointed out in our report, "direct annual appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for each of the 3 years preceding the last war were in excess of $1,000,000,000. The amount appropriated in 1940 was $1,543,000,000, more than double the amount for 1951 carried in this bill."

When we began marking up our bill, item by item, we were faced with the unpleasant fact that our Government has a $256,000,000,000 national debt and is now engaged in deficit spending which will exceed $5,000,000,000 by the end of this fiscal year. We were also faced with the fact that in addition to providing the necessary money to cover essentials in the regularly established agencies of the Department of Agriculture, we were confronted with various new laws which Congress previously passed authorizing expenditures of new money for new projects. For instance, last year, Congress passed the Housing Act of 1949. The budget allowed $25,000,000 for loans in 1950, which amount is to be borrowed from the Secretary of Treasury and $50,000,000 for 1951; $2,000,000 in grants and loans for 1950 and $5,000,000 for 1951; and approximately $3,000,000 for salaries and expenses and operational purposes for 1950 and approximately $5,000,000 for 1951. Our committee approved $35,000,000 for housing for 1951; $2,000,000 for grants and loans and $3,550,000 for salaries and expenses and operational purposes.

On June 25, 1949, the Forest Resources Survey Act was approved and an increase in the sum of $402,000 was allowed by the Budget for 1951 for forest resources investigations.

The reforestation and revegetation law of the Forest Service was approved October 11, 1949, and was allowed an increase of $870,000 by the budget for reforestation and $510,000 for revegetation; in addition the sum of $1,000,000 was allowed for cooperation of States in reforestation matters. Our committee allowed $350,000 for reforestation, $200,000 for revegetation, and $224,600 for cooperation with States.

Congress also amended the Federal Crop Insurance Act. It was approved August 24, 1949, and the Budget approved an increase in the sum of $2,396,000 to carry out the terms of this act. Our committee approved $1,800,000.

The sum of $25,000,000 was approved by the budget for loans in borrowing authorizations for farm ownership and water facilities on reclamation projects. We allowed $24,000,000, being a decrease of $1,000,000 below the budget estimate.

In order to carry out the proposed programs of the Department of Agriculture, we were asked to provide money for 2,600 additional employees. With the money at hand this was impossible as well as complying with some other Budget requests.

During our hearings I was convinced that practically all the projects administered by the Department of Agriculture are worthy and most desirable for our folks. But at the same time, I could not help but be appalled over the amount of money requested to carry the projects through. Therefore, in our conclusions we endeavored to put first things first

and distribute the money to those departments and different projects which we considered absolutely necessary to a balanced economy. In so doing we endeavored to keep in mind a statement that has been made many, many times in the past, that as our farmers prosper so does our Nation.

The time allotted me in discussing this bill forbids a discussion of each item, all of which are important to agriculture as a whole. I shall, therefore confine the balance of my remarks to some of the testimony of Secretary of Agriculture Charles Brannan.

The Secretary pointed out that last year the farmer had less than four-fifths as much as in 1947 and next year he may have only two-thirds as much as in 1947. Since 1947 gross farm-cash income has fallen more than $2,000,000,000 and the cash expenses have gone up by more than $1,000,000,000.

Last year, he said, the farm operators had about $14,000,000,000 after paying production expenses. This was 15 percent less than they had in 1948 and at least 20 percent less than in 1947.

We were also told the farm-family purchasing power, in terms of 1947 dollars dropped about $2,000,000,000 in 1948 and about $2,000,000,000 more in 1949. It could drop another $2,000,000,000 in 1950 or another 15 percent if farm prices are not improved. Farm living expenses are not coming down as fast as net income. Carrying charges on debt and taxes are increasing and farm debts are going up.

This paints a very dismal picture to me, and looking behind these general trends an even more distressing picture is projected on the screen of our vision. It cannot be denied that most of our farm people have been in the Nation's low-income group. The Secretary pointed out that we were recently reminded by the subcommittee of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report that in 1948, 3,300,000 families—about one-half of all the families living on farms—had money incomes of less than $2,000, and that one-fourth of all the farm families has less than $1,000, and these are not per capita figures. Instead, they represent family cash incomes, or estimates of actual dollars available for purchasing of nonfarm goods and services, for savings and for paying debts. It was further pointed out that most commodities today are bringing less than parity, and parity ratio is now less than 100; that while farm income has gone down more than 20 percent since 1947, the personal incomes of nonfarm people has gone up 10 percent. Moreover, at the same time, per capita food consumption has declined during the same period.

This picture, as I stated, is not very bright, but it would even be worse were it not for the Federal price-support program. Even with all the criticism which has been leveled at our farmers in some of the newspapers, by news commentators and others, may I say to you had it not been for the cushion which the Commodity Credit Corporation used, the shock of declining farm prices would have been greater and, in my judgment, we would have been headed for the greatest depression this country has ever witnessed.

There are many people in our land today who for good reasons of their own do not agree with Secretary Brannan's plan with reference to agriculture. But, after listening to him testify before our committee the past 2 years, one must be impressed with the fact that he has a wealth of information relative to agricultural economics and is endeavoring to place those ideas into a plan of operation. I doubt if anyone is completely satisfied with the present farm-support program. I know I am not, especially when it comes to surpluses. But, I am convinced that with the great reservoir of knowledge and information the Secretary has relative to agriculture, some satisfactory and permanent solution will be found ultimately which will be far better than the plan we have now, and will insure a fair return to the farmer for the commodities he produces.

[Mr. HORAN addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. KRUSE].

Mr. KRUSE. Mr. Chairman, the hour is late, and I wish to make only a few comments relative to the bill before us today and relative in particular to the work of our committee.

I believe I would be remiss in my duty here if I did not pay tribute to the chairman of our committee. It has been a privilege and a pleasure for me to have served under the direction of our able chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN]. I also wish to commend the other members of our subcommittee.

I come from an agricultural and industrial area, so I am well familiar with the cross-currents of criticism that are being particularly leveled at the farmers of this country. I wish that all Americans who indulge in such criticism could read the speech our able chairman delivered here on the floor of the House today.

I believe that much of the present criticism of our agricultural program is unfounded, while at the same time I certainly recognize that it is not perfect. Most certainly our present agricultural policies and programs must be continually reviewed and in many respects changed or corrected. I am convinced, however, that much of the criticism today is due to a lack of understanding or knowledge as to the costs of and the manner in which our present program operates. For example, I would like to point out that the bill before us today provides less than half of the amount appropriated for this same program in prewar 1940; it is also significant to note that the price-support programs operated by the Commodity Credit Corporation have cost the American people the approximate sum of $1,000,000,000 during the past 10 years, far less than the amounts spent following the war in enabling industry to reconvert to peacetime operation. Agriculture is very much interrelated to the rest of our economy, and our investment in agriculture is justified by virtue of its contribution to the over-all economy. The continued conservation of our natural resources is vital to the continued welfare of our Nation.

One thing I have learned since serving as a member of our subcommittee is that agriculture is basic. The problem is not political. Our country would rue the day if politics became the dominant factor in our consideration of such an important and basic question. I know that at no time has politics ever entered into our discussions while our committee has been in session, either this year or last year. I think that is the greatest tribute that can be paid to the individual Members.

There is considerable talk about economy these days. Since I have been here I think I have followed as independent a course of action as any Member of the Congress. I have never hesitated to oppose the administration if I thought they were wrong. I have voted against some of the large spending programs that have brought before us in the past year and a half, and I will continue doing so in the future if I am convinced they are not in the best interests of the country, but I know that much of the criticism directed toward Government spending today is ill-timed and also is founded upon an erroneous conception of what we are doing with the money, and a notable lack of understanding of how our Government operates.

Not too many people seem to realize that about 70 to 75 percent of all our expenditures today are related directly to past wars or presently disordered world conditions. Some people criticize the relatively insignificant expenditures for our agricultural economy, when they constitute but a very, very small percentage of our over-all expenditures.

I believe one of the greatest services the average Member of Congress can perform to the people whom he represents, in addition to representing them with a sense of integrity, is to help clear up some of these misconceptions.

I wish to again say at this point that I am as concerned about mounting governmental expenditures as is any Member of this House, and I have on frequent occasions been highly critical of various proposed expenditures and also of new legislation which would inevitably entail enormous expenditures in the future. However, indiscriminate and ill-timed criticism does not contribute to a constructive solution of the problem; surely it is far better that we apply ourselves continuously in an intelligent and enlightened manner and then take that action at all times that is in the best interests of our Nation as a whole.

I think our bill this year is a good bill. It was significant that much of the increase in the bill in certain specific items was due to new legislation. Therein lies one of the big problems so far as cutting down on expenditures in the future is concerned.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KRUSE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Is it not a fact that had it not been for the new

legislation which the Congress adopted last year we could have brought in a bill considerably under the present figure? In fact, we could have shown quite a saving under 1950.

Mr. KRUSE. That is very true.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KRUSE. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. I want to congratulate the gentleman on the sincerity of his approach and his devotion to his assignment as a member of this committee.

Mr. KRUSE. I thank the gentleman very much. Mr. Chairman, in connection with my remarks concerning the need for further economy in Government, I should like to call to the attention of the Members of the House the following editorial from a recent issue of the Fort Wayne Journal-Gazette. The editorial reads as follows:

CONGRESS MUST DO ITS DUTY

Congress is one of the three separate and distince branches of the American Government.

Congress is elected by the people and is answerable only to the people.

Therefore, it cannot evade its responsibility for what goes on in Washington.

People say Washington is a far-flung, loose-jointed network of bureaucracies, and it is.

People say Federal taxes are too high, and they are.

People say public expenditures run rampant, and they do.

If these things are true, and they are, Congress has not done its duty to the public.

No dollar can be spent by the Government which has not been authorized by Congress.

No tax can be levied which Congress does not approve.

No bureaucrat can be paid unless Congress votes the money.

The fact is that a majority of Senators and Representatives are too responsive to the pressure of minorities which are bent on making raids on the Federal Treasury. Many Congressmen have formed the annoying and expensive habit of talking economy out of one side of their mouths, while voting for increased expenditures out of the other side of the same mouths.

The trick then is to pass the buck to the executive department which may have requested a bloated budget. The executive department must and does face its share of the blame, but that does not clear the skirts of Congress.

The President proposes. Congress disposes. The President may recommend. He cannot legislate. The power to legislate under our Constitution is invested solely in the House and the Senate.

The American people have been alarmed for years by the overgrowth of boards and commissions in the National Capital. They have talked against it. They have adopted resolutions against it. But the increase of bureaucracy has been accelerated—all because the people's duly elected Representatives in Congress have failed to stand up to their responsibility.

(Mr. KRUSE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART].

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I wish to speak briefly on the item for emergency control of insects by the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine.

The Appropriations Committee leveled some very serious charges at this agency in connection with its operations in the grasshopper eradication campaign last year. As a result of the committee's investigations, the Commission made very sizable reductions in the amounts requested by the Bureau.

While I praise the committee in its efforts for economy, the fact remains that the sums appropriated in the recent deficiency bill and recommended for appropriation in this measure are not adequate to control a grasshopper plague of the proportions we now expect in Montana and Wyoming.

Terrific destruction of crops and ranges are in prospect if the hoppers are not controlled this spring, before they have a chance to spread over the countryside. It is a job that the local people cannot do alone. Far the larger share of the land involved is in Federal ownership. It is a Federal responsibility not only to prevent grasshopper destruction of the range it owns, but also to control grasshoppers so that they will not spread to the adjacent land in private ownership. The ranchers and farmers in the area have a right to expect that the Government will take care of its own problem, and they also wish to have Federal assistance on a 50–50 basis for the campaign against hoppers on State, county, and private lands.

The original Bureau request for $3,523,000 for this spring's work was cut by the Budget Bureau to $2,200,000 and further reduced to $1,000,000 in the urgent deficiency bill. The Bureau also requested $2,500,000 for 1951 which is cut to $850,000 in the pending bill.

These amounts I fear will not be adequate for the work ahead. I am told that a supplemental request may soon be submitted for additional funds for this spring's work, and I hope it will have the speedy attention of the Congress. I also hope that a suitable adjustment will be made for the 1951 fiscal year.

At this point I wish to include in my remarks an expression of concern from the county commissioners of six counties in northeast Montana. A similar situation is in prospect in southeast Montana and in Wyoming.

RESOLUTION REQUESTING EMERGENCY GRASSHOPPER FUNDS

Whereas a severe infestation of grasshoppers, both local and migratory, is expected; and

Whereas most of the present infestation comes from migration of hoppers from other States; and

Whereas county funds have been exhausted during the severe winter and farmers have come through a long, expensive winter; and

Whereas last year's crops were short as a result of drought and grasshopper damage. There is no money or foreseeable method of grasshopper control for the six northeast Montana counties; and

Whereas more than one-third of the land in these counties is State or Federal owned and not taxed by the various counties; and

Whereas the Bureau of Entomology program has been explained and little or no assistance can be expected from them from presently appropriated funds. Federal funds are needed because farmers do not have money for spraying crops and spraying is not effective when crops begin to ripen and/or dry out.

Whereas the State leaders of 16 Western States, at their annual meeting in November 1949 based their estimate of need at $3,523,000 for grasshopper and Mormon cricket control in 1950, upon the known facts as of that date. No new facts have been established to reduce these estimates. The State leaders reaffirm that the original estimate was based upon facts determined by sound survey methods. Therefore, to do the job properly, the full amount requested is still needed: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the county commissioners of these six northeast Montana counties at a joint meeting in Wolf Point, Mont., April 17, 1950, That emergency funds in the amount of $500,000 be made available to the Bureau of Entomology to assist in fighting the severe expected infestation of grasshoppers in our area. We request an additional $350,000 to be allotted for Fort Peck Indian Agency and other Federal lands within these six counties, for the purchase and spreading of bait for control of hoppers, which we understand are Federal responsibilities.

The funds which we request for private lands will be matched on a 50–50 basis through obtaining, mixing, distributing, and spreading baits.

To be of any value in coping with the grasshopper emergency in this area funds should be available not later than May 15, 1950.

F. H. Danielson, Henry Walder, Sheridan County; Harry Bummer, Thomas Throndson, Harvey Wagar, Daniels County; George Eckhoff, Donald W. Pentre, Richland County; Floyd Davis, John Breitbach, McCone County; Stanley Nees, C. H. Peterson, Roosevelt County; Roy A. Biddle, Valley County.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, may I say to the gentleman apparently there is some misinformation and misapprehension with regard to the handling of this program to which the gentleman has addressed his remarks. The action of the committee in fixing the amount of money in the next fiscal year was not intended to include the program for next year. I am sure the gentleman is familiar with the problems we have had in connection with the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine in this year's report. The committee felt we ought to let them have the money this year, which came in a supplemental bill, and see what they do with it before we fix the amount for next year. So far as the committee is concerned it is the intention to bring them in next spring rather than to provide for them in this bill. I just want the gentleman to know that there was no desire to cut the heart out of the work. They are on trial. I think they invited that, but we expect to be fair with them.

Mr. D'EWART. May I state that I read the committee report carefully and I sympathize with the committee. I am sure that if the results as they appear later in the spring show that there is a need for more funds in grasshopper control they will be forthcoming. I am sure the committee realizes that and will take care of the situation at the proper time. I thank the gentleman very much.

(Mr. HESELTON (at the request of Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, at this time I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the remarks I made during general debate on April 5 beginning at page 4829 with reference to the provision in the committee bill, page 193, authorizing the Department of Agriculture to pay out of section 32 funds transportation and handling charges on surplus commodities owned by the Department or any of its instrumentalities or agencies for the purpose of distribution to public-welfare agencies. You will find that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] to whom great credit is due for sponsoring this important provision, discussed it with me and said he felt that the provision needed broadening considerably. Both he and I agreed that we could not conceive that any Member of this body would assume the terrific responsibility of objecting to such a provision which attempts to make available these gigantic quantities of surplus perishable products to the people in America who need that food.

I then placed in the RECORD two versions of amendments which could be considered. After consultation with a number of my colleagues and consideration of other comparable legislation including the conference report on the disposition of surplus potatoes, now a law, section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, and the provision in the ECA Act, I have decided that the second of the two proposals is best adapted to accomplish the purposes I believe the great majority of us have in mind. For the benefit of my colleagues I want the language of this amendment which I shall propose readily available. It is as follows:

Page 193, line 18, strike out lines 18 through 24 inclusive, and insert "In order to prevent the waste of food commodities acquired through price-support operations which are found to be in danger of loss through deterioration or spoilage before they can be disposed of in normal domestic channels without impairment of the price-support program, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Commodity Credit Corporation are authorized and directed to make available such commodities as follows in the order of priority set forth: First, to school-lunch programs, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and Federal, State, and local tax-supported institutions, such as hospitals, orphanages, schools, penal and mental institutions, and public-welfare organizations for the assistance of needy Indians and other needy persons; second, to private-welfare organizations for the assistance of needy persons within the United States; third, to private-welfare organizations for the assistance of needy persons outside the United States; fourth, to intergovernmental or international nonprofit welfare agencies, for assistance to needy persons outside the United States. The Secretary of Agriculture shall first determine that such commodities are in ample supply over and above such reserves as may be required and deemed in the public interest. The Secretary of Agriculture and the Corporation shall make any such commodities available at no cost at point of use within the United States or at shipside at port of embarkation. The Secretary and the Corporation may pay as against handling and transportation costs in making delivery up to the equivalent of 6 months' storage costs on any such commodities turned over: *Provided*, That no transportation or handling charges shall be incurred by the Commodity Credit Corporation or Department of Agriculture if in so doing it would lower the total amount of agricultural commodities acquired by any institution or organization through the normal channels of trade and commerce."

Finally, I want to call attention to the tabulation which I placed in the RECORD that day of the items of food which could be immediately used, their cost, the comparable carrying charges for fiscal 1949 and the first half of fiscal 1950. This should be considered in connection with the more recent reports of heavily increased purchases as well as the announcement of the Department yesterday that all loans must be paid or the collateral, that is these surplus food commodities, would be taken over. I attempted today to get exact information from the Department as to the quantities now on hand but I was unable to get anything specific. I shall try again tomorrow morning to develop this but I have serious doubts that there is information available in any form which accurately reflects the amount of food being stored at the continuing heavy expense to the American taxpayer and at the very real risk of spoilage, if that has not been the case in large measure up to now. I can conclude in no better way than to quote from a memorandum prepared by the Friends Committee on National Legislation following a 10-day seminar from January 31 to February 10 of farmers from 18 States on the question "What could and should American agriculture do for a hungry world?" I quote:

The important thing is that food or agricultural products paid for by the American taxpayer should not be allowed to spoil, be eaten by rats, or be destroyed. It should actually get into peoples' mouths at home or abroad.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL].

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, today I take the floor to call the attention of this House to the plight of 20,000 Endicott-Johnson shoe workers in the triple cities area, if certain proposals to lower tariffs now being made by our State Department become the law of the land.

From a recent answer I had from the Secretary of State to an inquiry I made, I quote the following:

A proposal to eliminate the use of American selling price is being considered in connection with possible legislation, which it is expected will be submitted to Congress by the Treasury Department in the near future.

Mr. Chairman, during the past week, I have received the greatest mass protest in the mail from the Endicott-Johnson workers and their friends of any I have ever witnessed since I have served in Congress.

A whole table in my office is weighed down by a tremendous pile of more than 20,000 penny post cards, signed personally by each worker, and addressed to me with the following exhortation:

As a resident of the triple cities area and an Endicott-Johnson worker, I am opposed to any reduction in existing tariffs on imports of rubber-soled canvas and waterproof rubber footwear. Such reduction may come through negotiations under the reciprocal-trade program or through enactment of a proposed bill to revise administrative procedures of the Bureau of Customs which calls for the elimination of the American selling-price principle for assessment of duty on certain items, including canvas and waterproof rubber footwear. I regard any reduction in tariffs on canvas and waterproof rubber footwear as an economic threat to the community in which I live and therefore of a most serious threat to my own security.

I would like to have brought these cards into the well of this House to display to the membership. However, such a vast bulk as 20,000 post cards packaged together would have made it impossible to carry. Nevertheless if any would care to see this gigantic expression from patriotic American workers, I will be pleased to show them if you will come to my office.

Supported by such intense enthusiasm and demands for action, I cannot remain silent longer upon the subject of the State Department's proposal to abolish the American selling-price principle in relation to regulating duties on imported rubber-soled shoes.

According to the many statements from those who know the rubber-footwear industry in my section, to abolish the American selling price as a basis for figuring the amount of duty on rubber footwear sent from Japan or from behind the iron curtain, will flood our country with shoes of such low value, that our high standards and wages will collapse and our rubber-footwear industries will be put out of business.

As one who voted for the minimum-wage law in the first session of this Congress, I oppose any action by the State Department or by this House which will destroy that minimum wage or eliminate the jobs of any individual or group of American working men and women.

Tragic and paradoxical as it is, the State Department is in favor of this, to quote further from their answer: "require that dutiable value be based on the actual value of the imported merchandise and not on the value of domestic merchandise."

This means, for example, that a canvas oxford coming from Japan at an invoice price of 49 cents is given unfair advantage over a comparable pair made by Endicott-Johnson workers that sell for $1.80.

The American selling price therefore is $1.80 and the present tariff for the 49-cent Japanese pair is 35 percent of the $1.80 or 62 cents.

This makes the total price of the Jap pair $1.11. But if we figure on the new basis, the tariff will become 17 cents, and the same pair will be sent into this country for 66 cents.

You do not have to scratch your heads to conclude that Endicott-Johnson workers' rubber footwear or any other American firm's can never compete with a sit-

uation which practically erases American competition with Japan and iron-curtain countries right here in our own front yard.

Perhaps the State Department thinks this is a triumph in international relations. I, for one, cannot go along with them on this and I will fight as hard as I can to defeat their attempts to ruin the present arrangement which is working out satisfactorily for the workers I represent.

Let us examine this plan from another angle. The rubber-footwear industry is one in which the labor cost in proportion to the total cost of the shoe is very high, namely, 47 percent.

In Japan, the labor cost is very small, the Japanese shoe worker receiving about 67 cents a day in contrast to our American workers' hourly wage of an average of nearly $1.50 an hour.

In the Binghamton-Johnson City-Endicott-Vestal area, workers enjoy as high a standard of living as there is in America and the world. They own their homes, many drive cars, buy United States savings bonds and spend their money in the triple cities. The Endicott-Johnson workers earn living wages but they do not have money to throw away. They cannot afford to take a pay cut and they do not want interference from the State Department with the good work they now do.

Ever since I have served in Congress, I have tried to work for things which would benefit our valley of opportunity and fight things which tend to hurt it. I do not recall an incident which will prove as disastrous to the Americans in my district or to the country at large as the abolition of the American selling-price principle in the rubber-footwear industry.

Although there are nearly 1,500 workers engaged in the actual manufacture of canvas rubber-soled and rubber shoes, the whole Endicott-Johnson factory personnel of 20,000 workers will be directly or indirectly affected.

Whatever friendly international feeling the State Department might bring about by giving reduced duty to foreign made shoes and allowing Japan and other nations to engulf the American market with inferior products, I fear will be greatly outweighed by serious and widespread unemployment, and the closing of the doors of some American factories.

With the unemployment problem now No. 1 in some sections, can we afford to tolerate such ridiculous procedure?

Yet the State Department is apparently boldly accepting the certain results of American labor competing with Japanese made shoes. Note the following statement made by a prominent official working in close conjunction with them that "he is aware that many in America will lose their jobs but that the Government should take care of such jobless employees and rehabilitate them to new types of work."

In answer to that amazing statement, let me say that Endicott Johnson workers are essentially shoe people, skilled in the technique and art of making shoes. This is their life's occupation, their chosen profession.

It seems outrageous that any scheme of power politics would contemplate abandoning large American industries to the fate of being jeopardized or closed entirely because we want to curry favor with any foreign nation. I question the wisdom and the ultimate success of such a policy.

Certainly, I am not going to stand idly by and see thousands of people engaged in the time honored pursuit of making shoes relegated to the dole or the breadline, while Japanese workers receiving about the world's lowest pay are encouraged to send in their products in unfair competition with our own people.

The United States cannot survive that kind of a program, however commendable and humanitarian it may appear to other nations. Some consideration must be given to the welfare of American labor and industry along with the rest.

In extending the high American standard of living to the entire world, we must likewise preserve it for America, else we defeat the very purposes of our well-intentioned aid and succor.

As one Member of Congress who has generally supported the foreign aid program, I have long been chagrined at the failure of those in charge to recognize that spending American dollars abroad must be carried on so as to bring home large demands for goods upon American industry so that our domestic production and employment will boom and prosperity will reach American shores while it pervades the globe.

I do hope that State Department officials, yes and the administration directing them, will reconsider their decision to ask that Congress tamper with our tariff again. In the name of the 20,000 interested Endicott Johnson workers, whose signed demands for action are now in my office, I implore Mr. Acheson and his associates to keep the American selling price principle in effect so that American-made rubber-soled shoes and rubber footwear will remain on the market.

In the name of these thousands of hardworking, earnest, patriotic Americans, I ask the Congress to protect our industry and our workers.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I am glad the gentleman informed us of the fact that the wage in Japan is about 9 cents an hour. How does he expect our industries to compete with such pauper wages?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. It is absolutely impossible.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

BRANNAN PLAN

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, this bill carries a lot of money for agriculture. It does not carry a dime that is not deserved. I believe that there are ways that the Government can save money on its agricultural program. At the present time the Government is engaged in the business of making loans on perishable commodities as well as those that are nonperishable, handling those commodities, transporting them, storing them, and selling them; the Government is in a big business in perishable products. There is a way that the Government can get out of that business of handling, transporting, storing, and selling perishable products. That plan has been suggested by the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan.

There are two things about that plan that I desire to especially invite your attention to: No. 1, it will get the Government out of the business that I have already stated; No. 2, it will preserve agriculture for the family-sized farm.

Today it is difficult for any person to go into private business in a line that is already dominated by large concerns. What chance has a young GI going into the grocery business, for instance, when one large concern admits that in 29 percent of the areas they sell at a loss? Naturally, it results in putting the little stores out of business; and to add to the bad effect, the Government permits them to have a tax deduction for those losses, thereby subsidizing out of the United States Treasury the concerns that destroy the independent small merchant in this country. Take the large steel concerns, they are not just in the steel business; they are in the fabricating business; they are going into all lines of business. What chance has an individual going into competition with them when the big steel companies have absolute control of the supply of materials and can cut off the supply of an individual any time they desire? He does not have any chance at all.

MONOPOLY IN FARMING?

In agriculture monopoly is beginning to rear its ugly head, although agriculture has only been real prosperous in the last few years, and only in the last few years have farmers had any degree of security; yet, after that short period of time, 1.7 percent of the farmers are producing one quarter, 25 percent, of the farm income. That is a warning to us; that is a warning we should heed. Let us not have monopoly in the farming business; let us preserve the farming business for the family-type farm.

Under the Brannan plan there is a limitation of $25,000 that can be paid to any one farmer. Under the present program one potato farmer, a Boston banker who happened to own land in Maine, received $576,000 last year. That is ridiculous; it is scandalous. It should not be permitted; it should be stopped. The Brannan plan will stop it.

Mr. WHITTEN. I hesitate to interrupt the gentleman but the gentleman has reference, I presume, to the Legislative Committee. I tried to insist to my friend from Texas that this was a matter that was properly before the Legislative Committee rather than the Appropriations Subcommittee. I hope the gentleman will make that clear.

Mr. PATMAN. If the gentleman remembers, I said "The great Committee on Agriculture." That is in the RECORD.

Mr. WHITTEN. Everyone does not understand the distinction between the Committee on Agriculture and the Committee on Agricultural Appropriations as the gentleman does. I have not made any point that this is not in order and do not wish to, but I feel I was in order in asking that question.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

UNITED STATES CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, there is opposition to this plan. I have been a Member of Congress for nearly 22 years and I have never known a national organization representing the big fellows and the little fellows that did not wind up representing the big fellows alone. Take the United States Chamber of Commerce, which is a very powerful organization. They are composed of the biggest businesses and industries in the country, the medium sized and the smaller ones. They often boast of the fact that most of their businesses are small. They are right. But I have never seen a time during the 22 years I have been a Member of Congress when there was a conflict of interest between the big ones and the little ones that the United States Chamber of Commerce did not take the side of the big ones.

There are quite a few Members on the floor here today. If there is any Member who ever remembers the United States Chamber of Commerce in its 38 years of experience failing to take the side of big business and against little business when there was a conflict of interest I would like to know, and I yield to anyone for that purpose.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MANUFACTURERS

The same is true as to the National Association of Manufacturers. They brag about having big ones and little ones. They boast about the fact that most of their members are little fellows, but they always are on the side of the big fellows.

There is an obvious reason for that. The big fellows attend all of the meetings, they become chairmen of committees, they go anywhere in the United States and attend these meetings. They go to the top rather fast and they dominate all these groups composed of the big fellows and the little fellows. I have never seen that organization fail to take the side of the big fellows when there was a conflict of interest as between the little and big fellows.

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU

Now, I may mention the American Farm Bureau, which is no exception. They have members who operate the big factory-type farms in their organization. They have the big farmers, the medium farmers, and the small farmers. But you know where the pressure comes from in the American Farm Bureau. The big fellows are right around the offices all the time, if they are not the officers themselves. They are always right around the officers. They have tremendous influence. They go to all the meetings. They are on good terms with all the officers and they dominate just exactly like they do in the United States Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers.

I regret exceedingly that the great American Farm Bureau president, Mr. Kline, has taken a side in opposition to this great plan. Yet he does not offer any plan as a substitute or as an alternative. He is just opposed. Posibly there are some parts of it I do not like. But I appeal to the great Committee of Agriculture of the House, the chairman of that committe, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] and the Members who work with him, and it is a fine committee. I hope they will take this bill up and further consider it during this present session, because something needs to be done in 1950. It should be done right now. If there is any other plan that is better, let us adopt the other plan, but if it is not better, let us take the plan that will get the Government out of the business of perishable products, the handling, storing, and selling to the extent of hundreds of millions of dollars a year, and also limit the amount that can be paid to any one farmer.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I compliment the gentleman from Texas for the courageous speech he is making and say that such a plan would be for the best interest of the farmers of America and for agriculture as a whole as a great element of our national economy.

Mr. PATMAN. Certainly, and the people in the cities are entitled to the lowest price that they can get consistent with the farmer's interest. I want to compliment, like the gentleman from Mississippi did, the Members from the cities. The Democratic Members from the cities of Chicago, New York, and Boston have better farm records right here in the House of Representatives than many of the Members from agricultural sections. The distinguished majority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts, the Honorable JOHN MCCORMACK, of Boston, has an excellent record on farm legislation. I am talking about Members now. They almost invariably go along because they know it is in the Nation's interest, but we do not always go along with them, and sometimes we should when we do not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, what I wonder about the Brannan plan is, Who will ever give this House or the Congress an honest estimate of what that plan will cost the taxpayers of the United States?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I do not think the gentleman can fully answer that question. I refuse to yield.

Mr. PATMAN. I will give the gentleman the answer.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I am sorry; I do not think that he is fully qualified to answer that question because nobody has come before our subcommittee who has been able to give us that answer. As far as I am concerned, I do not intend to let the farmers of America hold the sack at the end of the year because we are not able to get through Congress a huge appropriation of several billions to make good our promises if such legislation as the Brannan plan is adopted. I question sincerely that particular feature relative to the Brannan plan. How much will it cost? Also, if if does come to a show-down, will the city Members, who urge it now so as to get cheap food, vote for the huge appropriation necessary to back up the Brannan plan? Those are the questions to which I, as a farmer, have to have the answers before I discard this 90-percent price-support program I have always worked for.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

[Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

The Clerk read down to and including line 7 on page 156.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Federal Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXPLANATION

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, on the first roll call this morning the Committee on Agriculture was very busy considering important bills, but because of my attendance at the committee meeting I was not able to get here in time to answer to my name on the roll call. I was advised by our chairman that the committee had the authorization of the House to sit during the sessions of the House today. I think perhaps that is a reasonable excuse for not answering the roll call.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

EXHIBIT BY LOBBYISTS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, may I offer condolences to my colleagues unfortunate enough to have offices on the third

Golden	Lodge	Rains
Gore	Lucas	Redden
Granger	McSweeney	Rhodes
Grant	Macy	Riehlman
Hall,	Martin, Iowa	Roosevelt
Edwin Arthur	Miles	Sabath
Harden	Miller, Nebr.	Sadlak
Harrison	Morgan	Scott, Hardie
Harvey	Morrison	Shelley
Heller	Murdock	Smathers
Hobbs	Nixon	Smith, Ohio
Javits	Pfeifer,	Steed
Jenison	Joseph L.	Vursell
Jenkins	Pfeiffer,	Whitaker
Kee	William L.	White, Calif.
Kelly, N. Y.	Plumley	Wolverton
Kennedy	Poulson	Woodruff
Keough	Powell	
Kunkel	Quinn	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 355 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that—

The chapter on agricultural appropriations be considered as read and open to points of order and amendment; that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] have consent to offer a blanket amendment relating to administrative expenses;

That when the House adjourns on Friday it adjourn to meet on Monday next;

That no debate be in order on Friday, Monday, and Tuesday except general debate;

That general debate on the civil functions appropriations bill be confined to Tuesday;

That when the House adjourns on Tuesday next all general debate be concluded on the entire bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. PACE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, did the gentleman's request include the waiving of points of order under the agricultural title?

Mr. CANNON. No points of order are waived under the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. PATMAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, does this restrict the offering of amendments in any way?

Mr. CANNON. No restrictions of the right to offer amendments are contemplated.

Mr. PATMAN. Or debate?

Mr. CANNON. Debate is to be confined to general debate. There is no provision for amendment under the 5-minute rule. The bill will not be read for amendment until Wednesday morning.

Mr. TABER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, the general debate is confined to the bill and is not available for anything else except the chapters involved.

Mr. CANNON. Of course that is a part of the original agreement. All debate is confined to the bill and to the chapter under consideration.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the general debate on the other chapters of the bill, not mentioned in the request, follow in sequence?

Mr. CANNON. In regular sequence, with the exception of the civil-functions chapter, which will be confined to Tuesday.

Mr. McCORMACK. But all general debate closes on Tuesday?

Mr. CANNON. All general debate on the bill and all chapters of the bill closes on Tuesday, and we begin to read the bill under the 5-minute rule Wednesday morning.

Mr. TABER. That does not prevent people offering amendments and receiving recognition to speak under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I have a genuine amendment. I want to ask the gentleman, if you are limiting the debate to 1 day and the time is all taken up, if there will be a chance to offer my amendment and to speak on it for 5 minutes?

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman will have every opportunity to offer his amendment when the chapter to which it applies is under consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that this unanimous-consent request provides for waiving no points of order, and has nothing to do with the restricting of time for amendments.

Mr. PACE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, the request contains consent for the gentleman from Minnesota to offer an amendment. Does that request carry with it a waiver of a point of order against that amendment?

Mr. CANNON. Under the pending request no points of order are to be waived on any portion of the bill or any amendment thereto.

Mr. TABER. Except that it will cover more than one paragraph and it will be a blanket amendment.

Mr. CANNON. But no points of order are waived.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, the chairman has said that the debate will follow in sequence on the chapters in the bill. Then there is a special mention made of the civil-functions chapter. Is it to be understood that on Wednesday we will start considering the chapters of the bill in sequence, for amendment, without respect to civil functions?

Mr. CANNON. In their regular and orderly sequence.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does this mean that general debate on Interior and the military portion of the bill would have to be disposed of on Monday or Tuesday?

Mr. CANNON. On Friday, Monday, or Tuesday.

Mr. CARROLL. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, with reference to the Interior Department, is there anything in the motion that precludes the submission of an amendment under the 5-minute rule?

Mr. CANNON. Every opportunity will be afforded under the rules of the House for the consideration of amendments offered by any Member of the House.

Mr. TABER. I understand that with reference to the pending agricultural chapter there will be no attempt to close debate on that until after all legitimate amendments have been discussed?

Mr. CANNON. The pending chapter will be considered under the regular rules of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1951

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7786, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

CHAPTER VI—DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

The CHAIRMAN. Under the consent agreement when the Committee rose yesterday, chapter VI, relating to the Department of Agriculture, is considered as read. It is now subject to points of order to any part of the chapter.

Is there any point of order to be made to chapter VI?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language appearing in lines 15 to 17 on page 157, reading "Except that a poultry breeding house may be constructed at Purdue University," on the ground that it is legislation in an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. WHITTEN. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to call attention to the fact that under the Research and Marketing Act, section 7–A, 7 United States Code 427 (h), the Department of Agriculture is authorized to construct agricultural buildings without limitation on the amounts. This committee has put restrictions heretofore on these amounts, fixing the individual amount at $15,000 per unit. We carry that provision with the exception that in this instance we let them go above it.

It traces back to the legislative authorization in the Research and Marketing Act under which they have authority to build such houses without any limitation.

In effect this is a limitation.

The authorization reads as follows:

> The money appropriated in pursuance of this title shall also be available for the purchase or rental of land and the construction and acquisition of buildings necessary for conducting research provided for in this title.

In effect this is a limitation fixing the amount they may spend for this purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from New York has made a point of order against the lan-

guage appearing in the pending bill on page 157, lines 15 to 17, on the ground it constitutes legislation on an appropriation bill.

The Chair has examined the provisions of existing law cited by the gentleman from Mississippi and invites attention to the fact that the first part of this paragraph appears clearly to be a limitation and the latter part of the paragraph appears to be an exception to the limitation for a purpose authorized by law.

The Chair, therefore, overrules the point of order.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, a further point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language appearing in lines 6 to 7, page 204, "travel expenses, including examination of estimates for appropriations in the field."

Mr. Chairman, I ask to be briefly heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be very pleased to hear the gentleman.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, in previous chapters we have had before us a similar provision but in each instance the wording has contained the phrase in substance "as approved" or "as authorized by the Secretary." In those instances the particular section has been held to be subject to a point of order because it involved additional duties on the part of the Secretary. In this case those words are absent. There is nothing in existing law to my knowledge—I will be glad to be referred to it if I am uninformed—to authorize such expenditures. Indeed, if there had been, there would seem to have been very little reason for the inclusion of previous sections which we have adopted conferring such authority. Therefore, it seems to me that these travel expenses for the Office of the Secretary of Agriculture are subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that as to whether this language is surplusage or essential in this bill is beside the point. To properly discharge the duties of the Secretary of Agriculture under the basic law setting up the Department and the duties of the Secretary, this is absolutely essential to carry out those duties and it is authorized in that way. As to whether it may be necessary to carry this language might be something else. I would like to point out to the gentleman that it is under this language that inspections in the field are made by the Congress. I know that from time to time we have to undergo criticism for our efforts in trying to cut these appropriations, but last year, I would like to point out to the gentleman, as the result of our investigation we turned down a quarter of a million dollars for the building of a refrigeration unit for research, because they had one in Florida. On a check it was found that the Army did have one, and we saved that amount of money. As the result of our investigation of the foot-and-mouth disease, I think I can point out that we have saved untold amounts of money, and I think if you go further you will find that this committee, by reason of its investigation, has brought about 100 percent increase in productivity as the result of the soil-conservation policies, and I certainly offer no apologies for the efforts that this committee has put into those projects. I think the point of order should not be sustained, because it is essential to properly discharge the duties of the office under the legislation setting up the Department of Agriculture, and the duties of the Secretary.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the force of what the gentleman from Mississippi said. I have no reason in any respect to question the good faith or the value of the work of his committee in the field. My point of order is made against that provision, and I think if we are going to enter into the type of activity which he describes—and if it should be done, as to that I have no views at the moment—then we should do it in an appropriate way by authorizing legislation. I still think that this is subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] has made a point of order against the language appearing on page 204 of the chapter beginning in line 6, which has been quoted by him, on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill in violation of the rules of the House. The Chair has examined the language and has listened attentively to the arguments presented and has also made an examination of the precedents and decisions of the House. It appears that in 1938 a point of order was made against language similar to this, and the Chairman, Mr. Jones, of Texas, overruled the point of order. The decision is found on page 2656 of the RECORD of March 1, 1938. On the basis of that precedent and decision the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, a further point of order. I make the point of order against the language in lines 16 to 20:

> For necessary expenses, including dues, when authorized by the Secretary, for library membership in societies or associations which issue publications to members only or at a price to members lower than to subscribers who are not members; $713,293.

It involves additional duties on the part of the Secretary, and is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. WHITTEN. I would like to call the attention of the Chair to 5 United States Code, section 83, which seems to cover this matter.

Mr. Chairman, a further review of this matter raises a question in my own mind as to whether the language "when authorized by the Secretary" does not make the point of order in order; in other words, it should be sustained. Therefore, I offer no objection to the point of order that has been raised, and I shall offer an amendment, because I think that in the absence of the language "when authorized by the Secretary" the amendment would not be subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair appreciates the statement of the gentleman from Mississippi. However, amendments will be in order after all points of order that may be made against the chapter have been considered and disposed of.

The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] makes a point of order against the language appearing on page 208 of the pending bill in lines 16 to 20, inclusive, on the ground that it includes legislation on an appropriation bill, in violation of the rules of the House. The gentleman from Mississippi concedes the point of order in that the language includes the words "when authorized by the Secretary." Therefore, the Chair sustains the point of order.

Are there further points of order to this chapter?

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the language on page 193, lines 18 through 24, that it is legislation on an appropriation bill and therefore is contrary to the rules of the House, in that it seeks to add an additional purpose for which section 32 funds may be expended.

Section 32 of the act of August 24, 1935, is the section which sets aside 30 percent of the gross customs receipts to be expended for certain purposes; namely, to increase the export and the consumption of agricultural commodities. The purposes for which the funds may be expended are set out. They may be used by paying indemnities to exporters, and by making payments to producers. The further authority proposed to be set forth in this bill is to pay the transportation and handling charges on certain agricultural commodities.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. WHITTEN. I would, but I should like to yield first to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, needless to say I regret very much that the gentleman from Georgia feels it necessary to press this point of order.

Mr. PACE. If the committee in its wisdom should put some limitation of, say, $5,000,000 or $10,000,000 on the expenditure of these funds for this purpose, there would be no objection on my part, but I understand there is no estimate of how much will be expended. It could be that the entire sum could be expended in paying transportation charges. I feel very deeply that it would be unwise to impose this burden on section 32 funds.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I would be very glad to accept an amendment such as the gentleman has in mind. Will the gentleman from Mississippi prepare such an amendment, because after all, the gentleman from Georgia knows this particular language is aimed at saving the taxpayers of the Nation millions of dollars by preventing the spoilage of these tremendous quan-

tities of perishables that we have on hand? Certainly if you gentlemen can aid me right now in putting some limitation in the bill so that we can achieve that purpose I will be deeply grateful to you.

Mr. WHITTEN. While there is much merit to the intent of our friend, the gentleman from Minnesota, I am rather of the same opinion as my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia, so far as the use of section 32 funds is concerned. Further, it has been my purpose and the purpose of our committee to cooperate with the legislative committee and in no case to usurp or try to usurp their prerogatives. The provision put in here is a stop-gap and it was done only on the basis that the legislative committee was now considering this matter. I think the committee is so considering it. I wonder if it would not be better to let the whole thing go out and let the legislative committee handle it by substantive law. I think that is the way it properly should be handled. I did yield to the desires of our colleagues of the committee to try to meet this situation by putting it in here. But if there is any objection on the part of the legislative committee, certainly it is their business. We are trying to help out rather than try to usurp their prerogatives. That is the position I take.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, may I call to the attention of the committee that the intent of section 32 of the act of 1938 is to dispose of surplus commodities. Obviously that might entail their transportation to places where they might be consumed. I do not believe any ruling or interpretation of that act has been had in that regard. I just want to call it to the attention of the Committee before the Chairman rules on the point of order.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. If this point of order should be overruled or withdrawn is it not entirely possible that this section might be amended so that section 32 funds might even be used in connection with our foreign-aid program which contemplates the exportation of vast surpluses of agricultural commodities?

Mr. HORAN. I am sure that is possible and I am sure the Congress will take some action.

Mr. COOLEY. If that is true, then as suggested by my colleague the gentleman from Georgia the burden on section 32 funds will be even greater and more intensified and section 32 funds as a result may be entirely used up and not available for the purposes for which they were originally intended.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, since the chairman of the legislative Committee on Agriculture has raised the point of the burden on section 32 funds I trust that if the ruling on the point of order should include the kicking out of this paragraph, I trust there will also be an investigation made, if the gentleman's committee works on this, of the use of almost $3,000,000 of section 32 funds for administrative purposes. I do not believe that was the intent either.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, if I may be heard further on the point of order in connection with the point raised by the chairman of the legislative committee on agriculture, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], I want to say I am just as disturbed as he is about this foreign situation and the use of section 32 funds in connection with ECA and the occupied countries, and so on. On April 4 I had them give me a statement as to what part of section 32 funds were being used to reduce costs paid for agricultural commodities below what we have invested in them to ECA.

In other words, the Department of Agriculture has had to sell its commodities $36,000,000 below what we had in it, and section 32 funds were used. So $36,000,000 of section 32 funds have gone into the ECA program into these occupied areas. That money would have been put up by the Federal Government either way, whether by appropriation through ECA or whether by the means that they used. But by doing it this way it is charged up to Agriculture, which I insist is not right. I want to agree with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], who raises that question, that it is serious.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, some time ago the question arose on the floor as to whether existing law permitted section 32 funds to be used for the payment of transportation of surplus commodities. It was my impression at the time that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] called the Department of Agriculture and talked to someone there, and was advised that the present law was broad enough to permit the use of section 32 funds for that purpose. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] some time ago, in referring to section 32, used the word "consumption." I do not have the law before me. Perhaps the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] has. Perhaps he feels there is an absolute bar there against this purpose, but the impression has prevailed among many Members that the original section 32 law was broad enough to cover this matter. I was wondering if we might not perhaps arrive at a unanimous-consent request that the right to consider the point of order on this particular paragraph be deferred until we reach that in the orderly consideration of the bill for amendment, and then the issue be resolved as to the point of order and also as to the possible modifications or limitations on this paragraph, as proposed by the Andersen amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent request entered into, the whole chapter is open to points of order at any point, if offered; and also to amendments that are offered. The Chair said that points of order would have to be disposed of first.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, would it not be possible for the point of order to be reserved, by unanimous consent, as to this paragraph?

The CHAIRMAN. It is rather unusual. It might make it more difficult to keep up with the situation.

Mr. TABER. But it could be done.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair prefers to dispose of it here and now.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. PACE. I understand that numerous amendments will be offered. Section 32 does specify that one of its purposes is to increase the consumption of agricultural commodities, and it says exactly how the money shall be expended. It says, "To encourage exportation by payment of benefits, by payment of indemnities for losses, by payments to producers." Then, to increase consumption, "by payment of benefits, indemnities, and donations," and so forth. Certainly, it is evident if the Department of Agriculture was satisfied that it had authority to spend section 32 money for transportation of any or all agricultural commodities that are in surplus, it would not be here today asking the committee to give it the authority.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Georgia has amply made the point I was seeking to bring out, that by donations to encourage consumption, the authority does exist. The Department is not here asking for this authority. The language was put in here on the suggestion of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN]. Under the language which the gentleman from Georgia has read and under the example cited by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] as to the use of this fund for the payment of certain costs in connection with ECA, it would seem that this might come within the broad powers already given by section 32, and consequently not be a broadening of the existing law.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I am wondering if there could be understanding with the chairman of the subcommittee and other members of the subcommittee that there be a limitation in the nature of an amendment to this, limiting the over-all expenditure for this particular purpose to $5,000,000.

Mr. PACE. That would be entirely acceptable to me.

Mr. TABER. Would you be willing to waive the point of order, if that understanding may be had?

Mr. PACE. I would.

Mr. TABER. I am wondering if the chairman of the subcommittee handling this chapter cares to say anything about it.

Mr. WHITTEN. If such an amendment were sent to the floor I would like to ask the Chair's advice in connection with it. I understand certain other amendments will be offered to this section if it remains in the bill, which are quite definitely legislative. This is far reaching in its provisions. Notwithstanding the fact that the author of this amendment, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] is trying to reach an objective which is worthy and has done much work on it, I would be constrained to make a point of order against such amendments.

I want to know at this time if this point of order is withdrawn against this

section, whether an amendment greatly enlarging it would still be subject to a point of order? If not, I would rather make the point of order to this section myself.

The CHAIRMAN. Obviously, the Chair cannot undertake to pass on a point of order of that nature until the amendment is presented.

Mr. WHITTEN. If points of order to the bill are now waived and this section is held to be in order I wish to know whether legislation which would necessarily follow would be considered on the pending basis.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would not be passing on the question at all if the point of order were withdrawn.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Whatever may be done now certainly does not prejudice the right of the gentleman from Mississippi to raise the point of order against any amendment that may be offered and, certainly, whatever may be done now would not make in order an amendment which would not otherwise be in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I feel I did not make myself clear. It is whether if a legislative section is in the bill as it is now written and it remains in the bill, would substitute legislation for the legislation be subject to a point of order if we take it for granted that the amendment is legislation? The fact that we have permitted such legislation to be in the bill would preclude the offering of a substitute legislative provision.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will endeavor to answer the gentleman's parliamentary inquiry and will state that such an amendment could be offered provided it were germane, and also provided that it did not extend the legislative provisions now appearing in the bill.

Mr. TABER. A further parliamentary inquiry on that point.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TABER. The waiving of a point of order at this point would not permit a germane amendment to this paragraph which would expand its legislative activity, and such an expansion would be subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct. That is what the Chair just endeavored to state.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. This is the regular order.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Who has the floor; may I inquire?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has the floor right now considering a point of order.

Mr. PACE. In the light of the situation, I am constrained to insist on the point of order.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that this particular point of order in connection with this section be laid aside temporarily reserving all rights to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE], later on, anywhere through the bill, at any part he sees fit, to again bring the matter up. We do not want to act hastily here. This is too important a matter.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McCORMACK. If the point of order is sustained, later on if the parties get together after other amendments are offered, assuming points of order are advanced against them and are sustained, if the parties get together there is nothing to stop them from offering an amendment if no one advances a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct. An amendment could be offered and if no point of order is made against the amendment, of course, the question is not raised.

The Chair is prepared to rule on the point of order.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] has made a point of order against the language appearing in the pending bill on page 293, beginning in line 18 and including line 24, on the ground it contains legislation on an appropriation bill in violation of the rules of the House. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Mississippi, chairman of the subcommittee in charge of the bill under consideration, for all practical purposes concedes the point of order.

The Chair has examined the language referred to and is definitely of the opinion that it does include legislation on an appropriation bill. The Chair is very favorably impressed with the last statement made by the gentleman from Georgia in reply to the observation made by the gentleman from South Dakota to the effect that if existing law provided for this there would be no useful purpose to be served by having this provision in the bill. It does appear very clearly to the Chair that the inclusion of this language would result in a diversion of certain funds from the purpose provided by existing law for the use of those funds. It therefore appearing to the Chair that it is legislation on an appropriation bill, in violation of the rules of the House, the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language on page 205, beginning with line 8:

together with such amounts from other appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules in the Budget for the current fiscal year for such expenses, which several amounts or portions thereof, as may be determined by the Secretary, not exceeding a total of $207,000, shall be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation: *Provided, however,* That if the total amounts of such appropriations or authorizations for the current fiscal year shall at any time exceed or fall below the amounts estimated, respectively, therefor in the budget for such year, the amounts transferred or to be transferred therefrom to this appropriation shall be increased or decreased in such amounts as the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives of the Department, shall determine are appropriate to the requirements as changed by such reductions or increases in such appropriations or authorizations.

I make a point of order against all of the remainder of the provision relating to the Office of Solicitor on the ground that the provision therein contained is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. May the Chair understand the gentleman. He refers to page 205 of the pending bill, beginning in what line?

Mr. KEATING. Beginning with line 8, the words "together with such amounts" to the end of that paragraph. I make the point of order on the ground that the provisions call for additional duties on the part of both the Secretary of Agriculture and the Bureau of the Budget and constitute legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I can only say that this is the usual and customary way of carrying these funds. In fairness to the Chair, I think it does appear to be legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from New York has made a point of order against the language appearing on page 205 beginning with the words "together with such amounts" in line 8 and through the remainder of that paragraph, on the ground it is legislation on an appropriation bill and in violation of the rules of the House. The gentleman from Mississippi concedes the point of order; therefore, the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order to the language appearing on page 207, line 8, beginning with the words *"Provided,* That."

The CHAIRMAN. And going how far?

Mr. KEATING. To page 208, line 3, ending with the words "objects specified herein." I make the point of order that these provisions require additional duties upon the part of both the Secretary of Agriculture and the Bureau of the Budget and constitute legislation on an appropriation bill and are, therefore, subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, there is no desire on the part of the committee to legislate except in line with the usual and customary practices that have been carried on in this bill. I think the first part of the language to which the point of order is made could be classified as legislation on an appropriation bill. I do have doubts as to whether a point of order should lie against the part beginning with line 19, and that that part is good. The point of order, as I understand, is not divided but is to the entirety, and in view of that I am of the opinion that the point of order should be sustained.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule. The gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] makes the point of order against the language appearing on page 207 of the bill, which has been pointed out by him, on the ground that it includes legislation on an appropriation bill in violation of the rules of the House. The gentleman from Mississippi concedes the point of order. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, a further point of order. On page 200, line 16, beginning with the words—

Provided further, That for the purpose of making loans pursuant to the foregoing authority, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public-debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under that act are extended to include such loans to the Secretary: *Provided further,* That repayments to the Secretary of the Treasury on such loans shall be treated as a public-debt transaction.

I make the point of order that that language involves legislation on an appropriation bill. However, I do this in order to protect the record at this point and would be very glad to reserve the point of order and ask for an explanation of what is attempted to be accomplished by this proviso. My point is that it may be something highly desirable to which I would not want to make a point of order. Offhand it looks to me clearly like legislation on an appropriation bill, but perhaps it may be desirable legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. WHITTEN. This language was included to facilitate the handling of the program which is set out above in the bill. It is merely technical, as is apparent, and is just in order to facilitate the handling of the matter by the Treasury Department and, as I understand, was originally included at the insistence of the Treasury Department to so facilitate it. I am not prepared to say whether it is or is not legislation on an appropriation bill. I do say that it is economy to keep it in rather than strike it out.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, is it not a fact that the justification for this language is that this would permit the Secretary of the Treasury to use the proceeds of bond sales for making loans which he is directed to make in the foregoing proviso, and that otherwise he would be required to make these loans out of tax revenues rather than from bond sales?

Mr. KEATING. If these loans are going to be made, it just strikes me offhand that they should be made out of tax revenues rather than involving the Government in additional deficit spending. If that is the effect of it, I certainly press my point of order.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The foregoing proviso authorizes the Secretary to utilize the proceeds from payment of principal and interest under certain acts referred to to repay the Secretary of the Treasury for the amounts borrowed. The proviso ahead of that, beginning with line 9, reads that the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to loan such sums to the Secretary. It is my recollection that the language to which the gentleman has directed his point of order is language which appears in the RFC Act, and in the Housing Act, and in other acts which make either discretionary or mandatory loans from the Secretary available to various agencies, that is, loans from the Secretary of the Treasury. Here it would make them available to the Secretary of Agriculture for the purpose of the Bankhead-Jones Act.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, there seems to be some question whether the gentleman wants to press the point of order. If it is pressed, there is nothing for me to say except that I think the point of order should be sustained. I seriously doubt whether the gentleman really wants to do it in this instance. I do not think he gains anything. I think he contributes somewhat to the problem of handling the very things that go before it. But that is a decision for him to make, and I could be wrong. If the point of order is insisted upon, I shall have to concede it.

Mr. KEATING. My impression is that it is desirable to have the RECORD show the cost in each year of these various programs. They should be handled on a current basis rather than by having one arm of the Government loan to another arm, thereby deferring the day of reckoning. This looks to me like a possible manner of covering up the present cost of the program for the Farmers' Home Administration. I think at this point, at least, I will press the point of order, with the suggestion to the gentleman from Mississippi that if an amendment is offered to the bill later to restore this language, and we can be convinced that it is desirable, it is possible that at that time no point of order will be raised. At this juncture I do press the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] makes a point of order against the language appearing in the pending bill on page 200, beginning with the word "Provided" in line 16 and continuing through the remainder of that paragraph, on the ground that it includes legislation on an appropriation bill, not authorized under the rules of the House. The gentleman from Mississippi concedes the point of order.

The Chair would invite attention to the fact that the language appearing in this provision, "the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public-debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act," and so forth, would appear to be clearly legislation on an appropriation bill, in violation of the rules of the House.

The Chair sustains the point of order.

Are there further points of order?

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the following language beginning in line 17 on page 191—

Provided further, That the county agricultural conservation committee in any county with the approval of the State committee may allot not to exceed 5 percent of its allocation for the agricultural conservation program to the Soil Conservation Service for services of its technicians in formulating and carrying out the agricultural conservation program and the funds so allotted shall be utilized by the Soil Conservation Service for technical and other assistance in such county—

That it is legislation on an appropriation bill. The language contained in these lines has to do with the administration of the programs in two separate agencies of the Department of Agriculture, which ought to come before a proper legislative committee to have legal determination made.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, in answer to the statement by the gentleman from Minnesota, I point out that this provision was written in the bill last year after conference with and with the approval of the members of the legislative Committee on Agriculture. It is an effort on the part of our committee to more properly utilize the various specialists of the two agricultural programs.

Under the present law, these two agricultural agencies are authorized to utilize the services of other agencies. In effect, by fixing it at 5 percent, I think we are on sound ground in insisting on the limitation. It is a limitation in the amount which can be used for a particular purpose, whereas, in the absence of the 5-percent figure, each agency could use the services of the other, and under the general law would have a right to compensate the other for services rendered. I think under the general provisions of the law that is true. The 5-percent provision is a limitation rather than legislation or an authorization.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is it the contention of the gentleman from Mississippi that, under existing law, without this limitation an allotment might be made in excess of 5 percent?

Mr. WHITTEN. I do not know as to the use of the word "allotment," but under the Economy Act of 1932, section 601, any agency is entitled to use and is authorized to use the services of another agency and to pay for such services.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Under the basic act, the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, is it not true that these technical and other services could be provided?

Mr. WHITTEN. They could be. The point that we are trying to get at here is that the Production and Marketing Administration is entitled to this type of service, and in many cases has to go out and hire and train additional specialists while the Federal Government is paying

such specialists, who are doing the same kind of work.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is right.

Mr. WHITTEN. They would be authorized to use the services of the Soil Conservation Service beyond this 5 percent. May I point out that the citation of the act is 31 United States Code, section 686. The 5-percent provision here is not compulsory. By its insertion we hope to be able to get these two agencies to use the services of the other, instead of going out in two directions. I think we are on sound ground in our objective and in our approach to reach that objective. They already have authority to use these services, but by putting this provision in we stress our intention that they make use of the services. I think it will result in economy, if they do make use of the services. I may say that the Department has just begun to make use of them, and, from the reports that I am now getting, it is doing a great deal of good.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If I understand the gentleman correctly, this service could be carried on by the Production and Marketing Administration itself?

Mr. WHITTEN. And in most cases it is, with absolute disregard of the fact that technical people are already drawing pay from the Federal Government who could do the work.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman has cited the act and also pointed out that existing law authorizes the agency to utilize the services of another agency to carry out its authorized functions.

Mr. WHITTEN. That is correct.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chairman will be pleased to hear the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I regard this as a matter of importance or I would not inject myself into the discussion. We are now faced with a situation where we have the Soil Conservation Service, and I think $50,000,000 is provided for that service under this bill. Then we have the Production and Marketing Administration, which is given authority to pay out benefits to the farmers for the practices in which they are engaged. We all fear that there is about to come about the setting up of two sets of technicians. The Soil Conservation Service now has those technicians. They are paid by the Government and they are in the counties and they are available, but there seems to be a tendency for PMA to set up its own technicians, with others standing by. I insist, Mr. Chairman, that under the general authority which one department has to call upon the services of another, and for which they must pay, that it is authorized by law for this transfer of funds to be made, and that in the transfer of funds, in using the technicians available in the Soil Conservation Service, there would be enormous savings to the Government; and, second, in a small way, would eliminate the duplication which we find in the Department.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. Of course we are committed to the organization of the entire Nation into soil conservation districts. We are moving in that direction. I asked Mr. Dykes, of the Soil Conservation Service, when he was before our subcommittee, if we were to organize the entire Nation into soil conservation districts, what, in his opinion, would be the amount of personnel required to carry on the work in those districts, and he answered: "Better than 16,000 men." They now have 11,700 in the Soil Conservation Service. Obviously, we will have greater commitments in the form of larger appropriations before the Congress when we have organized all the districts in the United States. We now have nearly 2,400. So, obviously, this language does serve a very useful purpose and should exist.

Mr. PACE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, it was my privilege last fall to sit in on a meeting with the Soil Conservation Service in my district. It was also my privilege to sit in with some county PMA committees. I do desire to bring this statement to the Committee, in thinking in terms of economy, that that little provision which was placed in the Appropriation Act last year has created in my district more confusion than any similar number of words could possibly do.

Those agencies were cooperating fairly well until this language was put into the appropriation bill, which nobody seemed to clearly understand, bringing about a feeling that the Congress of the United States was attempting in some way or other to put one under the other, or the other under the other. It has interfered very greatly with their program of planning work. The Soil Conservation Service cannot possibly set up their schedule of dates and follow it through when the PMA committees request that they do something for them on such and such a date. The same thing is true as far as the PMA committee is concerned. I agree with the preceding gentlemen who have spoken in terms of economy and in terms of the necessity of something being spelled out so that there is no duplication in these agencies. That is heartily in accord with my views. However, I think that is an entirely separate matter. I think it is something that ought to be taken up and given consideration by the legislative committee of the House, which has control over these agencies, and that part should be left by the Appropriations Committee to them.

Mr. Chairman, I desire that my point of order be sustained.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL] has made a point of order against the language appearing in that section of the bill on page 191 beginning with the word *"Provided"* in line 17, and continuing through the remainder of that paragraph down to and including the word "county" in line 25, on the ground that it includes legislation on an appropriation bill in violation of the rules of the House.

The Chair has examined the language here in question and is of the opinion that it could be drawn so as to constitute a limitation, but as the language appears now in the bill it does appear to the Chair that it contains legislation. The Chair, of course, has to pass on the question as it is here presented and invites attention to the fact that among other things it includes the words "with the approval." It appears to the Chair that the language quoted does include legislation on an appropriation bill in violation of the rules of the House.

The point of order is sustained.

Are there further points of order to this chapter? The Chair will not entertain points of order after we begin the consideration of amendments.

Is there any other point of order to this chapter of the pending bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and will consider amendments at this time.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN:

On page 158, line 8, strike out "$2,600,00 and insert "$2,548,000."

On page 159, line 1, strike out "$2,725,00 and insert "$2,671,000."

On page 165, line 3, strike out "$2,250,00 and insert $2,205,000."

On page 166, line 14, strike out "$12,800,00 and insert "$12,544,000."

On page 170, line 3, strike out "$3,400,000" and insert "$3,332,000."

On page 170, line 7, strike out "$2,950,000" and insert "$2,891,000."

On page 170, line 10, strike out "$450,000" and insert "$441,000."

On page 170, line 22, strike out "$2,680,000" and insert "$2,627,000."

On page 172, line 25, strike out "$4,100,000" and insert "$4,018,000."

On page 174, line 8, strike out "$4,185,900" and insert "$4,101,900."

On page 176, line 14, strike out "$539,500" and insert "$528,500."

On page 176, line 17, strike out "$900,000" and insert "$882,000."

On page 176, line 20, strike out "$3,280,000" and insert "$3,215,000."

On page 179, line 3, strike out "$665,000" and insert "$652,000."

On page 180, line 15, strike out "$26,890,000" and insert "$26,790,000."

On page 181, line 14, strike out "$2,995,000" and insert "$2,893,000."

On page 181, line 17, strike out "$1,300,000" and insert "$1,274,000."

On page 181, line 20, strike out "$880,000" and insert "$863,000."

On page 182, line 3, strike out "$10,348,000" and insert "$10,248,000."

On page 184, line 10, strike out "$9,500,000" and insert "$9,400,000."

On page 185, line 2, strike out "$1,300,000" and insert "$1,274,000."

On page 185, line 11, strike out "$10,750,000" and insert "$10,535,000."

On page 188, line 11, strike out "$1,490,000" and insert "$1,460,000."

On page 188, line 19, strike out "$400,000" and insert "$392,000."

On page 194, line 18, strike out "$2,050,000" and insert "$2,010,000."

On page 195, line 6, strike out "$780,000" and insert "$765,000."
On page 196, line 1, strike out "$1,260,000" and insert "$1,235,000."
On page 196, line 18, strike out "$1,660,500" and insert "$1,627,500."
On page 197, line 4, strike out "$1,675,000" and insert "$1,642,000."
On page 197, line 21, strike out "$3,550,000" and insert "$3,479,000."
On page 197, line 25, strike out "$650,000" and insert "$637,000."
On page 198, line 2, strike out "$6,854,000" and insert "$6,717,000."
On page 198, line 9, strike out "$8,150,000" and insert "$7,987,000."
On page 201, line 12, strike out "$27,700,000" and insert "$27,423,000."
On page 204, line 2, strike out "$900,000" and insert "$882,000."
On page 204, line 13, strike out "$2,143,300" and insert "$2,140,000."
On page 205, line 8, strike out "$2,450,000" and insert "$2,401,000."
On page 206, line 5, strike out "$600,000" and insert "$588,000."
On page 206, line 12, strike out "$1,265,800" and insert "$1,239,800."
On page 208, line 20, strike out "$713,293" and insert "$699,293."

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact there are 40 small items embraced in this particular amendment, and it will be thoroughly discussed, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I do so regretfully, but I think even with the reading now we still will have trouble knowing what is in the amendment; so I shall have to object.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my request.

(The Clerk concluded reading the amendment.)

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

(Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment to 40 specific items in the bill calls for a reduction of a total of only $2,562,300 and I wish you would keep that figure in mind. All I am asking here is to tighten up just a little bit in the various bureaus of the department. In not a single case have I asked for over a 2 percent cut and in a good many cases only 1 percent. In some not at all.

Mr. Chairman, I have a little son age 11. He gets a certain allowance each week, but I notice if I give him a little too much that he is inclined to spend the allowance perhaps for things that do not do him much good; for instance, he may buy too many Coca-Colas. So as much as I think of that boy I have to hold him down in his expenditures.

Mr. Chairman, the same proposition holds true here with the Department of Agriculture. We have a splendid group of bureaus in this great division of our Government.

It seems to me it is my duty as a member of the Appropriations Committee, and the duty of all of us, Mr. Chairman, to scan every appropriation bill we have before us and see if we can tighten up here and there a little.

This is not meat ax economy. Referring to the remarks of one of my friends, he stated, "Well, CARL, this is just peanuts; why bother trying to get this $2,500,000 reduction through?" My answer to that is, gentlemen, if we get enough of these peanuts cut off of these various bills, perhaps it will amount to something toward stabilizing the financial security of this great Nation of ours.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It was difficult for me and perhaps for other Members to keep track of all of the amendments which the gentleman included in his general amendment. May I ask him if a reduction is proposed by him in the appropriation made for the Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics on page 164?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. No; there is no reduction proposed there, because, frankly, I think that our subcommittee was hard enough on that particular group. In other words, may I say to the gentleman, I have very carefully gone over these items and I am not attempting to reduce all of them. I am just trying to squeeze a little where it will not hurt and where we, on the subcommittee, in my opinion, were a trifle lenient.

Now may I say something about the work of our subcommittee? I think it has done a goob job in this bill which we have brought to the floor. It is my personal opinion that with some of these items we have been a little liberal and, frankly had it not been for the assertion made officially the other day that our deficit is apt to go up to $7,300,000,000 for next year, I doubt whether I would have tried to take this amount off of the Department's budget, because I do think that our subcommittee, headed by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], has done a good, conscientious job. But, let me call your attention to the fact that this very day, just this one day, our Nation is going into the red to the extent of $20,000,000, $800,000 an hour, and all I am asking for in this reduction is to take care of 3 hours of that deficit; just 3 hours. All I am asking is to take about 600 employees off of the over 64,000 employees in the Department of Agriculture. Certainly that cannot be said to be a meat ax economy. It is just as I stated about that small boy of mine; you have to tighten up occasionally.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HOLMES. Involved in the gentleman's amendment, was there included a reduction in moneys for agricultural research?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. There are no reductions in that particular item. Let me say to the gentleman, you must remember that the Secretary has the right all through the bill, if he so sees fit, to shift 7 percent of any of these appropriation items in his discretion over to another department. If he feels, for example, that the Bureau of Human Nutrition has been unfairly treated by the Congress, he can take 7 percent from another item and put it over into that particular bureau and increase its appropriation. So, I cannot possibly see, gentlemen, where a little tightening up, just a mere 1 percent or 2 percent, in these 40 items will do any damage whatsoever to our great Department of Agriculture.

Mr. HOLMES. The reason I asked that question of the gentleman from Minnesota is that I believe the Research Division of the Department of Agriculture is one of the most important divisions that we have.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. HOLMES. And I do not want to see those funds unduly reduced, because I think they are making a great contribution to the whole problem.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. You will see that the first item having to do with research has not been touched at all.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. I should like to ask a question similar to those asked by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HOLMES]. I am interested in the gentleman's amendment. I wonder whether he would tell the House exactly where, in what bureaus, his reductions will take place. As the Clerk read the amendment, I was unable to follow it. I think perhaps it would be wise if the House knew exactly where the gentleman proposes that the reduction be made.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I wonder if we should not give the gentleman time enough so that he can start at the beginning and go right through and tell us what each item does and why.

Mr. YATES. I think that would be a very good idea.

Mr. TABER. With that in mind, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be given 10 additional minutes, and I suggest that we let him have a little more if necessary in order to let him finish.

Mr. WHITTEN. That is agreeable. Of course, I hope the gentleman will be fair enough to give us the same time in reply. I am sure he will.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. As far as I am concerned, the gentleman from Mississippi can have until 6 o'clock tonight.

Mr. WHITTEN. I wonder if we could have an agreement as to time on this amendment. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto

close in 25 minutes, the last 15 minutes to be controlled by the committee.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That is out of order until the first speaker has finished speaking, is it not, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may yield if he so desires.

Mr. WHITTEN. I wanted to give the gentleman his time, but I wanted to be sure the same time was given the other side.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Surely, but it is a little bit early to make that request. I should like all the gentlemen interested to have an opportunity to speak.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that whatever time the gentleman has, the committee have an equal amount of time preceding the close of the debate.

Mr. TABER. That is all right.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I understand from that there is no limitation on other gentlemen who may care to speak, because after all this may be the only opportunity a lot of Members who are interested in agriculture will have to say what they think.

Mr. WHITTEN. I have no desire to close them off at all.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York that the gentleman from Minnesota be permitted to proceed for 10 additional minutes?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. It is really a little easier, Mr. Chairman, to answer the inquiry of the gentleman from Illinois by simply pointing out, as I have, that these cuts are not directed in the main at any one item.

Mr. Chairman, these are all very small reductions. But you will see they total up to a considerable sum. All it means in reference to any of these particular items is that in the case of a few people who happen to retire, just do not replace them and shortly these bureaus will be down to this particular figure. I know how it is on my farm in Minnesota. Prices have gone down. I do not get what I used to get for my produce. Consequently I had to lay off a man in the last 2 years. It seems to me we get the work done anyhow to a certain degree. Times are getting hard. The average man in the Government does not realize that. My amendment is simply an effort, as I have said, to do a little tightening up.

Two or three years ago I mentioned to CLINTON ANDERSON, then Secretary of Agriculture, "Why do you not come to Congress and ask the Congress a little additional pay for the top men under your jurisdiction? I do not like to see men having the responsibility of a great bureau receiving the same pay, $10,330, as three or four or five of his subordinates receive." I said, "If that man is any good, he is entitled to $13,000 or $14,000 a year." So I say that perhaps we have too many eight- and nine-thousand-dollar-a-year men in Government, and I certainly feel on the other hand that our topnotchers, who have proved themselves, are entitled to consideration, which was given them just this last week by affording a little break on that ten-thousand-dollar limit, a place where these good men in Government could expect to pass on upward if they really showed they had the goods.

I think that gives you my opinion relative to these good men in Government. Let us pay them what they are worth, but let us not have too many of them.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield.

Mr. REES. I think it is extremely important, however, in giving consideration to the increase in salaries to these top-flight men in Government, that we do secure men who are qualified and entitled to those increases in salaries, and not simply increase somebody's salary because we can get it done. I am very earnest when I say it is extremely important that we get men of ability to hold these jobs, and not select them just because they may be political appointees, appointed because of their political affiliations, or something they have done for the party, and things like that.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman's record in Congress has always shown that he has been sincere in these things. He is trying to accomplish much for the good of our Nation. But I want to tell the gentleman this: I have been closely associated with this great Department of Agriculture for at least 6 years, while serving on this subcommittee. I know there are many, many very good men connected with that department. I am sure the gentleman does not dispute me in that regard.

Mr. REES. Oh, I am in accord with that statement. I am speaking generally with respect to this question of paying top-flight salaries. I supported the legislation, but along with it we want to get men who are entitled to that salary.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. May I say that the Forest Service is one of the services of this country more near to the hearts of the average Member of Congress than any other service, but, at the same time, let me come back to this old thesis of mine, that if we are to cut we also have to cut on those things that are dear to us.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] has again expired.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Now, as to REA, it is very important to many of us; in fact, in 1948, I fought through an amendment on the floor adding $100,000,000 in loans for that particular project, and since that time our subcommittee has seen fit—and I may say that that was in the awful Republican Eightieth Congress when first REA received the great impetus toward construction—but since the Republican Congress took that step, the step which gave to them whatever money they could use without waste—because, after all, it was nothing but loans, and the repayment record was splendid—the Eighty-first Congress has, I am glad to say, followed the same policy. Since the Republican Congress started that policy we have continued the same policy in this subcommittee, and, as a consequence, that great boon to the farmers has spread all over the Nation. I want you to remember that point when you refer to the awful Eightieth Congress. I might elaborate by saying that in that particular Eightieth Congress we gave $800,000,000 in loan authorization to the REA where the previous five Congresses had given them only $240,000,000 more than that amount. The total is $1,042,000,000, I believe. I am just pointing that out, as an indication that REA is a very dear project to me personally; it lights my own farm. But at the same time I am asking that REA take here a small administrative cut. It is 2 percent, I believe, to be exact. We cannot expect, Mr. Chairman, to cut the projects dear to other people unless we are willing to take part of that cut on our own projects, on those, so to speak, very close to us personally.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield.

Mr. WHITTEN. By this rather lengthy and comprehensive amendment which we agreed the gentleman might offer all together, he does not mean to indicate that we have not already cut out financing of these programs, does he?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman from Mississippi knows that I have said that the subcommittee has done a very splendid job. I also made the statement that had it not been for that shocking statement made the other day that we were going into the red during fiscal year 1951 by $7,300,000,000, I would not have offered this amendment. But I feel it my duty to do so, because I added $1,000,000 to the bill for more soil conservation service districts, as the gentleman knows; so I feel it my duty to take off a little to make this bill balance out.

Mr. WHITTEN. In other words, after the gentleman adds to this whatever he is specially interested in he wants to cut down on the rest of it; is that it?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. No. I might say that I did not do it; I am not powerful enough on that subcommittee to add an additional million. I did it together with my good friends the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STIGLER], the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN], and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. KRUSE]; they aided and abetted me in that addition on the theory if we were to have new soil conservation districts throughout America formed by people interested in keeping up the soil, that certainly those soil conservation districts should be activiated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, if you will look on pages 180, 181 and 182 in connection with the Forest Service you will see there that I propose very small cuts on tremendously big items. They are little 1 and 2 percent cuts. Here we have, for example, a cut of $100,000 on a great big item of $9,500,000; only $26,000 on forest fire cooperation out of $1,300,000; flood control, a reduction of 2 percent on an item totalling $10,750,000; soil conservation, two particular items, a reduction of $38,000, which has nothing to do with the operation of the Soil Conservation Service. Then there is P&MAIN we have six different items on which we have asked very minor reductions totaling about $300,000 which is very little when you figure that we have given that great organization approximately $10,000,000 or $11,000,000 in this part of the bill. And so on through. I may add that there is a 2 percent cut there also for REA of $163,000 out of $8,850,000, which leaves them $8,000,000. I remember not so long ago they were very pleased to get an appropriation of $5,200,000. I do know the telephone bill passed last year and for which I was glad to vote, further work has been necessary; but at the same time if we are going to cut in Government expenditures we must also cut these things that are dear to us. This brings us up to the office of the Secretary. I propose there only a 2 percent reduction, an amount of $43,000, reducing an appropriation of $2,143,000 to an even $2,100,000. That is a considerable sum of money. The same applies to the Office of Solicitor, Foreign Agricultural Relations and Information.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. STAGGERS. On page 180 did the gentleman reduce the item for national forest protection and management of $26,890,000? If that was reduced I did not hear it.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. By only one-third of 1 percent, $100,000, on that large item of $26,800,000. That is because of the splendid record that the Forest Service has made in bringing back into the Treasury an almost equal amount in receipts.

Mr. STAGGERS. Page 182, the item of $10,348,000 for roads and trails, was that reduced?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. By 1 percent, a little less than 1 percent, I might say to the gentleman.

Mr. STAGGERS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I will conclude by making this statement. Remember that we as a nation are going into the hole $800,000 every hour of the day. This amendment simply takes care of the deficit for 3 hours. I cannot help but remember that back in my county a 2 days' deficit on the part of this great Government of ours would buy all of the splendid farms in my home county and you could throw in a good many of the business districts in that particular area to boot for that money.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. During the debate on the District of Columbia appropriation the gentleman stated that in the name of economy and in order to cut the District of Columbia appropriation he was willing on behalf of the farmers of Minnesota to accept a 10-percent reduction on AAA payments.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Yes.

Mr. YATES. Is that provided for in the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Had your people on your side done what I challenged them to do, and that is to cut everything along the line 10 percent, I would be willing that agriculture also share in its contribution to our national solvency. But, no, you know what little amendments have been accepted in the last 8 days on this floor. The majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], knows what has been done. It does not amount to anything; practically nothing, and I am hoping that this amendment now will be considered so moderate and so reasonable that you Democrats will help to save $2,500,000 and get 600 people off of the pay rolls of our great Government, people who are not necessary. Yes, I repeat, had similar cuts been made throughout the bill, certainly I would have voted and would support an amendment to cut out 10 percent of the triple A payments. My farmers would want me to do so.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to indicate my interest in the proposed appropriations for the national forests. I have a personal as well as a national interest in them. The Allegheny National Forest is located in my district in Pennsylvania—the Nineteenth Pennsylvania District. I know, therefore, from observation what is being done to rehabilitate that forest land there on the headwaters of one of the important watersheds in this country. I am seriously concerned, therefore, that this bill not only does not provide for strengthening our work with these natural resources but, instead, proposes the equivalent of heavy cuts in this type of work.

I realize that the report—page 154—shows an increase of $590,000 for "national forest protection and management." However, when Pay Act costs are included, that increase is converted into a decrease of $250,000.

In other words, instead of there being an increase for the national forests, the bill actually calls for the equivalent of a cut of more than $1,000,000 in most national forest activities.

The bill also calls for cuts in other national forest projects. For minor forest roads and trails—our western friends call them access roads—a cut of almost $200,000 below the amount available this year. And a cut of 75 percent below the appropriation this year for acquisition of lands inside the national forests—as within the Allegheny National Forest.

Many of us here—and many of our fellow Americans throughout the country—are inclined to believe that our forest resources are really in pretty good shape, not a thing to worry about. That is perfectly natural, I think, and is in large measure induced by the fact that—as you travel or drive along in your car—you will see many trees growing, most everywhere. Unfortunately, too few of the doubting Thomases among us take time to stop, get out, and see what kind and manner of trees these are. Granted that they are pretty to look at, serve some purposes of shade, and soil and watershed protection, we must still think, practically, along the lines of our Nation's need for timber today and tomorrow. And that is really something to think about, gentlemen. The close view will disclose the alarming fact, even to a layman, that our second-growth stands of timber generally cannot begin to compare with the original. Most of the trees growing, apparently so prolifically, are but poor substitutes for those they replace, both in species and quality. A large part of this timber will never make the grade as sawlogs, our essential source of wood.

There is little doubt that everyone of us is concerned with bringing about economy in government, whenever and wherever it is feasible and just. I realize fully what a difficult job it was for the committee to weigh all the factors, coordinate all the demands, and come up with the fine bill which it finally prepared. If I have any criticism of this bill it deals mainly with what I think is a rather natural failure to consider—from a sufficiently long-range point of view—a very definite, very valuable, portion of all the trees growing in this country. I am speaking, of course, of the timber in our national forests. In establishing the appropriation for the protection, management, and utilization of these national forests of ours, I firmly believe that our committee should have taken more into account the future values inherent in these public forests. What the bill proposes is the equivalent of a heavy cut in the appropriation, seriously affecting future timber yields, future financial returns.

It is estimated that more than 600,000,000,000 board feet of saw timber is presently growing in our national forests. Now, these are multiple-purpose forests, with trees good to look at and enjoy, good for watershed purposes, and—if our foresters are only given the wherewithal—capable of management for the greatest possible yield of lumber and other forest products. The timber harvest on the national forests is run-

ning about 4,000,000,000 feet a year, a very vital contribution to total production in the country. Cash returned to the Treasury from this harvest exceeded $27,000,000 last year. This is not as much timber as could be harvested right now, actually only about two-thirds of the current, possible timber yield. And with proper consideration from an appropriation standpoint the yield could well be doubled in a not-too-distant future. But it takes a small increase, not a cut, in protection and management of the national forests; a small increase, not a cut, in the building of access roads to open up the stands of big trees that are ready, right now, to be logged; a small actual increase, not a diversion by earmarking from other needed national forest funds, for the program of planting small trees to replace those gone; in the acquisition of key sites within the national forests to make the handling of them more efficient and effective. Aside from the timber resource, more money, not less, is needed to build up and maintain the other national-forest services our citizens deserve to have and to use; the range resource, the fish and wildlife resources, the recreational resource, the water resource. Well, the bill as it now stands does not provide the necessary increases; instead, it cuts in several instances well below budget figures.

Gentlemen, as you know, you cannot grow a crop of trees overnight or in a single season, as you do a crop of corn. Our appropriations for the national forests should be made with that in mind. We should not hamstring necessary current efforts; nor placing a restrictive ceiling on future values and returns. We just cannot afford to hold back the clock in the matter of national-forest management, protection, and utilization. Our national welfare, during peacetime, and our national strength, at any time, demand that we overlook no bets in keeping our natural resources well and strong.

I do not now propose an amendment to the appropriations bill in connection with the national-forest items. I do, however, urge our House conferees to favorably consider any proposal by the Senate to increase these appropriations.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LECOMPTE to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] Where the words "on page 172, line 25," appear in the Andersen amendment strike out the figure "$4,018,000" and insert "$4,118,000" and add the words "*Provided*, That $100,000 shall be made available for European corn borer research."

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, since the gentleman from Minnesota has offered a comprehensive amendment to change almost all of the figures in this entire section, I am offering an amendment at this time to his amendment, which provides simply for adding $100,000 for European corn borer research and making that amount available exclusively for this important task. We have spent over $100,000,000 to fight the foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico to keep it out of our great herds, and this is money well spent if we win the battle, for the livestock industry is worth billions of dollars. Can we not spend a little to fight the corn borer?

Mr. Chairman, the Middle West is the bread basket of the United States. At the present time the great Midwest corn area is invaded by the European corn borer which was discovered 25 or 50 years ago along the Atlantic seaboard. It gradually traveled west until it has invaded the commercial corn area to such an extent that it is believed that the corn borer in the crop season of 1949 cost the producers of this country from 100,000,000 to 200,000,000 bushels of corn. Corn is worth over a dollar a bushel. I offer this amendment which simply raises the total amount in this bill by $100,000, an increase of $100,000 in a $29,000,000,000 bill. As an actual matter of fact, I think this is the best economy that we can practice. I imagine that it will occur to many persons that at the present time there is a surplus of grain, particularly a surplus of wheat and corn. But, that may not always prevail. The gentleman from the city districts should be interested in this amendment because 90 percent of the corn crop is fed to meat animals and poultry. It is commonly said that corn is marketed on the hoof.

The whole purpose of this amendment—and I have been at the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine day after day—is to get a little bit more money for experimentation and research into methods by which we can control the European corn borer and perhaps discover a parasite that will live on the European corn borer and help to destroy it without becoming a pest itself. There was a cut of $166,000 below the President's budget estimate for insect investigation and control. My request is only for an additional $100,000, $66,000 less than the President's request. In the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota there is a proposal for an additional cut. The corn borers have invaded practically every corn field in the commercial corn area. Some progress has been made in treating young corn with DDT and other insecticides. Efforts are being made to develop a variety of corn that will be corn borer resistant.

My amendment, although it provides for research, will permit some of the money that is to be used for research to be released for control. At the present time the Bureau is cooperating with the several States. A corn-borer experiment station has been located in Iowa. The fieldmen of the Department go through the counties and advise the farmers of the proper time and the proper method of applying the dust or spray to control the corn borers.

I believe this amendment might save the country vastly more than the $100,000 involved. It might save millions of dollars in the years to come. Now is the time to accomplish results. I have been in favor of the economy proposals down through the consideration of this bill. In most of the cases I have supported the proposals to cut the appropriations in this bill. However, I think it is real economy to give the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine a little more money with which to go into research on the European corn borer and undertake to discover some kind of parasite that will prey on the corn borer and to that extent help in the production of one of the greatest of all basic crops.

Remember when you vote on this amendment that every person is interested in the production of food. A little money invested now in research will bring in untold returns.

(Mr. LECOMPTE and Mr. HULL asked and were given permission to revise and extend their remarks.)

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I move to srtike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, many Members of this House operate farms, as I do. However, it is not necessary to be a farmer, though it helps, to be fully aware of the decline in farm income. The prices received for farm commodities have declined much more rapidly than the operating costs. That is what hurts, and the small farmers have suffered most, for their margin of profit is less. This situation prevails in your district as well as mine.

We are all familiar with the findings of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report. It was released some months ago. It showed that about one-half of the farm families, in this great, rich country of ours had insufficient income to maintain a decent standard of living and meet current, essential, farm-operating costs. The report was for the year 1948, when the farm income was considered satisfactory. Now the income is considerably less, yet the operating costs remain relatively high.

We used to talk about the lower third. Now, due to economic changes, it appears that we should be concerned about the lower half of the American families who gain the major portion of their livelihood from farm operations. Where can they turn to for needed credit, advice, and guidance? Credit through the regular channels is not now readily available. For the majority of these farm families, their only source of help is the Farmers Home Administration.

Many Members of this body believe that, due to the economic trend, the only salvation for many farm families is to make changes in their farming operations. To do this they, too, need credit, advice, and guidance in making this transition. Again, the only source of credit and help available to them is through the Farmers Home Administration. Feed, seed, fertlizer, livestock, and good operating equipment are essential for successful farming operations. It's immaterial whether one lives in the East, South, West, or North.

Thousands of veterans turned to this agency for financial aid and assistance. It was the only avenue open to many of them who desired to get reestablished on farms. The latest report I have shows that over 150,000 loans have been made to ex-service men, who also received helpful guidance through this agency of the Department of Agriculture. What would these young men be doing now if it had not been for the Farmers Home Administration?

The Administrator, Mr. Dillard B. Lasseter, in accordance with the wishes of the Congress has given preference to veteran needs. But, the demand from veterans for operating loans to properly stock and equip a farm have been so great that, after their needs have been taken care of, what is left cannot even partly meet the needs of the nonveterans. They, too, are good Americans and made valuable contributions to the war effort, even though they were never in uniform. If eligible and worthy, families of these nonveterans, if they too wish to farm, should be given encouragement. Funds should be made available to both groups. Who are we to say that they are not entitled to an opportunity?

In the Ninth Wisconsin District operating loan funds have been exhausted for some time. The same situation prevails throughout the entire State. It happens every year. I get numerous complaints—several this week—from young folks in my district advising that the county committee has approved their applications but no help is available, for the money has run out. I made it my business to find out just how much Wisconsin was allocated out of funds appropriated by the Congress for the 1950 fiscal year. The amount was $2,350,000. This two-million-odd dollars did not meet the demand. We could use advantageously twice that much in Wisconsin. There is no reason to think that the situation is any different in my State than yours. Members of this body, especially those representing agricultural districts, are equally aware of the inadequacy of operating loan funds. In all probability the demand will be still greater in 1951.

I know what the Farmers Home Administration and its predecessors have accomplished. I have followed their activities closely for a number of years. I have been on their farms and observed the progress made by farm families through the assistance of this agency. It has a most commendable record; no agency of the Department has a better one. Not only has it rendered valuable assistance to millions of worthy farm families, unable to get credit elsewhere; it has a remarkable collection record. Of the obligations to the Government which have matured, the Farmers Home Administration has collected $9 out of every $10. The interest collected has gone far in defraying cost of administration.

I believe, as many of you do, that the budget estimate of $85,000,000 for operating loan funds is too low to meet the demand for the 1951 fiscal year. I believe the future has been underestimated. Mr. Lasseter is conscientiously endeavoring to carry out the mandate of the Congress. We expect him to render a service to a community and give financial and and assistance to all worthy farm families. At the same time we cripple him with lack of funds. He is unable to perform the duties expected of him. We give billions to foreign countries in an effort to rehabilitate the needy and underprivileged, much of which we know will never be repaid. But here at home we hesitate to make funds available for loans to our own countrymen, the major portion of which we know will be repaid to the Treasury, with interest. Is that fair?

I am recommending an increase in the operating loan authorization for the Farmers Home Administration. I think this is seriously needed if this agency is to function properly and as the Congress expects. I repeat, I believe that the Budget Bureau's request for $85,000,000 is too low. If my home State of Wisconsin is a criterion, the amount should be far greater—at least $125,000,000.

Again, let me remind you that this is not to be a dole or a gift. The funds appropriated will be paid back into the Treasury, with interest, by good, substantial, hard working, worthy families. I believe they are entitled to an opportunity to get a start in life through our help. They do not want subsidies—all they ask for is a loan.

I also want to call attention to another program included in a part of the bill now under consideration. It is the soil conservation program carried out through Soil Conservation districts. Farmers are proud of the success they have made in tying down their top soil by applying conservation practices and measures through this program. They find it increases their efficiency and that it is profitable to them. It is making them more independent and more secure in the feeling that they can weather whatever economic situations they are likely to encounter in the future. To me this soil conservation program is the very kind which the Federal Government should foster because it is building up not only the land resources upon which the future well-being of this country depends but it is helping to make farmers stronger and better able to carry their share of the responsibility for keeping America great.

The Federal Government contributes to this program by supplying the needed technical assistance to farmers through the Soil Conservation Service. It is important that sufficient funds be made available to give farmers the technical help they are asking. In the 57 soil conservation districts in Wisconsin where technical assistance is being provided, and I presume everywhere else in the United States in the 2,152 soil conservation districts, there is a waiting list of farmers who are anxious to get help in applying a soil conservation program to their farms. We must not fail to provide sufficient funds to see that these farmer requests are met as quickly as possible.

Farmers themselves operate these soil conservation districts. They take the responsibiilty of organizing their own program and obtaining assistance from all available sources. The Federal Government supplies the technical assistance largely but the State and local government agencies also assist these districts in getting their job done. The big point is that farmers themselves put their own money, time and effort into applying the conservation measures and that amounts to from 3 to 10 times more than they receive from governmental sources.

There were more than 125,000 farm conservation plans made in soil conservation districts, with the assistance of the Soil Conservation Service, during the last calendar year. These plans covered nearly 35,000,000 acres and the application of conservation practices and measures was completed on nearly 25,000,000 acres. Although these totals are considerably greater than the accomplishments of the 1948 calendar year, still they are lower than could have been accomplished providing more Federal assistance were available since I understand there were more than 350,000 farmer applications in the districts than it was possible to get around to with the assistance available.

My own district in Wisconsin is completely organized into soil conservation districts and they are moving ahead very rapidly. I want to encourage them in this most important job and urge that the Congress make sufficient funds available so that the farmer needs will be met. Conserving our resources is equally important with that of national defense and the maintenance of a wholesome economy in keeping our country prepared to withstand any crisis in which it may be forced. The appropriation to the Soil Conservation Service contributes directly and most efficiently to conserving our land resources so I urge that its appropriation be made sufficient to carry out all the farmers' needs.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEATING. Included in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota is a change in the figure appearing in the bill at page 208, line 20. Under previous rulings of the Chair lines 16 to 20 have been eliminated from the bill. My question is: One, is it too late to make a point of order against that portion of the gentleman's amendment, and if it is too late what is the effect of amending a figure which is not now in the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. It is too late now to make a point of order and, of course, it will be a nullity to amend something if it is not in the bill.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 40 minutes, the last 20 minutes to be reserved to myself.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, is it necessary if one wishes to reduce further the figures included in the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota to offer such reductions as amendments to his amendment, or would they be in order at a later time?

The CHAIRMAN. They would be in order at a later time if the H. Carl Andersen amendment were voted down.

Mr. KEATING. But if the H. Carl Andersen amendment is carried then they would not be in order at a later time, is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] is recognized.

(Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, with all the newspaper articles and all the stuff we hear on the air during the last few months about agricultural-support programs, it is always refreshing to me to be able to report that we have one agricultural program, at least, that is doing a very good job.

During the Easter vacation I took occasion to visit and study over one of these guaranteed loans as provided by the Cooley bill. The Cooley bill is one of the most constructive pieces of agricultural legislation that the Congress has passed in the last 10 years. Together with the Steagall bill, they were probably the two most constructive pieces of legislation that this Congress has passed. These guaranteed loans are an example of the cooperation that can take place between the bankers of a State and the local people. Young farmers are provided farms before they get so old they cannot work on them.

There have been 2,400 of these guaranteed loans in the United States, and over 260 of them are in the State of Wisconsin. It was refreshing to go on this kind of a field day. We visited one of those farms on which they were going to make a guaranteed loan, and we met the people. It was encouraging to see the things that could be done here in Washington and see it in action out in the field. Here was a young couple, in their late twenties, going out there and acquiring a home, owning a piece of America. I do not imagine any of us will live long enough to see the time when it will mean much in this country because we have too much undeveloped land, but it is an indication of a program that should be followed, because there is nothing that brings unrest, there is nothing that feeds communism as a program that does not allow people to own something and become a part of America themselves.

Under the Cooley Act, since its organization some 4 years ago, an organization has developed that is going ahead carefully. The returns to the United States Treasury have been very satisfactory. I repeat, it is one of the outstanding projects in legislation that has been passed. I wish to add that it has had bipartisan support all the way through. I repeat what I said before, in these days when so many things are said about agriculture, some true and others not, with everyone seeming to know all about it, it was surely a refreshing day to me to see legislation in operation right out in the field.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] is recognized.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, as I understood the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota he referred to his amendment as a "peanuts" amendment.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I stated that some other gentlemen had called it a "peanuts" amendment. To my mind it is anything but peanuts.

Mr. STAGGERS. I stand corrected.

As I understood the gentleman from Minnesota in his talk he proposes a small cut all along the line, but when he referred to the school-lunch program he praised that and said he was not going to make any reduction there.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman will note that I made no reduction whatsoever in any of these great worth-while programs, loans, or anything of that nature; the cuts were aimed simply at administrative expenses throughout the bill in certain items.

Mr. STAGGERS. I stand corrected.

Mr. Chairman, we are living in a highly turbulent world today. Everyone recognizes this fact. We have recently passed through one of the greatest depressions of history and have taken part and successfully waged the greatest war of all times. We are standing today almost alone as the one nation which is trying to uphold the rights of freemen throughout the world.

We recognize, too, that all the material things which go into making this a great and independent nation directly come from the soil. Therefore the fundamental truth is we rely upon the farmer and his products, so the strength of this Nation is directly interwoven with the strength and prosperity of our farmers.

Anything that affects this group of people affects everyone in the Nation whatever his walk in life. His well-being is our responsibility as well as any other phase of our national life. There is no question but what the great natural resources of our Nation have been the real basis of our high standard of living.

The committee is to be congratulated on the work it has done.

I well recognize the problems which it faced in its consideration of this bill. However, I believe that in recommending the equivalent of a reduction in the appropriations for our national forests, the committee failed to give sufficient consideration to the long-time implications of this reduction. In examining the budget requests for the national forests it is evident that they are based upon the financial needs to make these national assets contribute more adequately to the Nation's future security. We are all agreed that the United States must be kept strong to retain its place of world leadership. Our natural resources—soil, forests, and water—are the basis of that strength. We must not allow them to deteriorate. They should be strengthened.

I is true that there is a budget deficit this year. It is also true that 75 percent or more of the total budget is concerned with past and future wars, the national debt, and with miltary and economic assistance abroad. Only a little of it has to do with the conservation of the natural resources of which the national forests are such a vital part.

There certainly is no economy and, in fact, little sense in neglecting the protection and management of forest, range, and watershed resources belonging to the Federal Government; in failing to make these resources contriblute their utmost to our welfare and to our own strength and security. Such investments as these pay very good financial returns as well as nonmonetary returns indispensable to a prosperous people.

It is my understanding that we tried to recognize some of these needs by saying that they should be taken care of but that this should be done by diverting funds from one national forest activity to another. It does not make much sense to say you should put more money on reseeding ranges or replanting forests but drop the protection and administration of these resources while doing it. The more timber and forage we can grow on these national forests, the greater will be the dividends—the returns—from them. We know there will always be a demand for this timber, for the forage, and for the recreational and wildlife resources. So it seems only common sense to step up the production of these national properties; to protect and develop them so they will contribute more of the goods and services we need.

Such action necessitates providing each year suitable funds under a long-term program to protect and improve these forests properties. Continued productive condition of these properties will contribute greatly to the Nation's tax base and long-time security. It is urged that the conferees of this body when considering the several key items of the Forest Service, appropriations for which are now very inadequate, concur in the increased recommendations which we hope and expect will result from Senate consideration. The conferees who really study and investigate the amounts recommended by the two Houses will, in my opinion, find the higher recommendation of the Senate none too high due to the urgently needed work to prevent our national forest properties and other forest lands from being threatened with inadequate protection—a "paper" economy usually resulting in heavy losses and damages to the public's interest concerned.

National forest protection and management

Appropriation, fiscal year 1950	[1] $26,300,000
Budget Bureau recommendation, fiscal year 1951	30,270,500
House committee recommendation, fiscal year 1951	[1] 26,890,000
Difference	3,380,500

[1] Comparison misleading. Present national forest work will have to be cut $250,000 to provide salary increases. Present work on the vitally important 9 subitems of timber, range, wildlife, watershed and recreation management, land-use survey (Alaska), maintenance of improvements, fire control, and unit management will have to be cut a further $775,000. This amount is to be added to 3 subitems, namely, construction improvement ($150,000 to correct inducive interference from REA lines and $75,000 for sanitation improvements), reforestation ($350,000), and range revegetation ($200,000). The last 2 subitems were given only a portion of the appropriation authorization of $3,000,000 and $1,500,000, respectively (Public Law 348, approved Oct. 11, 1949).

Forest-development roads and trails

Appropriation fiscal year 1950	$10,348,000
Budget Bureau recommendation, fiscal year 1951	12,465,000
House committee recommendation, fiscal year 1951	10,348,000
Difference	2,117,000

Many of our development roads have been so long without adequate maintenance work they are injuring adjacent national-forest resources by accelerating erosion. Log bridges constructed by the CCC on some of these roads are becoming hazardous and need immediate replacement. In addition, many access roads are urgently needed and expenditures on these would be completely self-liquidating. These roads would make overmature virgin timber accessible for immediate cutting. Delay in such cutting encourages disease or insect epidemics, the control of any one of which may cost many times the amount by the Bureau of the Budget. That amount, $12,465,000, is still $5,000,000 less than the appropriation authorized for this item.

(Mr. STAGGERS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, the bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the next fiscal year amounts to $764,000,000 plus. This is an increase of approximately $32,000,000 over the appropriations for the last fiscal year. The omnibus amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota seeks to make some reductions in the administration of this Department. As I understand the amendment, it refers entirely to administration and is an attempt to eliminate small items in various parts of the chapter in the sake of economy without affecting actual benefits to the farmers. It should not affect REA or Soil Conservation.

My purpose in rising at this time is to inquire of the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking minority member of the committee whether or not their assurances to me of last year to eliminate duplications have been carried out in this year's bill? I cannot find it in the report. I refer specifically to the duplication of investigation of farms by the AAA and the Soil Conservation people, both of which agree with me that duplication should be eliminated.

The AAA examines farms, the owners of which are to comply with the soil conservation program. They make the payments. The Soil Conservation people furnish the technical advice. They also make full examination of the same farm. One examination should be sufficient. On certain occasions I have had opportunity to investigate the complaints of the AAA agency, also the complaints of representatives from the Soil Conservation Service that there is definite duplication in the examination of the farms and the projects under the soil conservation program.

Now, may I ask the chairman of the subcommittee whether or not that duplication has been eliminated in order that one examination of farms may be made to comply with the program?

Mr. WHITTEN. I may say to the gentleman that this has caused us a great deal of concern. All of us on this committee have tried to avoid this type of duplication. The 5-percent provision which went out on a point of order was our effort to take care of that. In other words, the technical engineers of the Soil Conservation Service will lay out plans for a drainage ditch and so forth, then you have a layman with no experience going out there and O. K.'ing the project.

Mr. STEFAN. The complaint of the farmer is he would like to go to the county seat or town and get all his information at one place. Then, too, his complaint is he has two sets of people who come to the farm and make examinations, one for technical advice and the other for payment. The officials of the AAA and soil conservation people tell me they are worried about this duplication and that the duplication exists. A year ago I took it up with this committee and I was assured they were going to do something about it. I am sure the two agencies would like to have this matter straightened out one way or another.

Mr. WHITTEN. We tried to put this provision in there. It was a starter, but we were tied down by limitations as to what we can do in an appropriation bill, and that provision went out on a point of order. We will follow it up by offering amendments to carry out the same purpose, but we are very limited in what we can do.

Mr. STEFAN. In view of the fact that the farmers, the officials of the AAA and officials of the soil conservation all agree that duplication is there, I hope that an effort will be made to eliminate such duplication. I want to do everything to make the soil-conservation program successful. Let us cooperate for that success.

Mr. WHITTEN. I am in thorough accord with the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am sure the Members of the House feel as I do about this bill. I think the committee has done a very excellent job. I think, however, as the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] has just stated, that we could very well cut down a little on the administrative expenses of the Department of Agriculture and it would hurt no one.

Agriculture is, of course, the basic industry in America. About 80 percent of all of the raw products are grown on our farms. The other 20 percent of raw products come from underneath the ground and from the sea. That is the new wealth that is created each year and is consumed the year it is grown or mined, or the year after, and because of that it becomes the basic industry of our land. The things that are manufactured and processed from raw products do not wear out and need replacement for years and years. So, first of all, we have to get the things that are grown on the farm to start this great economic system of ours to operate. Mother earth is our economic generating plant. Seventy percent of all the labor in America is employed in the transportation, the processing, the distribution, and the sale of farm products, and when we have a deficiency of farm products, naturally employment suffers, but when we have depressed price for farm products, we have a depression in America. We have always had a depression in America with poor farm prices, and we have always had prosperity in America with good farm prices. Let us not forget that our wage earners collect over $4 for every $1 of farm income; also the businessmen of America sell over $4 worth of goods for each $1 of farm income. And I want to say that it is not just we folk that come from the farm districts that understand the problem and the value of a good farm program and of good farm prices, because most of the Members from the city districts on both sides of the aisle in this House have been very cooperative with the Members from the farm States.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment has been called by some a peanuts amendment because it takes a little bit out of a great many appropriations. Let me say to you that the over-all figure is, as I understand, $2,585,000. I may have that last figure wrong, but it is $2,500,000 anyhow.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. May I give the gentleman the correct figure?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Two million five hundred and twenty-two thousand three hundred dollars. Of course, that includes the cut made on the estimate which was stricken on a point of order, I believe.

Mr. TABER. Well, that, of course, would not be affected at all.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That is correct.

Mr. TABER. These cuts vary from amounts as low as $10,000 up to amounts

as high as nearly $300,000. It would be absolutely impossible to take up the time of the House to have these small cuts running about $10,000 considered, for there would be too many amendments to consider them individually. This blanket amendment proposition is the only way we can get any consideration of a reduction in the bill on so many items, where the proposed cuts are comparatively small. Under those circumstances I think the gentleman from Minnesota has performed a real service.

I am not going into detail on these items except to say that we all know there is not a department or agency of the Government of the United States that cannot take at least a 10-percent cut without being hurt a bit. When a Member proposed only a 2-percent cut we ought to adopt it and adopt it quickly and without any division on the floor of the House.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Remember that on many of these items only a 1-percent cut is asked for.

Mr. TABER. I understand that is so.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Further in reference to what the gentleman just had to say, if anybody would take the time to go through any of our departments he would find plenty of people in the departments that would make him wonder just what they are doing for the money the Government is paying them.

Mr. TABER. Yes. The committee has made a great many cuts. It has tried hard to make some savings in this bill. We have so many burdens being thrust upon us in the nature of defense that we cannot consider cutting in any substantial amount that our situation today is such that every place we can cut where it will do no harm we ought to cut.

I think the committee should accept this effort to cut and should allow the Congress to adopt this cut unanimously. I know of no possible way except by cutting down the expenses of government that this bill or any other bill relating to the disbursement of funds can be brought down within the limits of our ability to pay.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota which I understand is not in order while the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa is pending. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that we vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa at this time.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I must object to that, of course, since we have not had a chance to speak on the amendment.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment may be read at this time and I will speak to it and the amendment be disposed of later.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KRUSE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and on that I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN and Mr. WHITTEN.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 10, noes 47.

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. KRUSE. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] for information.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEATING to the amendment offered by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN: On page 198, line 2, strike out "$6,717,000" and insert "$5,054,000."

On page 198, line 9, strike out "$9,987,000" and insert "$6,963,000."

On page 201, line 12, strike out "$27,423,000" and insert "$26,149,000."

On page 205, line 8, strike out "$2,401,000" and insert "$2,364,000."

On page 206, line 5, strike out "$588,000" and insert "$576,400."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] is recognized in support of his amendment.

(Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, this amendment at least has the merit that it will produce a substantial saving, and is simple. I hope it has sufficient merit that it will appeal to the Members of the House.

There are five instances in the perhaps 30 or 40 included within the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN], where his proposed cut does not go as far as reducing to the figure for that particular expenditure to the amount provided last year. I commend the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] for the study and the care that he has given to this matter. He has certainly performed a distinct service. I shall of course support his amendment.

I do feel, however, that we should go further in those places where we are appropriating this year more money than we appropriated last year. This is no time to increase. On the contrary, we must decrease at every possible point if we are to achieve financial stability. My amendment, I emphasize, is conservative in that it only restores last year's appropriations at the designated points. There are only five such places but they do involve substantial expenditures. I would like to point out those five places in detail, without discussion of the figures.

On page 198 the provision for Federal Crop Insurance Corporation would be reduced by this amendment $1,700,000 more than the gentleman from Minnesota has reduced it, but it would give to this Corporation the same amount which it had last year.

The next figure is in the Rural Electrification Administration, which I realize is a touchy subject, but it seems to me that here again we would be acting with all the generosity which our Federal purse permits, and then some, if we were to allot to this Administration the amount which it had last year, which is provided in my amendment, rather than the increased amount.

Then, on page 201, in line 12, is a provision for administrative salaries and expenses for the Farmers Home Administration, which again is reduced to the amount they had last year.

At page 205, line 8, the same reduction to last year's appropriation is provided for the expenses of the Office of the Solicitor for the Department and at page 206, line 5 for the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations. I hope the Members will agree that retrenchment at least to the extent of returning to last year's figures on these items is in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, may I be recognized in opposition to the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired except the time reserved by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I hope that I may have the attention of the membership when I try to address myself to the pending amendments.

I do not yield to anyone in this Congress in my sincere effort to reach governmental economy. I think my record here will bear that out, and I think my actions on the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations will bear that out. Certainly I hope that it will, and my sincere effort has been to see that it would.

This thing of providing appropriations for a governmental department which affects approximately 6,000,000 farm families and goes into every county and into every home in the United States is an important undertaking. To try to determine how much money a great department should have is a terrific problem. As I tried to tell you yesterday, one has to give attention not only to one bureau's need but to every part of it.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman mentioned 6,000,000 people. Do I understand that the money in this appropriation is paid to 6,000,000 different people?

Mr. WHITTEN. I meant to say that the effects of the operations of the Department of Agriculture directly goes into the home of approximately 6,000,000 farm families. It is not a case of any particular person, or anything like that.

Mr. VORYS. How many direct recipients would there be?

Mr. WHITTEN. It would be hard to say; it would be just as if the gentleman asked how many direct recipients there are of ECA aid. It is something one cannot state with exactness. But I may say that the residual beneficiaries of the action of the department are every man,

woman, and child in the United States; and now, through ECA, in many of the foreign countries.

In considering our activities on this bill and trying to meet our responsibilities we have worked as a committee. I am proud to say that in our considerations on the Appropriations Committee we have tried to start at A and go through to Z, to ferret out and dig into each item and say how much it took to actually operate this department. As we went ahead and advised with people to try to fix the program that we have brought to you we found that this 70,000,000 acres of land is eroded and needs to be restored. It was testified in the hearings that there would have to be an 85-percent increase in forestry appropriations if we were to properly take care of our forests. We do not have the money. We did not make any such provision, but it does call attention to the actual need that exists. When we got in there we tried to act as a committee for the whole United States; we try to be nonpartisan; we try to look over these situations. We realize that in particular areas there are particular problems, but we try to do this on a national scale and act from a national viewpoint. I think we have done a good job.

I know that it is popular to cut, and my good friend from Minnesota is taking the popular side of this matter.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman knows full well, and all of the members of the committee and our executive clerk know full well that I stated in the subcommittee that I did not consider myself bound, but felt free to offer any amendment I cared to either in the full committee or on the floor of the House. Surely, the gentleman does not want to leave the impression that I am going back on my word in any way, does he?

Mr. WHITTEN. No; I do not mean to indicate that; the gentleman has not gone back on his word. He stayed in the committee, and we worked out these amounts, and we worked them out to a general concensus of opinion of the five members. I believe that is a sound operation.

There is nothing wrong in offering these amendments as the gentleman does here; it is something that appeals to people; they like to think of cutting bureaucrats; they like to think of cutting public office holders. But the thing to remember is that last year this Congress raised the salary of many people in these departments. That was apparently popular with many Members here. It passed, anyway, and there is $6,000,000 in this bill that had to be inserted to pay for these salary raises that this Congress passed last year. One bureau head testified that they had about twice as much money this year as they had in 1939, but fewer people, and that this was due because Congress had raised salaries. That is something we are up against when we try to provide for these programs.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Before the week is over I shall offer an amendment to reduce salaries. Will the gentleman go along with it?

Mr. WHITTEN. When the gentleman introduces a bill here, I will go along with it, but how can I vote on it if he does not have a bill?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman could make a talk for it; that would help some.

Mr. WHITTEN. I would be glad to do that.

Now, in connection with this bill the Congress last year authorized the rural-telephone program. Are you going to destroy the rural-telephone program by voting for the language offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] which strikes out all of the money with which you set up the program? If you do not, and you are going ahead and have the program, are you going to strike out the expenses of the lawyers and those who have to go out and see whether you are going to get good security and whether you are setting it up on a sound basis, whether it is economically feasible, and for determining whether the Federal Government will be repaid?

Then there is the Rural Electrification Administration which has loans outstanding of approximately $2,000,000,000. Are you going to strike out the supervision of those loans and not see to it that the borrowers repay their money, that the rates are reasonable, and that these benefits go to the rural people? Are you going to do that?

In that connection, we set up the rural housing program. Are you going to strike that out, too? Are you going to let it go out to the rural people of this country that we set up for them a rural housing program, then proceed to strike it out?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. The gentleman is not assuming that it was me personally who offered that particular amendment. He, I believe, is referring to the Keating amendment, is he not?

Mr. WHITTEN. I mean no such inference. I know the gentleman is for both these programs.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I thank the gentleman. We both know that certain bureaus have considerable additional work as a result of last year's legislation, and I therefore cannot agree with Mr. KEATING's proposals.

Mr. WHITTEN. But I am trying to point out to you that when you cut down supervision you are cutting down your chances of collecting the money that is outstanding. You have to give attention to implementing these programs that you go to the country and say you have passed to provide for the rural people of the country.

When I say that, I do not mean that we should not conserve in every way we can. I do say that the bill this committee brought out does do that. The President's budget was reduced more than $42,000,000 by this bill. The bill that we present to the Congress this year is less than half the appropriation for the Department of Agriculture in 1940. Can you show me any record in any department that compares favorably with that?

Mr. Chairman, I do not advocate spending a dime that we can get by without spending, but in our effort to try to take advantage politically, and this is a political year, in our effort to get a reputation and headlines back home that we have set out to cut these bureaucrats, let us not lose sight of the fact that the American people and the American taxpayers have a whole lot of interest in these outstanding loans. We have a great interest in the proper operation of the Rural Electrification Administration, we have a great interest in the operation of the Farmers Home Administration and I say to my friends on the left who come and talk to me and say: Some of you say we have cut the Forest Service too much, this one too much and that one too much, that we have tried to do this thing on a fair and impartial basis. And may I say that my friend from Minnesota carried his due share of weight in the committee. This bill is the general consensus of opinion.

Just to show you how this thing works out, the corn borer is a very important item in Iowa. Our friend from Iowa [Mr. LECOMPTE] wants to increase that item because it affects his area, and it is a serious problem. We are all aware of our local problems. We know what our local problems are.

It is popular today to offer an amendment to cut the bill away off here, there, and yonder or somewhere, and I am ready right now to cut from A to Z throughout this Department if it becomes necessary, and I tell you that it is rapidly reaching that point. And, if you make an over-all cut here and then at the conclusion of this omnibus bill you make another cut, where are you going to leave agriculture? I think we have cut in this bill beyond the point that other subcommittee has gone. I think when I tell you that we have reduced this appropriation to where it is less than half the amount that was appropriated in 1940, that that of itself would show to you that we are doing a sincere job, and I believe that in the long run you will come out better if you will follow the advice and the consensus of opinion of the five members of this committee who worked long and painstakingly two and a half months on it than you would when some man gets up and says, "Let us cut it by this amount." Listen, in some places he takes out $3,000, and in some places $200,000, and, as I pointed out, in some cases there is no reduction. Now, that is not the way to do business here, and I say to my friends on the left I do not believe that you want to do that kind of business. Now, the gentleman has offered his amendment. Now, come on, let us run this Department like it should be run, and if there is any reason that we should cut further, I am willing to cut further.

Mr. KRUSE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. KRUSE. I want to commend the able chairman of the subcommittee on the statement he has just made and to join with him in his desire to see this amendment defeated.

Mr. WHITTEN. I appreciate the statement of my friend from Indiana.

Now, looking to the amendment that was offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LECOMPTE] I want to say that this problem which he raises here is a serious problem. This European corn borer is very, very destructive, but I would like to point out that in this bill there is close to $200,000 for work in connection with the European corn borer. So, we are not ignoring that subject.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LECOMPTE. We are spending $112,000,000 trying to stop the foot-and-mouth disease down in Mexico, and it is money well spent. My amendment just asks for $100,000 for research with respect to the European corn borer, and we have not got near enough money in the bill on that subject.

Mr. WHITTEN. That is right. The gentleman from Iowa knows that, the fellow from the forest areas knows about that, and the fellow from the cotton area knows about that, and if we total them all up this bill will be five times the amount that we have in it.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Are we not all interested in that program?

Mr. WHITTEN. Certainly, and I make no criticism of that. I have the same thing in my area and I am just saying that you have to cut your pattern to the cloth, and I am pointing out, and you are proving it, that this committee held back just as far as it could and still meet the problems that exist in this country.

In regard to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING], under the basic law the crop insurance program is to be extended to 240 new counties. If his amendment prevails, you are not carrying out the law. You are giving aid to two-thirds of those entitled to it, but you are saying to the other one-third, "Well, we will not do it." If his amendment prevails you are cutting out the money for the rural-housing program. You see, we authorized the loans. Well, what good is a loan if there is nobody to process them, if there is nobody to supervise them, or if there is nobody to see that that money is repaid, as provided by law. What good is it if you are not going to protect your investment by not setting up supervision. What good is farm housing, what good is the rural-telephone program if you want to do that?

When I make this type of appeal, and I hope it has appealed to you, I am in no way trying to get away from the fact that we have to reduce governmental expenditures drastically. As chairman of this subcommittee, I say to you that we went into the subcommittee room and we spent 2½ months working on this bill. I have had complaint after complaint, just as from my good friend from Iowa [Mr. LECOMPTE], that the cuts are too drastic. I have had plenty of them like that.

Then after we did that and found that we had reduced the appropriation by many millions of dollars below the President's budget, when we resurveyed the situation and saw that we were running in the red, I asked the members of my committee to go back, and we went back and cut out more than $6,000,000 more. I mention that to show you that I have tried to cooperate in every way that I know.

If we are going to have to start from A in Government down to Z in Government, I will be ready just as quickly as any of you are ready to take that action in the light of necessity, but I say to you that you make a mistake in cutting Agriculture, in this manner, now that we are right in the process of trying to get readjusted to a peacetime basis, further than we have already cut it, at the same time that you are voting authorizations for Marshall plan aid and for these many other things that most of you have voted for.

I say to the Members on my left who have been before my committee urging and beseeching that we take care of problems in connection with their own areas, with which they are familiar, and on which they should come before our committee, you think long before you come in here and vote to cut down still further the amounts we have put in this bill. I do not believe there is a one of you but that knows our subcommittee has made a firm and a conscientious effort to reduce these appropriations.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate the force of what the gentleman is saying. I of course admire him and his sincerity, as he knows. But the fact remains that regardless of the sincere effort which the gentleman says he and his committee made, the appropriation under this chapter is still $32,000,000 more than it was last year. My amendment is designed to reduce that by some $4,000,000.

Mr. WHITTEN. In reply to that, may I say to the gentleman that that is true, because the Congress provided for salary raises, the Congress provided for all these forest programs, the Congress provided for additional fire protection, the Congress provided for the rural telephone program, and the Congress provided for the rural housing program. If you want to cut those out, vote for these amendments, but if you want to keep faith with the American people and protect the position you have taken, you implement them as we have tried to provide that they be implemented here.

Just to give you some idea of what we have had to do in connection with this Department, you know it is popular to say, "Put them in the field, cut them out in Washington," but we are looking to this Department in Washington to supervise properly a $750,000,000 operation.

Last year I tried to pare down every division in the Department. If you will read the hearings you will see that that is so. This year the Republican members of my committee were protecting the Department from the questions I was asking the witnesses on one or two occasions. I tried to go into those things.

It developed that the Soil Conservation Service was not making the progress in some areas I felt it should be. We got them to bring up two different districts organized in the same State at about the same time. One of them had done twice as much work as the other. I asked that they set up minimum work standards, and gave them $25,000 more with which to make this study. That was last year. They made it. This year their statement was that the results from that program have increased 100 percent.

Mr. Chairman, do not vote for this false economy by striking out the supervision of a billion-dollar operation. I am going to hold them responsible. I ask you to let us give them enough funds so we can hold their feet to the fire and keep them responsible.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LECOMPTE], to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be again read for the information of the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The Clerk again read the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LECOMPTE], to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEATING to the amendment offered by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN: On page 198, line 2, strike out "$6,717,000" and insert "$5,054,000."

On page 198, line 9, strike out "$7,987,000" and insert "$6,963,000."

On page 201, line 12, strike out "$27,423,000" and insert "$26,149,000."

On page 205, line 8, strike out "$2,401,000" and insert "$2,364,000."

On page 206, line 5, strike out "$588,000" and insert "$576,400."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KEATING) there were—ayes 53, noes 82.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentle-

man from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN) there were—ayes 77, noes 91.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. WHITTEN and Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 95, noes 111.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not have proceeded very far before it will become apparent to the Members here present that my remarks will not sway any votes. I am tempted, however, to impose upon you for a very few moments in order that I may draw a picture in which may be contrasted the conditions of 30 or 40 years ago with the conditions that exist today. My recollection in this regard is probably not important at all; in fact it may not be too interesting, but, nevertheless, I venture to recite it.

Back in 1905 my father was chairman of the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives, a position which he held for 10 years. In those days the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, as did the chairmen of the other standing committees of the House at that time, handled the appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture on the floor of the House.

I was serving in the New York Legislature at that time. Upon adjournment of that body I came down here for a little 3- or 4-day vacation and found my father in his residence here in Washington. He was very much disturbed, pacing the floor, a worried look in his eye. I said to him, "What is the trouble?" He said, "Boy, do you realize that no matter how hard I work I cannot keep this Agricultural Department appropriation bill below $15,000,000?"

The bill now before us carries $769,000,000. If there is any such thing as turning over in graves, my revered father is doing that today. He made another observation to me which may have some bearing upon the present situation.

He asked me, "Do you know what an expert in the Department of Agriculture is?" I told him I was not sure. He said, "I will tell you. An expert in the Department of Agriculture is a man who can make two dollars grow in an appropriations bill where one grew before."

Mr. Chairman, apropos of that remark may I call your attention to the output of our present-day experts. I hold in my hand a document gotten out by the Department of Agriculture entitled "Family Fare—Food and Management Receipts." It is gotten out by the Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics. It might well be called The Federal Cook Book." I understand that every Member of the House is to have 3,000 of these for distribution as he sees fit. How many copies will be given to each Senator I do not know. If every Member of the Book. I understand that every Members of the House, there will be 1,305,000 copies at the disposal of the Members of the House of Representatives in the aggregate. Probably that figure will be raised to over 2,000,000 when the Senate's quota is added.

This pamphlet covers 95 pages devoted to telling the housewives of America how to cook, starting out chapter by chapter, how to cook beef in various ways, how to cook mutton, how to cook fish, how to fry eggs, how to boil potatoes. Is it not sweet that Uncle Sam should be so nice to our people by teaching them to cook?

I wonder what Jefferson and those who helped to write the Constitution and found our Government would think when they realize the powers of the Federal Government have now been extended to the point where it is regarded as a duty of the Federal Government to teach our women how to cook in their own homes?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Is there any appropriation for more cookbooks in this bill?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I do not know. This pamphlet has been paid for under appropriations made for the current fiscal year.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Does the gentleman know that there are 30 tons of books going out of the storeroom down here under the House Office Building, that have never had the wrapper broken on them, sold for old waste paper twice a year? And, they are baling it up every day.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It may be that some tonnage will be added to the amount referred to by the gentleman from Idaho, and that it will be contributed out of this publication.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. SUTTON. If the gentleman does not want his 3,000 copies, I would like to have them, because my people want them.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Let me say to the gentleman that I am not going to burden the Post Office Department with added loads. Everyone of these things is carried to the people at a loss to the taxpayers. I am not going to encourage its distribution. I do not know why I should pile such burdens on the people of this country. If other Members want to send out 6,000 instead of 3,000 or 9,000 instead of 3,000, they can go ahead and do it, but when you do so, remember the Post Office Department. It is going to cost thousands and thousands of dollars in addition to the cost of printing. I understand these things are going to be for sale at 25 cents apiece. It seems to me that bureaucracy has gone just about far enough. There is no public demand that the United States teach people how to cook. They can be taught in their local schools; they can be taught by State educational institutions. Why should they come to Washington? Is this a paternal government to that extent? Perhaps I ought to say it is a maternal government.

Already it has been proposed that the next move of this kind will be to design working clothing for women. Ouch! Where are we going?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we all dearly love to hear our good friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] speak. I do not know of any man on the Republican side or the other side here that is listened to more closely than is JIM WADSWORTH. In this connection, though, I think there are some facts that perhaps should be called to your attention. This book succeeds Aunt Sammy's cookbook, printed in 1927, under the Coolidge administration, and for many years thereafter, and it was continued on that basis until a few years ago. I would like to point out that in this pamphlet on Human Nutrition and Care it goes into the various foods, the calciums and the vitamins in general, and how to use foods and retain various elements. That is included in this book. Just yesterday this Congress voted millions and millions of dollars for public health, but to spend a little money here in trying to get the people themselves to study something about human nutrition, of course, it is good politics to laugh about that. I would like to point out to you the fact—and you supported it, and I am not condemning it—that this Congress provided the funds, and the public has demanded these volumes regarding the care and keeping of livestock healthy. In the last 2 or 3 years you have spent five times as much money on keeping livestock healthy, but you say it is ridiculous to give a little attention to human health. Do you know that in the last war about 36 percent of the draftees were turned down because of physical defects—mostly from faulty nutrition? Did you know that in this bill—and if you want to cut it down, you can do so—there is $83,500,000 for the school-lunch program? And, the testimony shows that the children from well-to-do families in about 50 percent of the cases need nutritious meals just as badly as those of poor people, and which they do not get because of the inadequate supervision and preparation in the home. And that is borne out by the record. Now, that is the book that is before you. Then there is criticism that the Congress distributes 3,000 copies of this book per Member, to whom? To the American people. Do you know any way in which to create more interest so that other people will buy them and get general distribution?

No, there is one other way to create more interest in it, and that is to have a few Members get up in Congress and

makes speeches concerning its publication. They create interest, and those speeches are helpful, because it has created interest in this pamphlet. The interest is such that people all over the country are asking for them.

Of course, our friend, the gentleman from New York, JIM WADSWORTH like me was raised on his mother's cooking, and I like to eat like she cooked, but in many cases it perhaps was not always the most nutritious way. It was the way we learned, and the way we like.

If you want to give a little attention to human health, you had better think of the money you spent on 71 previous pamphlets to keep livestock and other animals healthy. You spent millions of dollars yesterday on public health. Let us pay a little bit of attention to preventive medicine, and not wait until the opportunity is gone.

We had it so well pointed out to us in the last war when 36 percent of our youth at the very prime of their lives were physically defective, in most cases because of inadequate diet or bad nutrition.

I know the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] pointed out this Department used to be run for $15,000,000. I am proud of my record of holding down appropriations for this Department. It believe you will agree privately that I was right in what I was trying to do. This is the only Department of Government that is below what it was 10 years ago. Did you know that this appropriation is less than one-half the appropriation for the same Department in 1940? I am proud of that record, because it is a fight to hold administration costs down. But we are making that fight. You will strengthen our hand a little bit if you will recognize value when you see it, and pay a little attention to keeping people healthy instead of putting all your attention on horses and cows and mules, just as you have done. I believe you are going to do it.

This committee tried to keep the faith. We did not appropriate new money to provide this pamphlet. We substituted this for another book on keeping livestock healthy. We believe in putting people first. If that be bad business, make the most of it.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HORAN: On page 208, after line 20, insert "Not to exceed $12,000,000 of the funds appropriated in this title shall be available for travel expenses. Amounts available from appropriations contained in this title are hereby reduced by the total sum of $645,496, such amount to be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury immediately upon approval of this chapter."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment. I think the gentleman from Washington and I are interested in the same thing. Certainly we do not want needless travel.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, if a point of order is going to be raised, I think it should be determined now. I do not believe the amendment is subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rules of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi may reserve the point of order if he so desires.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. But that does not leave the presumption Mr. Chairman, that the point of order will stand, does it?

The CHAIRMAN. No.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Washington yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. HORAN. I yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. KEATING. Does the reservation of a point of order by the gentleman from Mississippi give any Member the right to make a point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment. It limits the amount of money which may be spent for travel. It provides for the covering back into the Treasury of the United States of money which has been budgeted this year above the fixed amount.

There have been ugly rumors going over the land that the Department of Agriculture has been engaged in what is certainly not legal tactics and that travel expenses have been involved in such activities. I believe until we have made some dispositon of these rumors it will be a protection to the good men and women in the Department of Agriculture to restrict these travel funds.

The founders of this great Republic of ours, believing as they did in a division of responsibility, provided for a legislative branch who were to express the will of the people of the United States. They were expected to meet once a year and put that will into law. Then the executive branch was to administer those laws as they appeared on the statute books. If we want to preserve the Republic, then when we hear of such infractions of the law of the land and infringements of one department of Government over the rights and duties of another department of Government, it is our duty to correct the situation. Certainly the executive branch should not become a propaganda machine to work its will when to do so would be contrary to what has been done by the Congress, the people's Congress, in this Nation's Capital. It should help stop the dangerous trend toward executive government. That is all the amendment does.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I presume my appearance here would be taken as in opposition to the amendment. But this is what I want to discuss with you. There is no difference between me and the gentleman from Washington so far as holding down travel is concerned not only in this department but in all the activities of Government. Travel should be restricted to the work of the department. It should be restricted to the necessities for carrying on the operations of the department. We have constantly stressed that fact. On occasion we do hear certain charges and frequently when we investigate them we find that the situation is not as it appears in the press but quite different instead. I question the wisdom of this amendment. Travel is not set up here as a separate item in this bill. The budget estimate came to us setting up tentative amounts which it was indicated would be used for travel. We reduced the budget. I personally state now so far as I am concerned, and I think I speak for the other members of the committee, the department will be expected to reduce travel in proportion to the reduction in these programs. Further we expect to see to it that they stick to the programs as they have been set out. If that is done they will come down to the figures in the gentleman's amendment. The only thing that I see about the amendment, and I would like to have the attention of the gentleman who has offered it in the hope that he will at least give thought to withdrawing the amendment, is if you set up a certain amount then when the end of the year comes around and there is still money available the temptation to take a few trips because they have the money is pretty big.

Mr. Chairman, I believe we have a better chance by having a committee understanding, as shown by the records in the debate, that they shall reduce their travel allowance to this amount or in proportion to the reductions we have made. I believe it would be better operation to reach our objective. We want them to have the right to do those things that they should do in connection with the operation of their department. I believe we can do it better without this amendment than with it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order for 1 minute of the 5 minutes to which I am entitled.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, with the dog-eat-dog parking situation that exists in the vicinity of the House Office Buildings for Congressmen, their families, visitors, and employees, Members of the House might be interested to know that Capitol Police have carried out orders from somewhere to reserve on Delaware Avenue, usually a nonrestricted area, space for about 10 cars, most of them reportedly Packards used by the United States Steel officials who are testifying on the third floor of the Old House Office Building in connection with the monopoly investigation.

I am wondering if the same parking facilities are furnished to other citizens called to testify in other hearings. If not, why this special privilege to United States Steel?

Is this in line with another privilege that I called attention to on the floor

of the House yesterday, that of United States Steel being allowed to clutter up the third floor of the Old Building with satin-bedecked exhibits, advertising scores of products of the corporation?

Incidentally, although I understand the exhibits were scheduled to remain in place for a week, they disappeared in the tubercular hours of the early morning today.

I again ask Members of the House, why all this special privilege?

Now, with respect to this bill, Mr. Chairman, it will take more than dollars alone to pull the farmers out of a tailspin which gives every indication of ending in a crash of the entire national economy.

Let us remember that every depression or period of prosperity has begun on the farms, because agriculture is our basic economy; because every dollar of farm income generates 7 dollars of national income, due to the fact that the farmer supports himself and six other people.

This is not like the chicken and the egg. We know by studying years of Government figures where depression and prosperity begin: on the farms. Never in the history of this country have unemployment lines lengthened until farm income has dropped.

And now, with the administration spending billions of dollars on inconsistent farm policies that fluctuate hour by hour, we know that farm income, according to the Department of Agriculture, has dropped about 30 percent in the past 2 years on a national average, with still another 3 percent drop forecast by the Department for 1950. And farmers of the Third District of Iowa, with whom I talked during the Easter recess, displayed produce and livestock receipts which demonstrated that their income has fallen not 30 percent but closer to 50 percent in the past 2 years.

Lawyers who helped farmers make out income tax statements tell the same story: farm income is down. Farmers therefore are paying much less income tax this year, and the Bureau of Internal Revenue will find this out when it completes final tabulations.

Although farm income has nose dived an admitted 30 percent, average prices that farmers have to pay to live and stay in business have fallen only imperceptibly. Prices of some farm equipment have actually increased as much as 26 percent while farm income has been dropping.

What has this situation already done to the Nation's economy? You surely know the answer: National income dropped about $5,000,000,000 from 1948 to 1949 and unemployment has now reached well above four million.

Thus we have chaos in the making, with population and unemployment increasing, but national income decreasing, ample evidence that the farm policies of the administration, although costing billions, have miserably failed not only farmers but the country as a whole.

As though this were not disastrous enough, the administration is sabotaging the farmer with his own tax dollars, by allowing the importation of almost every conceivable kind of farm product produced by slave or underpaid labor, financed in all too many instances by ECA.

I have repeatedly called attention to these imports, including hams from Poland, wheat and fresh eggs from Canada, and dried egg albumen from China and Argentina.

In the first 10 months of 1949 the administration imported 18,000,000 eggs from Canada, on top of an egg surplus in the United States, and I am informed that the Department of Agriculture will import not 18,000,000 eggs from Canada in 1950, but 360,000,000, or three-fifths of the total Canadian output, because Britain, Canada's traditional egg market, prefers not to buy eggs for cash from Canada when she can use our give-away dollars, or buy our dried egg surplus for practically nothing—a cent a pound.

And if you read last night's Washington Star, you perhaps noticed this ad by a supermarket. Here it is, in big type: Canned South American corned beef and canned South American roast beef at 43 cents per 12-ounce can. No doubt this is a tremendous aid to Dictator Peron, but it is no less than the act of a traitor to American beef producers; a further lever to pry the bottom out from under American farm prices.

Those of you from metropolitan districts might wonder what has happened, or not happened, to food prices that your constituents are forced to pay now that prices received by farmers are down about 30 to 50 percent.

Dun and Bradstreet reported yesterday that the wholesale food index, based on the total cost of a pound of each of 31 foods in general use, is up 2.8 percent over the same week last year.

Your metropolitan consumers are still tied up in the same noose they were last winter when they paid up to 70 cents a dozen for eggs for which Iowa farmers collected as little as 18 cents.

And how about so-called surplus onions? Iowa farmers have been plowing them under, rather than accept 3 cents per 50-pound bag, while metropolitan consumers pay 2 pounds for 15 cents, or at the rate of $3.75 per 50-pound bag.

So, I say again, we must look further than appropriations. This Congress should smoke out and order the prosecution of those responsible for the unconscionable spread of prices between farmer and consumer. Here's a job that my colleagues from metropolitan centers ought to enjoy getting their teeth into.

And we should enact a sound farm program, based on cost of production plus a reasonable profit to the farmer—a farm program such as the one introduced last session by the distinguished gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE], or the bill that I introduced March 24, House bill 7852.

These bills are not based on so-called parity, figures of the past, but on cost of production, the same as the products the farmer buys. Nor are they based on subsidies to be picked from the taxpayers' pockets; instead, support prices would be paid at the market place.

Mr. Chairman, such a farm program would go far toward stabilizing the economy of this Nation and avert the depression now in the making.

PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF MAY 1

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words and take this time for the purpose of asking the majority leader if he is in a position to tell us about the program for tomorrow and next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. I shall be pleased to.

Tomorrow, as heretofore announced, there will be general debate on one of the chapters of the general appropriation bill.

Monday: The Consent Calendar will be called and there will be three suspensions: One on H. R. 4942 relating to the Seneca Indians;

H. R. 6354, daylight saving time for the District of Columbia;

H. R. 7185, relating to a civil-service examination or list for veterans in one of the agencies.

General debate will continue on the appropriation bill.

Tuesday: The Private Calendar will be called and general debate on the appropriation bill will continue.

Conference reports, of course, may be brought up at any time.

The general appropriation bill will be the continuing order of business next week, but should it be disposed of in time for the consideration of other legislation I will confer with the leadership on the other side and announce to the House as soon as possible what the program will be so that the membership may be advised.

Mr. ARENDS. Is there a possibility there may be some roll calls under the suspensions on Monday?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; I should think so.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Did I understand the gentleman to say there would be nothing but general debate on Monday?

Mr. McCORMACK. Following the Consent Calendar and suspensions on Monday and following the Private Calendar on Tuesday.

There has been an understanding that all general debate on the appropriation bill will end Tuesday.

Mr. RANKIN. Is not that crowding general debate on some of these chapters?

Mr. McCORMACK. Earlier today there was a consent agreement that general debate would close on next Tuesday.

HOUR OF MEETING

Mr. ARENDS. May I ask the majority leader whether the hour of meeting tomorrow and on Monday and Tuesday of next week will be at 12 o'clock rather than 11?

Mr. McCORMACK. The House will meet at 12 o'clock tomorrow and at 12 o'clock on Monday. I should like to leave the hour of meeting open for Tuesday.

Mr. ARENDS. I thank the gentleman.

CHAPTER VI—DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment, and ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I want to bring out the fact that on Monday and Tuesday there will be a lot of Members absent because of primary contests. There are a lot of Members, I am sure, who will be absent but would like to hear the debate on the Interior bill. I wonder if we can have an understanding that we will not bring up anything pertaining to the Interior appropriation bill until Wednesday?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is beyond my control, I may advise the gentleman, because there is already a unanimous-consent agreement entered into that all general debate on the bill will close on Tuesday next and that the general debate on Tuesday will be on the civil-functions chapter. That was the unanimous-consent agreement made in the House before we went into the Committee of the Whole today.

Mr. JENSEN. I did not hear that request.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, that is binding, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Chairman, with further reference to the remarks made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] I wonder actually how many Members of the House have made a study of some of the publications, some of the hundreds and probably thousands of publications that are being issued from the very many plants devoted to the printing of Federal booklets, pamphlets, and publications? I have made a very cursory study and have come up with some very interesting facts.

For instance, the Interior Department has an interesting little brochure called The Early Life of the Atlantic Mackerel. I do not know how many people are interested in the early life of the Atlantic mackerel, but I should think it would be only a relative few.

If anyone is interested in the Mist Netting of Birds in Japan they can get full information on the subject from the Military Establishment. I am sure that in my district and throughout the Nation generally there are very few people indeed who have any interest in the mist netting of birds in Japan. I question that most of them could even afford the excise tax on a ticket to Japan.

Another little number is entitled "The Mortality of Soft Clams at Essex, Massachusetts." That probably is extremely interesting to the people of Essex, but it has no general utility so far as 160,000,000 people in the United States are concerned.

Now, we have something in the way of a Kinsey report on the sex life of the watermelon, for which the taxpayers of this country are being assessed. This may be biologically interesting to a few people as illuminating the facts of life about what transpires in a watermelon patch.

There is a humorous side to this but, on the other hand, hundreds and thousands, probably millions of dollars are being spent to turn out a lot of, to be charitable, we will say trash.

What this country needs today is not a good 5-cent cigar. It needs some booklets issued by the Federal Government on the following subjects: First, How To Balance the Federal Budget; second, How To Put an End to Deficit Financing; and third, How To Take a Saddle Off a Taxpayer.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. In listing these documents that are of limited interest, I think the gentleman and the Members may also be interested in some of the research projects that are undertaken and envisioned in this particular bill. I am happy at this moment to pay a compliment to the gentleman from Mississippi for bringing this out in the testimony.

The Bureau of Home Economics, it seems, went into the subject of functional clothing for women, and came up with the surprising result that the best way that a woman could carry more groceries home with her was to have pockets built in her apron.

Then on page 804 of the hearings they went into the question of how high a work table should be for the housewife in the kitchen. The gentleman from Mississippi with his usual adroitness brought out the fact, which seemed to be of some surprise to the research experts, that the height of a table would depend on the height of the housewife.

I congratulate the gentleman on his efforts in that direction.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Unless the Federal Government stops beating down the taxpayer they can build the tables considerably lower.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HOEVEN. Since we are discussing the agricultural appropriation bill, it might be of interest to the committee to know that quite recently the Department of Agriculture issued a very profound statement to the effect that eggs stored in cold storage will keep better than those in warm places, and that eggs in motion are more likely to be broken than if they are kept lying still.

Mr. JACKSON of California. I can only add that the Department of Agriculture missed one salient fact, to wit, that eggs are generally oval in shape, and except during the Easter season, are usually brown or white in color.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes, the last 3 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of Horan amendment. May I call the attention of the House to the fact that the amount of money available to the department for travel during this fiscal year is estimated at $12,126,201. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] in reality only drives that down $126,000. I think it is a very modest amendment. I do not see that there should be any objection to it. This is simply telling the good folks in the Department of Agriculture that they must hold their travel down to a total of $12,000,000. And, remember this, that the Secretary does have the right to shift from one fund to another in case of need in a certain bureau up to a limited extent, should the need arise.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, in this connection I would like to point out, as was earlier stated, that I am in thorough accord with what we are trying to do in this amendment, and that is to hold down the amount of money that is spent for travel. But, I have made some investigation of the matter, and administratively this effort to fix a limit in the bill will make it awfully difficult to handle. I believe that we should defeat this amendment, and in saying that I want the record to show that I do not believe they should exceed the amount provided for, and, furthermore, if possible, they should keep it below that. But, the bill does not now carry a separate provision for travel. The estimate of travel is listed in the budget; it was just on the budget submission to us for the operation of the department. We have reduced the budget by $42,500,000, and the travel should be reduced accordingly, and further, if possible. So far as I am concerned, I want the record to show that that is where we stand, but I do question the wisdom of doing it in this way.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Why not put a little bit of restriction upon them, so that they will have to toe the line a little bit? If we turn them loose, they are apt to run wild.

Mr. WHITTEN. To make this department alert, they have to come back before this committee next year—or at least, I trust that some members of this committee will be here next year—and

I think that the arguments that we are making here on the floor at this time will be sufficient notice to them that they better have their house in order, and I believe that is the better way to handle it.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. I am a little bit dubious about this, though. If we defeat this amendment, would it not be serving notice on the Department that they could go sky high?

Mr. WHITTEN. I asked the gentleman earlier to give consideration to withdrawing it for that very reason, but I reiterate that if it is defeated it does not in any way change the attitude of the majority Members that they should hold their travel expense to this figure or below. I hope we will defeat the amendment, because I believe we can meet the problem better without this being written into the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WHITTEN) there were—ayes 65, noes 68.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. WHITTEN and Mr. HORAN.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 81, noes 75.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, under the Agricultural Research and Marketing Act with regard to the utilization of research under section 10 (a), and cooperative research with State agencies under section 10 (b), the subcommittee in its wisdom has consolidated the appropriations under those sections with the regular appropriations of the various research bureaus and agencies of the Department which have been doing work by allotment from this appropriation in the past. Of course, we will all watch with interest what I might call this experimental effort on the part of the subcommittee. In the report of the committee at page 128 the committee states, "It is expected that the Department will continue to utilize the commodity committees provided for under title III of the act to an even larger extent than has been done in the past. The committee feels that the use of these committees is of extreme importance to the future effectiveness of the research work of the Department." I am in full accord. I think the House Committee on Agriculture fully agrees with that recommendation by the Appropriations Subcommittee. But reports have already reached me that inasmuch as the bill provides for the consolidation of the appropriations under sections 10 (a) and 10 (b) with the regular funds that the Bureau chiefs plan to eliminate from reports to and consideration by the commodity advisory committees of utilization research and in all cooperative research with State agencies.

I am further advised that similar action is contemplated in connection with research projects involving more than one commodity. I think this is of great importance, because I think the future of agriculture is in the research laboratory, and therefore I would like to ask whether or not it is the intent of the subcommittee that the research agencies in the Department shall, in every instance, continue to use the advisory committees, authorized under the act of 1946, or whether you intended, by consolidating the 10-A and 10-B funds with the regular funds, that those agencies were authorized to disregard and not make reports to and not use the services of the advisory committees.

Mr. WHITTEN. Certainly it would be the intent of the committee to see that the committees were used, as heretofore, to the fullest extent that they had been used, and in addition to that beyond the way they have been used before.

Mr. PACE. Notwithstanding this consolidation of the 10-A and 10-B funds?

Mr. WHITTEN. That is true. This research has been consolidated under one research administrator, and I personally conferred with him and suggested that he hold to himself the same rights to supervise the operations of research as heretofore, under the research administration, and not surrender it to the bureaus, as you indicate they have done. Instead of trying to enable the bureaus to get out from under the committee system, we have been trying to bring before the committee some of the regular operations of the Department, because we think that would be wholesome.

Mr. PACE. I thank the gentleman.

Now, is that the understanding of the gentleman from Minnesota and the gentleman from Washington, that they not only intended to use the advisory committee but to make greater use, notwithstanding the consolidation of funds?

Mr. HORAN. Very definitely, and to the fullest extent possible. I think the success of research depends entirely upon that. I am somewhat at a loss to have the gentleman from Georgia get any inference from our operation that we intended otherwise.

Mr. PACE. The rumor seemed to have some significance, and I hope the bureau chiefs will pay attention to what has been said here in the last 5 minutes.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I agree entirely with the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] in what they have had to say.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] has expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I have two amendments at the Clerk's desk. I wonder if they could be disposed of. I offer the first amendment, which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTEN: On page 191, line 17, after the colon insert: "*Provided further,* That not to exceed 5 percent of the allocation for the agricultural conservation program for any county may be allocated to the Soil Conservation Service for services of its technicians in formulating and carrying out the agricultural conservation program, and the funds so allocated shall not be utilized by the Soil Conservation Service for any purpose other than technical and other assistance in such county."

(Mr. ELLSWORTH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, we all appreciate what a tough situation the committee was facing in preparing this bill. Two volumes of testimony, most of it calling for increased appropriations, had to be weighed against the urgently pressing need to get this Nation on a better basis, financially. What I wish to propose is consistent with the committee's viewpoint in that respect—as considered from a long-range point of view.

Instead of a cut in the appropriations for protection and management of the national forests, an increase as provided in the budget would, without doubt, result in the long run, in strengthening the financial condition of this country Anyone who has tried to buy a single board within the past few years will appreciate the tremendous values we have in our national forests. More than 600,000,000,000 board feet of saw timber is growing within these Federal forests. Some 4,000,000,000 feet is now being cut annually from that stand. But billions of board feet more could and should be harvested every year by taking out the old trees and making room for the young ones. All of you farmers know that a crop should be harvested when it is ripe, and that provision should be made for the new crop. Appropriations for that sort of work are not expenditures of the ordinary type. They are investments which in the long run will be returned with good interest to the Treasury.

Funds are badly needed for access roads, fire protection, reforestation, and related work which will make our national forest timber available in great quantities, and forever, for peacetime and wartime needs, whatever they may be.

The situation is much the same with regard to other valuable national forest resources. Some 10,000,000 head of livestock are utilizing national forest ranges. The returns to the Treasury from grazing fees last year were more than 3¼ million dollars. In addition, those 10,000,000 animals contributed no small amount to the meat supply for this Nation. Surely we should do whatever is necessary to reseed depleted ranges and otherwise keep this great resource at a high level of productivity.

I realize that the House committee report, page 154, shows a small increase for national forest protection and management. However, instead of an increase there is actually a cut of more than $1,000,000 in most national forest activities. That is due to Pay Act cost disallowances of $250,000 and earmarking increases—page 134 of the committee report—of $775,000 for some projects, without providing any additional funds

for them. Hence, those earmarked increases can only be made by corresponding reductions in other work, such as timber sales, fire protection, range management, camp-ground operation, maintenance of lookout towers, and other improvements, and so forth. As shown on page 154 of the House report, the bill makes a cut below the budget of $3,380,-500 for national forest protection and management.

The same page in the House report shows a reduction of $2,117,000 below the budget for forest development roads—access roads. Due to Pay Act costs, this appropriation is cut almost $200,000 below the amount available this year. The total proposed is more than $7,000,-000 below the authorization.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I raise the same objection to this amendment as I heretofore raised, that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman desire to make that point of order?

Mr. MARSHALL. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I do.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi desire to be heard?

Mr. WHITTEN. I would just like to say that we made an effort to modify the amendment to strike out the language which we believe caused the Chair to hold earlier that it was subject to a point of order. We have tried to bring it within the limits of a limitation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. STEFAN. Is this amendment offered in an effort to eliminate duplication?

Mr. WHITTEN. It is an effort to try to coordinate these activities. I believe it holds high promise to give us a start on the point which the gentleman raised previously.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Mississippi has offered an amendment which the Clerk has reported. The gentleman from Minnesota has made a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it contains legislation on an appropriation bill, in violation of the rules of the House.

The Chair has examined the amendment and is of the opinion that it constitutes a limitation on an appropriation bill and is in conformity with the rules of the House.

The point of order, therefore, is overruled.

Mr. WHITTEN. I wish to state to the House that there has been considerable confusion about this item. It was carried in the bill last year and despite the confusion has brought about beneficial results.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. We understand there has been confusion, but we do not know who created the confusion. It is a permissive provision and is one that could be used to great advantage.

Mr. WHITTEN. I am glad to have the gentleman's statement. I think it will prove workable and I hope the House will adopt it.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. POAGE. Is not this about the only opportunity we have of getting any technical assistance in those areas where new soil-conservation districts are organized and established but without staffs at the present time?

Mr. WHITTEN. I think it will be a real help in that type of situation.

(Mr. HULL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION AND TELEPHONE PROGRAMS IN WISCONSIN

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, on May 11, 1950, the Rural Electrification Administration will be 15 years old. During this period the percentage of farm electrification in the United States has increased from 10.9 percent of all farms to over 83 percent.

In Wisconsin, at the time REA was established, only 39,206 farms, or 19.6 percent of the total, were receiving central station electric service. According to REA estimates, on June 30, 1949, 162,-802 farms, or 91.6 percent of the total, were receiving service, leaving approximately 14,943 farms unserved.

Through February 28, 1950, REA had approved $81,207,614 in loans in the State to 31 borrowers, 30 of them cooperatives. These loans will enable the borrowers to construct 27,926 miles of line and other rural electric facilities to serve 80,690 rural consumers. Most of these facilities already are in operation, and additional lines are being built as rapidly as possible.

REA had advanced $58,405,125 as loans by February 28, 1950, and borrowers in Wisconsin were operating 26,185 miles of line serving 72,932 farms and other rural consumers.

The average monthly farm consumption on REA-financed lines in Wisconsin increased from 84 kilowatt hours in December 1941 to 210 kilowatt hours in December 1949. This increase reflects greater use of electrical equipment to save time and labor in performing farm and household tasks to help bring about a more comfortable way of rural living. In the same period the national average went from 61 kilowatt-hours to 141 kilowatt-hours per farm.

As of December 31, 1949, Wisconsin borrowers have paid $8,592,528 in principal and interest on their Government loans. This includes $305,398 paid on principal in advance of date due. Fourteen borrowers were ahead on their payments. Three were behind, only $38,159 being more than 30 days overdue on loans in the State.

The Rural Electrification Act was amended on October 28, 1949—Public Law 423, Eighty-first Congress, first session—to empower REA to make loans for the improvement and expansion of rural telephone service. These loans may be made to commercial telephone companies, cooperatives, or mutual nonprofit organizations. Like the electrification loans, these loans bear 2 percent interest and are repaid over a maximum period of 35 years.

Nearly 2,500,000 farms had telephone service in this country in 1920. That was 38.7 percent of all farms in the United States. Farm service declined substantially during the late twenties and early thirties.

Beginning in 1936, farm telephone service was again expanded and by 1945 the census indicated that 31 8 percent of the farms in the United States had telephones, although much of the farm service was mediocre or poor.

In Wisconsin, 111,800 farms had telephone service in 1920. Paralleling the national trend, farm service declined substantially during the late twenties and early thirties. In 1940, only 72,440 Wisconsin farms had telephone service. By 1945 some increase was noted and the number of farms with telephone service had risen to a little more than 86,100, or 48.4 percent of the total number of farms. This left 91,640 or 51 6 percent without any kind of telephone service.

Although the telephone loan program is barely 6 months old, the REA has received 415 formally executed loan applications from borrowers all over the country. This includes 22 applications received from potential borrowers in Wisconsin, through April 25, 1950. These 22 applications represent requests for loans totaling $1,948,050 which would be used to extend telephone service to 3,836 new subscribers and improve service for 6,927 subscribers presently receiving substandard telephone service.

The 1951 budget request for the Rural Electrification Administration asked for a total of $450,000,000 in loan funds, of which $400,000,000 is to be used for electrification loans and $50,000,000 for telephone loans. A total of $9,525,000 in administrative funds was requested to administer these two programs—$7,425,000 for the electrification program; $2,100,-000 for the telephone program. As recommended by the committee, this bill contains loan authorizations for the rural electrification program amounting to $350,000,000, in addition to which a total of $150,000,000 additional may be made available upon certification by the Secretary of Agriculture as to the need for additional sums. For the rural telephone program, the committee recommended $25,000,000 in loan funds. A total of $8,150,000 for administrative expenses was included in the bill. This represents a decrease of $1,375,000 from the budget estimates for 1951. It appears that unless this amount is reinstated, REA will be unable to add personnel to its present skeleton staff of less than 100 people assigned to rural telephone work.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not disagree with the intent in the least that has been expressed by a number of Members of the House in trying to do away with existing duplication; my point is simply that based upon observation I know what has taken place in my district. I know from first-hand observation what has taken place, and this defeats the very purpose that the gentleman from Mississippi has

in mind, for it drives a wedge between two agencies of the Government; you are driving a wedge which defeats the purpose of the cooperative effort we should have.

It is my understanding that the Department of Agriculture has ample provisions within their regulations to provide for one agency's assisting the other. There is not the least doubt about that.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSHALL. For a question.

Mr. WHITTEN. I will ask it this way: The gentleman understands, I am sure, that this provision is permissive only; it is not compulsory. It was put in here in order to effect a saving, to allow them to use these technical people where they can be used to advantage and where we know they should use them. We believe it will help the situation.

Mr. MARSHALL. Soil conservation does not bring any dividends to the taxpayers of this country until it is actually put into effect on the farms. This particular provision does create in the minds of the people administering the program a feeling of distrust of one another. The farmers themselves are anxious, of course, to carry on good soil-conservation methods. It means that when this has been put into effect and each organization sets up their plans to carry on the best type of soil conservation possible, that, due to the wording of the bill, it complicates administration to the extent that the intent of Congress is not put into effect.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield for a question.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. It happens that I personally did not last year agree with this action of the subcommittee. I believe from all I have learned that the action of the subcommittee did no good whatsoever to the soil-conservation program of America. As the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL] said, it has created a sort of distrust between the two bodies, between which, on the other hand, there should be 100-percent cooperation. I certainly agree with him this amendment should be defeated.

Mr. MARSHALL. I thank the gentleman. May I say that the wording in this amendment costs more in administrative determination than the value received by the taxpayers in trying to do something to get these agencies together.

I have another point and I think this is a very important point. It is the responsibility of the Committee on Agriculture of this Congress to do something to bring about a solution of this problem. I believe legislative action is absolutely necessary. This legislative action should be based upon a complete understanding. I do not think that can be determined on the floor of this House. A legislative committee of this House will have to make a thorough investigation, not from the top in these agencies but out here on the farms to determine on the farm end exactly what this means.

The farmers do not like duplication and I do not like duplication, but that should be determined by a legislative committee based upon a full determination and understanding of what it means in the back 40, 80, or 160 acres, not what some person in Washington might determine it should be. I want to inform the committee that from my understanding of things in my neighborhood and among my neighbors they do not like this duplication.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. I would like to point out, if the gentleman will permit, that the provision here is at the county level, that this may be done at the county level, which is at the local level in county communities. I would like to point out further, and I am sure he is interested in the same thing I am, that the Appropriations Committee felt like he did; that is, this is a matter that should have some legislation. We have had to wait 8 or 9 years for such legislation and it is not here yet. In consultation with the legislative committee we worked out this effort to try to bring this about. We have evidence before our committee that in many cases they would get a graduate engineer to lay out these ditches and other things according to good engineering practice, then before any payment could be received by the farmer he would have to go to a different agency and get the approval of some farmer or some layman with no technical experience or background to approve it before he would get the Federal payment.

It is that kind of thing that we are trying to cure, and I point out again that the legislative committee has not acted in 9 or 10 years. We worked this out with the legislative committee, that committee approved it, we put it in, and it works at the local level. Nothing can be done except at the instance of the local committee.

Mr. MARSHALL. I am in accord with what the distinguished gentlemen from Mississippi is attempting to do, but I do maintain this is not doing the thing he thinks it is doing. I am basing my opinion upon first-hand information. It is confusing, it is adding salt to a sore, it is creating more problems instead of simplifying them and I believe that the thing is of such extreme importance that a legislative committee ought to take action on this matter once and for all and settle it. I do not think it is proper to bring this in in connection with an appropriation bill and complicate that end of the procedure.

Mr. WHITTEN. I will join with the gentleman in striking it out, but we have waited for 10 years and I doubt the wisdom of waiting 10 years more. We may lose the whole program.

Mr. MARSHALL. You have set the program back 2 years by the provisions that were put in last year in an effort to bring these agencies together.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I realize this is a serious situation in many places, although in my particular home county it is working out very satisfactorily the way it is.

I want to ask a little indulgence on the part of the membership so far as the Committee on Agriculture is concerned. We have spent so much of our time defending the things we have already accomplished and in keeping everyone from tearing them apart that we have not spent the time on constructive measures that we should have.

The Hoover Commission is of the opinion, and I think most everyone else agrees, that we must have a consolidation of some of these agencies. There must be some consolidation on the basis of the educational viewpoint and the noneducational viewpoint. But, as I say, I do not like to see this part go out of this legislation, because certainly in many places it is working out satisfactorily, and I have much confidence in the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, and if the committee will just give us time now, I think it can be worked out. This problem has not been up for 8 or 9 years, I believe, because the picture has changed during this time. You want to remember that there are many things we have today that we did not have 8 or 9 years ago, because the triple A did not spend the time in connection with soil conservation that they have in the last 2 or 3 years. I think that if you just give us 1 more year of grace, let us work it out the best we can this year, we will come in a year from now and we will be able to take care of this situation. I hope this amendment is passed.

(Mr. LEMKE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

HARD FACTS FOR FARMERS

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, let us get the facts straight. The farmer is again being made the political football. The shock absorber for the mistakes of the Secretaries of Agriculture from Wallace on down to Brannan. He is blamed by the unthinking for the high cost of living. Intelligent people know that the high cost of living is the result of high taxes, high wages, high distribution charges, and the depreciated 30-cent dollar. Depreciated by increasing the money in circulation from less than six billion to over twenty-seven and one-half billion.

The farmer, too, is effected by the high cost of living. He is also confronted with the high cost of production. This by the tripled prices of farm implements, repairs, and maintenance, by the tripled farm wages, by the tripled and quadrupled real estate, income and 100 hidden taxes. This situation was brought about largely because of our Government's foreign flirtations and interna-

tional WPA. The farmer has the same problems as the rest of us. Let us not blame him for that for which he was no more responsible than we.

It costs three times as much to operate your farm in 1942 as it did in 1932. From 1935 to 1942, the average annual cost of operating the farms of this Nation was $16,303,000,000. This on an average was 45½ percent more than the average total gross annual farm income of $11,204,000,000. By 1948, this had increased to $38,016,000,000. These higher costs are the direct result of increased taxes; higher farm wages; and higher prices for farm implements, equipment, and maintenance.

Now the farmer is blamed for the disastrous results of Brannan's potato fiasco and Brannan's scrambled egg and putrid butter program. He is now pestered with more regimentation and more allotments.

The public has suddenly become aware that the Secretary of Agriculture has been in the habit for years of dumping and destroying millions of bushels of potatoes, millions of dozens of eggs, and thousands of pounds of butter. An aroused, enlightened, and outraged public opinion now in no uncertain terms condemns such vandalism. So does the farmer. That vandalism was not necessary under the present farm program.

The Government could have disposed of these surpluses through charitable institutions at home, and through the ECA abroad. There was no need of dumping or permitting these surpluses to spoil. Unfortunately Secretary Brannan and Paul Hoffman, of the ECA, were more interested in shipping high-priced farm machinery and other manufactured articles to Europe than agricultural products.

However, Secretary Brannan is not wholly to blame. He was not the father of the disease known as the abundant life by scarcity; he inherited it from one of his predecessors, Wallace. It was Secretary Wallace that wantonly destroyed millions of pigs, calves, cattle, and sheep. It was Wallace that plowed under every third row of corn and cotton, and burned stacks of hay, wheat, and other grain. This at a time when millions were hungry and in rags.

It was Wallace that had his picture taken in Texas, with a mule hitched to a one-handle plow, plowing under cotton. It is said that the mule refused to step on the cotton while his master, who planted it, was still barefoot and in rags. We will leave it to future generations to decide who was the greater economist, the mule or Wallace.

The wanton destruction of property—especially agricultural products—is legally criminal, economically unsound, and religiously sinful. Brannan, however, blindly followed the Wallace program of waste and destruction. But now an aroused public opinion and a guilty conscience has overtaken him.

The Secretary now has a new program. He is not at all modest about it. He calls it the Brannan plan. He is still for price support on nonperishables in accordance with the present farm program. But he wants to add 27 other perishable farm products to potatoes, eggs, and butter. He wants these perishable products sold in the open market in competition with world prices. Sold in competition with farm products produced in other countries by slave and semislave labor.

In this way, he thinks he can fool both the farmer and the consumer. He tells the consumer that this will enable him to buy agricultural products cheaper. Then he tells the farmer that he will pay him the difference between the market price and 100 percent parity. The Secretary apparently believes that he can pull himself up by his own bootstraps. He forgets that his plan would give him only 27 additional headaches.

The Brannan program if carried to its logical conclusion would require an appropriation each year of at least $10,000,000,000 to $18,000,000,000. This amount is so staggering that any one with common sense knows that Congress would never appropriate it. The Secretary cannot fool either the farmer or the consumer. They both are taxpayers. Both know that for every dollar they receive in subsidies or save in lower cost of living, they or their children would have to pay $2 in increased taxes. The extra dollar would be for the collectors and distributors of the tax and for interest and overhead expenses.

The President shocked by the Secretary's potato, egg, and butter dumping program, attempts to escape his administration's responsibility by advocating the Brannan plan. You can always drop a hot potato by advocating something else. But that something else must have a semblance of success. A known failure is not even an experiment. No one expects the President to run the Department of Agriculture. Just now he is knee deep in international politics. He has troubles enough with his international point 4 program.

Under this program we send farm machinery and equipment, and agricultural experts to backward nations. The American taxpayer, and that includes both the consumer and the farmer, are paying for this lunacy—paying to build up competition for themselves. If we wish to maintain our standard of living, then we must all realize that the American farmer and laborer cannot compete with slavery.

The President and his lawyer Secretary of Agriculture are out of step with the Committee on Agriculture. That committee turned thumbs down on the Brannan plan. This because they feel the plan would wreck agriculture—would destroy what little progress has been made.

Chairman COOLEY, of the House Agriculture Committee, disagrees with the President. He said:

> I regret that the President made his message a vehicle for general condemnation of the present farm program * * * most disturbing of all to me in the President's statement is what appears to be a lack of appreciation of the soundness, importance and effectiveness of the present farm program * * *.
>
> The present farm program is now operating in the interest of the general welfare, except for potatoes it has not proven unduly expensive or costly and assures consumers of an ample supply of food and fiber at fair prices. The only alternative which Congress is offered is one which apparently contemplates the junking of the principles of the whole present program, and the acceptance of an entirely new program based primarily on principles of a consumer subsidy. Only with a sound workable program can we hope to maintain a balanced national economy.

The farmer cannot be blamed because the Secretary was caught with millions of bushels of potatoes, several million dozen of eggs, and thousands of pounds of butter while we imported these same products from other nations under the reciprocal trade agreements. Such a procedure seems inconsistent, if not idiotic. Here are some of the imports while Brannan was accumulating surpluses of domestic potatoes, eggs, and butter.

During the fiscal year ending July 1, 1949, we imported in round numbers 552,600,000 pounds of potatoes, 3,500,000 dozen of eggs, 25,200,000 pounds of cheese, 542,000 head of cattle, and in addition 116,200,000 pounds of canned beef.

We imported 150,000,000 pounds of hides and skins of all kinds; wool, all grades, 974,000,000 pounds; 10,400,000 bushels of barley; 19,400,000 bushels of oats; 7,000,000 bushels of rye; 4,500,000 bushels of wheat and in addition 82,000 100-pound bags of wheat flour; nuts, 70,000,000 pounds; honey, 9,000,000 pounds; and rice and rice products, 4,600,000 pounds.

We imported 1,952,000 bushels of apples, 637,000 bushels of corn, 618,000 bushels of flax, and in addition 2,242,000 pounds of linseed oil, 19,291,000 pounds of onions, 239,050,000 pounds of tomatoes, 14,415,000 pounds of sausage casings, 15,475,000 pounds of pears, 57,395,000 pounds of barley malt, and 139,858 tons bran and shorts. While statistics are not yet available, the imports since last July 1 have increased by leaps and bounds.

During 1948 and 1949 we imported free of duty some $267,000,000 worth of furs, to compete with our fur farmers and trappers.

These are just a few agricultural products we imported under the reciprocal trade agreements. On some of these we maintained a support price not only for the American farmer but for the foreign farmer and the importer as well. Take the potato scandal. The importers bought these potatoes for 60 cents below the support price and then sold them on the New York market at the support price.

Under the Reciprocal Trade Act, the President can enter into agreements with other nations and reduce the existing tariff as much as 75 percent.

Not satisfied with this betrayal of agriculture, further tariff slashes on agricultural imports are in store when our Government meets with 17 other nations in England next September. The Brannan plan is just a forerunner of a complete sell-out of agriculture. Get the farmer to sell his products for little or nothing in competition with foreign imports and then have him come on bended knees and beg Congress for an appropriation—a hand-out from an empty United States Treasury.

These trade agreements were first put over in 1934 on an unsuspecting and unalert Congress, by a group of international bankers and manufacturers who spent tousands of dollars in high-pressure propaganda. Nearly every agreement that has been entered into under this legislation has favored the international manufacturers, bankers, and importers against the best interest of agriculture and labor—against the best interest of our Nation.

Because of this performance, a support price on one hand and a reciprocal-trade agreement on the other, we have piled up surpluses at the expense of the American farmer and taxpayer.

While the present farm program has been of help it is not a permanent remedy. The whole agricultural problem has been fumbled by Congress. While both parties were chasing the will-o'-the-wisp of subsidies and price support, crop reduction allotments, and regimentation, there was pending a bill, H. R. 1686, that would have solved the problem permanently.

This, by giving the farmer cost of production for the principal agricultural products. This cost to include interest on farm indebtedness, soil depletion, depreciation of building improvements and farm implements and equipment, and wages for the farmer and his family equivalent to those received by industrial workers.

H. R. 1686 is a two-price-system bill. It would give the farmer the average cost of production on agricultural products domestically consumed. It would protect the family sized farm by giving the domestic market to all farmers up to $1,000, on any one product. After that, those who produce more would get their percentage of the remainder of the domestic market.

Under the provisions of this bill, the Secretary of Agriculture would ascertain the average cost of production to the farmers of each such agricultural product. Such average cost of production would be determined after public hearings participated in by the representatives of farmers' organizations and by other interested parties.

The bill provides for the disposition of surpluses. These must be disposed of in foreign markets. It protects domestic industry and labor. It permits the processing or manufacturing of surpluses into finished products. These, however, must also be disposed of in foreign markets.

The purpose of the bill is accomplished by the licensing of dealers in such agricultural products in interstate and foreign commerce.

It provides that when the price of any product falls below the average cost of production, that then there be an embargo prohibiting importations of such product or substitute. It gives the domestic market to our own people who are entitled to it. It gives to the farmer cost of production on farm products as a floor below which the price on that part domestically consumed will not fall. It protects the producer and consumer alike. This without appropriations, regimentation, subsidies, or increased taxes.

Under the provision of this bill the farmer would today receive in round numbers $29 per hundred pounds for hogs, $21 for beef cattle, $25.42 for veal, $29.23 for lambs, $15 for mutton, and $6.70 per hundred pounds for milk.

He would receive $2.35 per bushel for corn, $2.88 for wheat, $1.60 for oats, $1.70 for barley, $1.78 for rye, $6.58 for flax, $2.55 for potatoes, $2.94 for sweetpotatoes, $5.51 for cowpeas, $3.58 for soybeans, and $7.66 per bushel for dry beans. He would receive 46 cents per pound for cotton and 95 cents for wool.

He would receive comparable prices for his other farm products. This would put him on a par with the industrial worker.

When this bill is passed, then there need be no further appropriation for agriculture—no more subsidies. It will abolish regimentation of the farmers, who will again produce wealth in place of figuring out rules, regulations, and allotments. It will save the Treasury millions of dollars and give the Nation a permanent food supply. It will put the American farmer on a par with industrial enterprises.

No other segment of society works as hard or as long hours as the farmer and his family. No segment of society receives so little for their work per hour as the farmer and his family, who feed the Nation. It is time for the industrialist, the laborer and the city dwellers to wake up and to realize that their prosperity and future success is inseparably linked and intermingled with that of the farmer.

If the farmer is reduced to poverty he will not be able to buy the things that industry and labor produces. When the income of the farmer goes down so will wages, and so will the industrial and the national income at a ratio of 7 to 1.

Let us keep the record straight. The farmer, on an average, receives less than 30 cents out of the dollar that the consumer pays for his products. The balance goes for transportation, processing and marketing.

To make it plain, if wheat sold for $3 a bushel, then the farmer would get only 2½ cents out of the 14 cents the consumer pays for a pound loaf of bread. Out of this 2½ cents, he pays for labor, seed, cultivation and preparation of the land, harvesting, thrashing and harvesting. He also pays for necessary fences, buildings, and farm equipment, as well as for replacements and repairs. He pays for real estate, income and hidden taxes on the implements and other farm improvements, as well as on the wheat he produces. He pays overhead expenses and replaces soil depletion with fertilizer.

Again, the producer of apples in the State of Washington gets only 26 cents out of the consumer's dollar in Chicago. The balance goes for packing, transportation and wholesale and retail distribution.

In conclusion, we must never forget that the farmer produces the food that produces the energy for the industrial workers. Without food there could be no industries. The men and women that work in the factories live on that which the farmer produces.

The farmer is not responsible for the high income tax of 20 to 86 percent and the more than 100 hidden taxes that are added to consumable goods. He is not responsible for the waste and wanton destruction of food products.

The farmer knows that because of our large indebtedness, appropriations will be hard to get even though they come out of his and the consumer's tax dollar. He knows that the farm population has decreased from 33,000,000 in 1932 to 24,000,000 in 1950, while the general population has increased 26,000,000. He knows that as a result his strength in Congress has been reduced from one-third to one-seventh. He knows that he must get permanent legislation—100 percent real parity, or better still, 100 percent cost of production.

I have consistently supported all temporary farm legislation and shall continue to do so but that is not a solution. There is only one solution and that is cost of production for that part of agricultural products domestically consumed. The farmer will have to get that eventually, why not now? The farmer is the only person who, when he sells, asks "how much," and again when he buys, "how much"?

(Mr. HOPE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to commend the able and distinguished chairman of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] and the other members of the subcommittee for bringing in an excellent bill.

I believe that the committee has carefully considered the needs of the Department of Agriculture in carrying out its programs and functions. I further believe that the committee has made a conscientious and careful effort to cut down the expenditures of the Department of Agriculture to the lowest possible point consistent with good service. If I were on the committee I perhaps would not come up with exactly the same figures on the various items, and no doubt every Member of the House would, if it were within his power, like to change some of the items in this bill.

I personally have a feeling that perhaps the appropriations for the Rural Electrification Administration may not be sufficient to enable that agency to carry out the rural telephone program. I know, however, that the members of the subcommittee are all vitally interested in the rural telephone program and I have so much confidence in their good judgment that I am satisfied to accept the amounts which have been inserted in this bill. I say this, feeling sure that if it should be demonstrated as time goes on that this appropriation is inadequate the members of the subcommittee will cooperate in securing whatever additional appropriations may be necessary.

The rural telephone program has evoked a tremendous amount of interest among the farmers of this country and while it has taken some time to get the program started, and while the number of loans made up to date is small, I anticipate that during the fiscal year 1951 the demands upon the Rural Electrification

Administration under the rural telephone program will be very substantial.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the thing that has brought this matter about which we now have under discussion is the simple fact that the Soil Conservation Service has never had sufficient funds with which to do this important job of conserving our top soil, with the exception of our people the most priceless and precious thing we have in America. The gentleman from Mississippi and his committee placed this 5 percent provision in the bill last year, which the PMA now is permitted to use in conjunction and in cooperation with the Soil Conservation Service, and will do good wherever there are friendly relations between the Soil Conservation Service and the PMA. There are places however where they do not get along so good. We might be better off in the long run to keep the PMA and the Soil Conservation Service responsibilities separate. As most of you already know the PMA takes care of the payments for doing certain things such as fertilizing, contouring and terracing, taking land out of soil-depleting crops and putting in soil-conserving crops. The Soil Conservation Service provides the farmers with technical engineering service in cooperation with the Extension Service in planning a farm program, in showing farmers how to contour, how to build terraces, how to heal over gullies and how to build bonds, and proper crop rotations. But, as I said before, this Congress has never seen fit to appropriate the money that is justly needed by the Soil Conservation Service to get this job done in time for conserving our soil, which is the reason I introduced a bill during the last session which provides a speed-up program. So, I am not going to condemn the committee for putting in this 5 percent provision last year. I know the intent of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], was of the highest order, and I believe it can work, if the folks have the right kind of spirit and politics do not get mixed into it. First of all they must have soil conservation in their blood, in order to do a real job of conserving their soil under any circumstances.

Just how we can get sufficient funds to carry on the Soil Conservation Service and the great job we have to do all over America in conserving the soil is quite a problem so long as we spend millions for a lot of useless things as we are doing in this very bill.

The committee has recommended $1,000,000 over and above what the budget asked for the Soil Conservation Service, because the future of America depends on how well we preserve and conserve this priceless topsoil of ours. The farmers in my district are busy in the conservation of soil, as they are in the whole State of Iowa and in most every other State of the Union. They are going to see to it that at least this Nation does not commit national suicide through the starvation route, as have many other nations of the world who have been and are now at our doors crying for bread, because they forgot to take care of their priceless soil.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would not attempt to speak for the entire Committee on Agriculture, but as one member of the legislative Committee on Agriculture I commend the Committee on Appropriations on bringing in a practical method whereby we can secure some needed cooperation between the Soil Conservation Service and the PMA payment program. If you want the PMA payment program to be a real instrumentality of soil conservation, you must make some provision for technical supervision, you must have something more than mere farmer committees to be able to pass upon the technical qualities of the work that is done under the program.

As long as you expect to pay out more than one-quarter of a billion dollars a year in soil-conservation payments through the PMA, it seems to me it is but sound that we have some kind of well trained technical supervision of those practices and a determination that the practices have been well handled from a technical standpoint before we put out the money to make the payments.

You may say, "Why does not the Soil Conservation Service do that?" The Soil Conservation Service has been getting something less than $50,000,000 a year. I believe $52,000,000 is provided in this bill. The number of districts has been rapidly increasing in the United States, and many of those districts do not have any technical staff at all today. There is no way under the limited funds that are provided in this appropriation bill or the bills in the past few years whereby the Soil Conservation Service can staff even the existing soil-conservation districts. Without that added staff, there is no way we can expect them to pass reasonable judgment upon the work of the farmers who may come in and say, "We are entitled to payment under the Soil Conservation Practices Act."

The way we get payments is this. I am a farmer, and one of the practices in my territory is to establish a stock pond. For that the Government will contribute not to exceed 10 cents a yard for the moving of dirt up to a limit normally of about $250. I go out to build a tank, and I spend $1,000 on it. On it I cannot receive more than a definite sum, says $250, and that will depend on whether or not I have built it in keeping with good engineering practices. Unless there is some engineer to look at it the PMA man knows no more about it than I do and probably less. He does not know whether the tank has been properly built or not. He probably does not even know how much dirt has been moved. But could he go and look at the tank and say either it has been properly built or it has not been properly built. As a matter of fact he does not go but he employes somebody else. He employs some farmer and pays him out of the very funds which we propose to use for a soil conservation expert. He can pay out of these funds, out of the $285,000,000, that we have in this bill. A portion of it can be spent to pay for supervision anyhow. This proposal of the gentleman from Mississippi says that instead of being required to go out and employ somebody who never saw a slide rule and who does not know one engineering principal from another, the PMA may employ the Soil Conservation Service technicians.

We have never provided enough money to provide for all of this work by the soil conservation technicians. We might just as well use 5 percent of this money which we are appropriating for supervision purposes to provide some soil conservation technicians to do the job as to get somebody who never saw that kind of job and knows nothing about it. It just comes down to the question of what kind of supervision do you want. Do you want a trained technician to pass on a engineering problem or do you want to spend a quarter of a billion without any trained supervision?

This is not a problem of creating friction between anybody. Friction is created when somebody for political purposes tries to create ill feeling between these services. I say to you in my home county we have all the agricultural agencies in one building. They are on one floor of our post-office building. We have the county agent and the county home demonstration agent, the FHA, the PMA, the Soil Conservation Service, and the Bureau of Entomology all around one hall. When a farmer comes in it makes no difference whether he goes into one office or the other, if he gets in the wrong office he is directed to another office right down the hall.

If he says he does not have the time to look all over town he is told that he need only go right across the hall, or right next door. The representatives of all these agencies get along together fine. Just put these agencies together physically. Most of them are represented by good men and they will get together and work together when they know each other. That is what is needed. To get the agencies together; then they will work together.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. MARSHALL. The gentleman from Texas states that the American farmer will go out and spend his money to carry on practices which are not feasible from an engineering standpoint. I would like to say to the gentleman from Texas that from my knowledge of American farmers based upon my knowledge of Minnesota it does not appear to me that the gentleman from Texas has too high a regard for the intelligence of the American farmer to carry on these engineering and technical practices and

carry on good sound conservation practices. If that is the case we are going to be faced with a most difficult problem in carrying on national conservation of our soil which is absolutely necessary if we are to safeguard the most vital element in our natural resources.

Mr. POAGE. Unfortunately it is true that the average farmer is no engineer. Unfortunately the average American farmer, and I do not speak of Minnesota, because I do not know anything about that, maybe they all are college graduates in Minnesota, but unfortunately the average American farmer whose income is less than a thousand dollars a year—and that is the average income of the average American farmer, has not had an apportunity to go to engineering school. Unfortunately the average American farmer does not know anything about engineering practices and cannot tell whether a terrace is running up or down hill until it rains. The average American farmer knows no more about engineering that I know about medicine. It would be just as reasonable to say that the farmer's family's physical health should be intrusted to his judgment because he has a deep interest in his family as to trust the health of the soil to an untrained farmer when it involves engineering principles simply because the farmer has a deep interest in the soil. Generally speaking, the farmer has not had an opportunity to obtain needed training. If every American farmer were an engineer we would have little need for the Soil Conservation Service. If we could have every American farmer a graduate of the Texas A & M College we would not need many of these programs. But unfortunately the income of American farmers is not great enough to enable many of them to have that background. Therefore the best thing we can do is to get some people who have had that opportunity and use those people with that kind of training rather than waste the taxpayers' money. This amendment simply gives us an opportunity to have some real and effective supervision of these soil conservation payments. I look upon this as a real soil conservation program. I want to keep it that way. I know that that can only be done through trained supervision.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has made a most splendid argument in behalf of the defeat of this amendment. This matter should be gone over carefully by the legislative committee of the House. It has no business in this particular bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided; and there were—ayes 71, noes 14.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read, as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTEN: On page 208, line 16, insert: "For necessary expenses, including dues, for library membership in societies or associations which issue publications to members only or at a price to members lower than to subscribers who are not members; $713,293."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I may say that this amendment has had stricken out the part of the original provision which was subject to a point of order. This simply makes provision for the library service in the Department of Agriculture in the usual manner.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HESELTON: On page 193, line 18, insert "In order to prevent the waste of food commodities acquired through price-support operations which are found to be in danger of loss through deterioration or spoilage before they can be disposed of in normal domestic channels without impairment of the price-support program, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Commodity Credit Corporation are authorized and directed to make available such commodities as follows in the order of priority set forth: First, to school-lunch programs, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and Federal, State, and local tax-supported institutions, such as hospitals, orphanages, schools, penal and mental institutions, and public-welfare organizations for the assistance of needy Indians and other needy persons; second, to private-welfare organizations for the assistance of needy persons within the United States; third, to private-welfare organizations for the assistance of needy persons outside the United States; fourth, to intergovernmental or international nonprofit welfare agencies, for assistance to needy persons outside the United States. The Secretary of Agriculture shall first determine that such commodities are in ample supply over and above such reserves as may be required and deemed in the public interest. The Secretary of Agriculture and the Corporation shall make any such commodities available at no cost at point of use within the United States or at shipside at port of embarkation. The Secretary and the Corporation may pay as against handling and transportation costs in making delivery up to the equivalent of 6 months' storage costs on any such commodities turned over: *Provided*, That no transportation or handling charges shall be incurred by the Commodity Credit Corporation or Department of Agriculture if in so doing it would lower the total amount of agricultural commodities acquired by any insttiution or organization through the normal channels of trade and commerce."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill, but will not press it at the moment in order that the gentleman from Massachusetts may present his argument in favor of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi reserves a point of order against the amendment.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] is recognized.

(Mr. HESELTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much the courtesy of the gentleman from Mississippi in reserving his point of order rather than pressing it. I realize that the point of order can be well taken, but I hope that the gentleman, after listening to my presentation, may be prevailed upon not to make the point, under all the circumstances. The amendment is rather long. For that reason I placed it in the RECORD of yesterday. It will be found at page 5868, if anyone cares to restudy its contents.

Basically, the amendment is simple. We have a gigantic amount of edible foods in storage; we paid tremendous amounts of money for them; we are paying into the millions to keep them in storage. They are in danger of spoiling. The only sensible, the only sound, the only decent thing to do with these foods, it seems to me, is to get them out where they can and will be used for food, and stop this indefensible waste of public funds. Here we can economize if our Members here are given an opportunity to vote.

I call as witnesses to this contention the Friends Committee on National Legislation, which called together here farmers from 18 States for a 10-day seminar in January on the question: What Could and Should American Agriculture Do for a Hungry World? I quote two sentences to prove the case:

The important thing is that food or agricultural products paid for by American taxpayers should not be allowed to spoil, be eaten by rats, or be destroyed. They should actually get into people's mouths at home or abroad.

We have, as a matter of fact, in butter, dried milk, prunes, raisins, beans, dried eggs, and turkeys, something like $8,490,000 of carrying charges just to February 28. We have reports of increasing quantities of butter to be purchased. It already has reached the staggering total of 98,500,000 pounds. It has been publicly stated that this program, if carried out in this manner, bringing in 15,000,000 more pounds since the first of the year, can well leave in our storage warehouses better than two or three hundred million pounds of that wholesome food which could and would feed the American people. In the local press it was estimated that we now have on hand butter enough for 10,000,000 persons based on last year's consumption of less than 10 pounds per capita. That is more than twice the number of people in my State of Massachusetts. It would feed every man, woman, and child in Massachusetts for 2 years on this basis.

Any normal, objective person would wish that we could do something and do it before it is too late. I know the Committee on Agriculture is considering the problem; I know that they have assured us that they will hold further hearings and try to report some legislation, but I wish the chairman and the members of this subcommitte would take at least this initial step and let it go to conference so that we could insure against letting this thing be carried through beyond the period when we adjourn and then being faced with the charge that we were not responsible and not willing to measure up to our responsibility.

Some have said to me, "What do you expect when the President refuses to do anything?" His refusal is his responsibility, not ours. He will have to answer to an outraged public when the record becomes clear to him. But we will, too, if we refuse to act. And our responsibility will be the greater the longer we delay action. Others have said, "Do you really expect any legislation in view of what has happened here today already?" Members of the press have asked me if I did not think this whole story was now a runaround. I do expect legislation. Honorable men on the other side who control the matter have assured me that there will be. I respect and believe them. I do not think this is a runaround. I do not want that to happen because I know that most of the Members of this body are sickened and disgusted with those conditions and want an opportunity to stop it. But, my friends, we must act or it will be too late. I do hope the chairman will not press his point of order. Nothing compels him to do so. He can waive it and let all of us decide the matter on its merits. He did not make any point against the committee provision. The American public would construe a waiver now as consistent, logical, and in their interest.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. One final thought, and then I will yield.

According to an item in the Portland (Oreg.) Journal of Commerce of Saturday, April 22, and this condition has been repeatedly reported on this floor, of other agencies of the Government going into the market and purchasing food products when we have already paid for them and are keeping them in storage. The Federal Supply Service there announced that it would receive bids on February 25 to furnish f. o. b. Seattle, 1,650 dozen eggs, grade AA, large eggs in cartons. When in heaven's name are we going to recognize that the American people will eventually learn what is going on and will charge clear irresponsibility and flagrant dereliction of duty against not only the Department of Agriculture, but against those here who have known what was going on and who refused to take any action that might bring about a solution?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota, and I commend him again for authorship of the committee provision. I regret his fine work has been wrecked by a technicality. I know the American people will regret it too.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman will recall that for several years this Congress permitted the school lunch program, for example, to stay in the appropriation bill, regardless of the fact it was not authorized. Now, the matter rests with you gentleman, but you should consider right here that we have a problem, a very grave problem. Why should any of you take the responsibility upon yourselves to refuse to allow an amendment of this nature to stay in the bill when it means what it does to all the people of America? I frankly cannot understand it. In other years we permitted the school lunch program to remain in. We did not make any fight against it in the Rules Committee. We were glad to waive the point of order on it. I think the responsibility belongs to you people if you want to strike this out on a point of order.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. Certainly I am not opposed to what you are trying to do but unfortunately the rules of the House govern.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The rules of the House do not require that you bring up a point of order. You need not say anything. You can permit this amendment to be considered.

Mr. WHITTEN. The committee provided a provision in the bill to meet the problem and we did not put it in this lengthy language of a legislative nature, but it was stricken out on a point of order.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Yet the gentleman is here trying to strike it out.

Mr. WHITTEN. We had a chance to study that provision, but it went out. Now we are asked to substitute legislation. What the gentleman is trying to reach is a very worthy objective, certainly, I am not opposed to it, but I do insist on the point of order at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi insists on his point of order.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. On the point of order—not the merits.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. On the point of order.

Mr. Chairman, does not an amendment of this nature come under the Holman rule? I do think a broad interpretation of it would apply to this point.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts has offered an amendment which has been reported, and the gentleman from Mississippi has made a point of order against the amendment on the ground it proposes legislation on an appropriation bill in violation of the rules of the House. The Chair has examined the amendment very carefully and is unable to see how it could be held in order as a limitation because it provides for the disposition of commodities and does not even attempt to be a limitation on money appropriated in the bill. The amendment itself on its face contains quite a number of provisions that are very clearly legislation, which is in violation of the rules of the House, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, may I inquire of the gentleman from Mississippi with reference to his intent to proceed further this afternoon? We have two or three very controversial amendments and if we are to proceed with those amendments I personally shall insist on a quorum being present.

Mr. WHITTEN. Of course, that is within the gentleman's right. I hope to go along as far as we can. I wonder if he will let us proceed for a moment so that we may have some little time to check?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. What is the great hurry, may I ask the gentleman from Misisippi? Why can we not let this go over until Wednesday for final determination? It will only take 2 or 3 hours at that time. It will give Members who want to talk on the bill an opportunity to do so. We have an amendment which will try to reduce the amount of money that may be paid to one farmer under the AAA Act. Quite a few Members want to talk on that. We also have an amendment relative to the grasshopper situation in the West.

Mr. WHITTEN. Here is the situation. Earlier today we had this unanimous-consent agreement which I finally entered into largely to accommodate the gentleman from Minnesota, I may say, and under that agreement I felt that we would go ahead and try to work as long as we could so as to complete this chapter. I do not want to be insistent, but if we are going to carry out that unanimous-consent agreement, we are going to have to work toward its completion tonight.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I might say when I make an agreement, express or implied, that I carry it out, and I consider that we have an implied agreement. I will agree that it was no express agreement, but I assumed it was implied. There was plenty of work done in connection with the unanimous-consent agreement entered into today, time that I wish I could have devoted in other directions. But I want to be frank in saying that I personally assumed that it was an implied agreement that this chapter would be disposed of today.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. If the gentleman assumed that, it is all right with me to continue. I really did not have that assumption in mind.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank my friend. I want to frankly state that I considered there was an implied agreement.

(Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, at the outset I want to compliment the subcommittee for its splendid work on this section of the appropriation bill. I think, on the whole, it has done a pretty good job.

However, I want to call attention to the drastic cut that was made on the item for the control of emergency outbreaks of insects and plant disease. I would like to have the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Missouri

[Mr. CANNON], as well as the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

As the committee well knows, we had a bad situation with respect to grasshoppers in Wyoming and in several other Rocky Mountain States last year. The situation is much worse this year than it was a year ago. If we can control and eradicate these grasshoppers at their source, when they are hatching, we will prevent infestation in other States. The people of my State appreciate the gravity of the situation. Our people were led to believe that if a special session of the legislature had been called early this year and if it appropriated $750,000, that a like amount of Federal funds would be available to fight this grasshopper infestation. The infestation has reached epidemic proportions and certainly the Federal Government should bear the burden equally with our State. In the first instance, the United States owns outright more than 52 percent of all the land in the State of Wyoming. The United States owns 70 percent of the minerals underlying the entire State of Wyoming. The Federal Government is paid $10,000,000 in royalties from the minerals under the Federal lands in Wyoming each year. True, 37½ percent is returned to the State. Our legislature met and appropriated $750,000 to match an equal amount of Federal funds. It did that on the assumption that we could make an all-out attack on the grasshoppers and wipe them out as we were told by the Bureau people that it would take $1,500,000 to do a complete job. Now we find that the Bureau is able to match just about two-thirds of our money. This committee cut the budget request for this item by two-thirds as is shown on page 175 of the bill. When we had the conference report on the urgent deficiency bill before the House I indicated to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], that the amount allowed was insufficient and I asked him if a second deficiency bill would be brought before the House this spring, and he assured us then that a second deficiency bill would be brought in after the Easter recess. I want to ask the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], if it is the intention of the committee to bring in a second deficiency bill before the middle of May so that we may have an opportunity to get enough money to match the funds appropriated by the State of Wyoming to fight grasshoppers.

Mr. CANNON. We expect to report another deficiency bill before the end of the session. Hearings have already begun in some of the committees on items which are being considered for that bill. If the gentleman has a budget estimate for his item, I am certain the proper subcommittee will be glad to give it consideration.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. We have a budget estimate in this bill of $2,500,000. The appropriation was cut to $850,000. A larger cut was made on this item than was made on any other item in this bill. In January the Bureau of the Budget sent up a request for $2,200,000 for supplemental funds for the current fiscal year. Only 1,000,000 of that request has been allowed.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman understands the last budget estimate which came to the committee was disposed of when we reported this bill. If the gentleman desires consideration of such an item in the next bill it will be necessary for the Bureau of the Budget to send up another estimate.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming: On page 175, line 22, strike out "$850,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,010,000".

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, it is very doubtful if we can get action early enough on the second deficiency to provide the funds to match the Wyoming funds. Most certainly I will urge that such a request be sent up again.

Just as a matter of good faith, the United States should match Wyoming funds. Here is a situation where the United States owns half of the land. It owns the minerals in a great deal of the lands where the people own only the surface. The State of Wyoming appropriated $750,000, and all we are asking is that the United States appropriate a like amount so that we can take care of the property of the United States as well as the private property that is involved in this infestation.

I call your attention to the fact that the committee made some pretty drastic cuts here, but at the same time, during the war the Department of Agriculture spent considerable money to pay technicians to fight locast infestations in the Middle East, and we are spending large sums of money through the United Nations at the present time for research in controlling that infestation in Iraq, Syria, and Egypt.

It may well be that it will be impossible to bring out a second deficiency bill until the latter part of this session, but it seems to me that the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], should bring out a second bill in the near future so we can take care of this emergency.

If we are going to fight grasshoppers in Wyoming effectively we must have the money by the middle or the end of next month.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the committee will approve my amendment adding $160,000 at this time. While I know it will not take care of the situation in all of the States affected, yet it will take care of the situation in our State. Wyoming is the one State that called its legislature into special session and put up its share of the money to carry on this fight. So I hope the committee can go along with this amendment and increase this amount by $160,000.

(Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not mean to minimize in the least the seriousness of the problem the gentleman has nor the need of meeting that problem. The statement was made here that we have cut the appropriation for the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine 66⅔ percent on this particular appropriation. I suspect technically that statement is correct. I did tell the gentleman this morning it was not because we were trying to cut the operation to that extent, however. Last year I served on another committee, when this Department came in for money for the grasshoppers. This program was set up in 1935 as an emergency program. Since 1935 they have had an emergency every year. They have had 80 employees in a permanent office whose job it was to get out each year to decide whether another emergency existed. Naturally they found another emergency.

I was not quite satisfied with their justifications. So I asked the investigators for our committee to investigate the operations of the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine in this regard.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Certainly the people of Wyoming consider that it is an emergency when they call their legislature into special session and appropriate $750,000 to fight grasshoppers. So it cannot be said that it is not an emergency.

Mr. WHITTEN. I am not questioning that but the gentleman intimated that our committee had not taken sound action in this particular bill. I think it is very sound. I do not differ with the gentleman about the existence of his problem or the seriousness of it, but I think there are other things involved here. The testimony showed that they paid $27,000 for the rental of an airplane which cost $6,000. It showed that they paid $1.87½ an hour for schoolboys who were working out there. Many times they had altogether more people than they needed there. They had a world of supplies on hand for years which they made no use of. They moved equipment part to one place and part to another so that some other department of the Government would not get it. The testimony showed many, many other things. So what we did in this bill was to place supplies in the hands of the farmers and we held up next year's program until we could see how their program this year will be handled. The program that the gentleman wishes to amend was handled in a deficiency bill for this year's program. The money in this bill will be too late according to the testimony before our committee to meet the need of the gentleman from Wyoming. Now he tells me that he can get the money in Wyoming if he can assure the folks that the money will be forthcoming here.

As to that I am sure he would know more than I. I have suggested to him that since the record before the House shows that this money will not be available until July 1, there is no record in our hearings to support it, and I suggest that he take his case to the other body and present his case there, and if there is sound justification for it in the hearings, we will be sympathetic with

it when we come to conference. That is the best I can do.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. The management of the program this year is going to be mainly under the control of the State officials. They will use State money. We do have State money available, and this little item of $160,000 that I have asked for here will be available the first of July, and we can use that, because the program is going to be going on until about the middle of July.

Mr. WHITTEN. Here is the statement before our committee, and this is the position on which they justified it: They wanted to go in early in the spring and kill these grasshoppers before they laid their eggs; that if you waited until late spring or early summer, that would be too late. That is what they said before the committee.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. We do not intend to wait until then. We propose out of the Wyoming money to start the program and carry it on until the middle of July and then this money will be available in July.

Mr. WHITTEN. If the gentleman will make his case in the Senate, we will be sympathetic with him when it comes to conference, if we can be shown that it is necessary. If your amendment is voted on here and it is not agreed to, it will not help the cause when we come to conference.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. The chairman of the Appropriations Committee tells me now that he will have the second deficiency bill sometime toward the end of the session. If we could get action on this item today, we could go ahead with the program. If we have to wait until the deficiency bill is passed or wait until the Senate acts, it will be too late to do anything with the program.

Mr. WHITTEN. I have just stated that the money in this appropriation bill will not be available until the 1st of July. That is all I can tell the gentleman. I am glad to help him in any way I can.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire how many amendments there are to consider this afternoon.

The CHAIRMAN. There are three on the Clerk's desk now.

Mr. TABER. And I have an amendment to offer.

The CHAIRMAN. Several other Members apparently have amendments to offer.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REES: On page 191, line 7, strike out "$2,500" and insert "$750."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the debate on this amendment be limited to 10 minutes.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, we do not know yet what the amendment is. If the gentleman would reserve his request until we find out what it is about, there might not be any objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the request.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized in support of his amendment.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, this is a big bill. It involves the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars. This item alone amounts to $285,000,000. Here we are in late afternoon. It is almost 6 o'clock. Yet we are told by the leadership we must complete the chapter of the bill relating to agricultural appropriations before we adjourn today. I am informed there are several amendments to be considered following this one. I think it is unfair to crowd such important legislation without giving it the consideration to which it is entitled. After all, the funds that are appropriated in this measure are funds of the people who pay the taxes, including the farmers of this country. I feel we should have more Members present to hear this discussion.

As I have stated, this bill appropriates $285,000,000 for what is generally known as triple-A payments, together with cost of administration, and is administered by the Production and Marketing Administration. Incidentally $25,500,000 is for salaries and expenses.

The funds, as you know, are paid to farmers provided they follow requirements with respect to soil practices and soil conservation. The practices differ in different localities. Generally they are paid to the participant for means of preventing soil erosion, soil depletion, floods, and so forth. It includes building contours by the farmer. Also dams and reservoirs on the owner's farm. Also fertilizer and other relative items. They come under what is described as soil building practices and must be done under specifications laid down by the Production and Marketing Administration and its representatives, except the representatives in each State may arrange a program suitable for that particular area. The participant is paid for approximately one-third of the estimate of the cost of the work performed, in some cases more, and is also paid a share of the cost of the fertilizer used on his farm. There are a number of things the owner of the land may do in order to participate in soil practices. Except on a small farm the chances to earn the payments are very much limited.

When this program was first put into effect there was no limitation in the amount any one person could be paid, provided he had enough land and complied with the program. The result was that payments as high as $100,000 and more were paid to individuals for following soil practices on their own land. It was observed that out of the hundreds of millions appropriated under the act, most of the funds—in fact about 90 percent—was distributed to less than 10 percent of those under the program. So Congress limited the amount anyone could receive was $10,000. Again it was observed the thing was lopsided and that many payments of $10,000 were being paid to landowners. Later it was reduced to a lower figure, I believe $2,500 to one individual. Either last year, or the year before, the limit was fixed at $750. This was the limit last year. This present bill increases the limitation to $2,500 that may be paid to any landowner who will follow what is described as a soil-conservation program.

My amendment would limit the amount paid to the landowner or the tenant, as the case may be, to not more than $750. I think the limitation is fair. Certainly no one would be unduly injured thereby. I really think a farm owner with an operation that would permit him to participate for a larger amount, would not want to ask his Government to pay more. The limit of $750 was satisfactory last year. It should be satisfactory next year.

Now, I want it understood that I am in favor of a real soil-conservation program. Certainly, as one who has always been associated with agriculture, I want to do everything to encourage the conservation of the soil in this country. But let us take a look at the manner in which these funds are distributed after they are appropriated. During the last 10 years, or I may say 5 years, the average payment to almost half of those under the program was less than an average of $60. Listen to this. Seventy-five percent of the participants got an average of less than $100. In fact more than half of the money went to less than 15 percent of those who participated. Who were they? They were the large land owners, of course, who could well take care of the program, without, at least, asking the Government for more than the amount limited in this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is my contention, if you want to do a real service, spend a little more on these small farms that really need most conservation practices. What are you paying the small farmer under this program? A good many of them get from $25 to $35.

Much is said these days about the family-sized farm. Here is a chance to help the small operator, the man of the family-sized farm, if you want to do so. You can increase payments to those who receive the smaller amounts. Then adopt this amendment and still have at least $35,000,00 or $40,000,000 for the taxpayers of this country. The people of this country, including the farmers, will applaud you if you will do it.

I am not unmindful of the good that has been accomplished under soil-conservation programs in this country. I want to remind you also of the big soil-conservation program that is carried on under another agency, the Soil Conservation Service. I wish I had the time to discuss the work that is being accomplished in the conservation of soil by this Service. Incidentally, you have an appropriation of $56,000,000 for this Service in this bill.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Washington, a very active and effective member of this great committee.

Mr. HORAN. Does the gentleman remember the discussion we had about the growth of the soil-conservation districts? If we assume that commitment, we are going to have to divide a smaller melon into a greater number of slices. Unless we greatly increase our budget, irrespective of the national income, or dip into this fund to help man additional districts.

Mr. REES. The gentleman refers to the great Soil Conservation Service, which is separate and apart from the one presently being considered, and for which this bill provides an appropriation of $56,000,000.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. What will be the cost to the Government of the program allowing $2,500 as the maximum payment?

Mr. REES. It is difficult to answer that question accurately. I tried to get the figure. The $2,500 program will cost several million dollars more than if my amendment is adopted. On the basis of that argument why limit the payments to $2,500. If that is your reasoning, why limit to $5,000 or $10,000. I challenge anyone to answer that, especially those of you who say this amendment will injure the program. I just do not believe anyone will answer it.

Most of the plea will be for the big operator and the plantation owner.

The gentleman from Georgia is on the floor. His state, of course, participates greatly in this thing, I understand. But let us give a little more to his smaller farmers down there, these peanut growers in whom he is greatly interested and for whom he has rendered great service. The cotton growers, I mean the individuals, the big operators, the plantation owners, would still get as much as $750.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. In a moment. Let me make this one statement and I shall be pleased to yield to the gentleman from Georgia who is a very important member of the House Committee on Agriculture. This House saw fit to reduce the payment to $750 at one time. Why in the world at this time should you want to raise it to $2,500? Who of you, opposed to this amendment will answer that? I want to hear you explain that.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. I did not understand the gentleman's remark. He said if there were larger returns to the Soil Conservation Service for their money. The Soil Conservation has no money.

Mr. REES. I had in mind payments under this program. I meant the AAA payments. AAA payments, I should have said. The Soil Conservation Service does not pay money to farmers. It renders service to farmers in assisting them in soil conservation and soil practices.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota, also a very important member of the House Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I favor the gentleman's amendment. If his amendment were adopted it means that the man who operates a small family-sized farm will get more money as a result of the savings from these larger sums that are paid to the big operators.

Mr. REES. The gentleman from Minnesota is correct. If you approve this amendment, you can give the small operator a better break. You will conserve soil where most needed. And at the same time you can still save several millions of dollars for the taxpayers of this country. No one was injured when the limit was $750. You heard no complaint except from the few big operators who thought they should have more money. I don't think very many of them really complained. Most of them, I think, have insisted we cut the cost of Government. Here is a place to do a little good in that respect. I understand the gentleman from Mississippi, the able chairman of this subcommittee, is interested in this proposal. He has a few big operators in his State. I have a few in mine. I hope he will go along with me on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Kansas would have you believe that this Congress is just giving away several millon dollars here under this PMA soil-conservation program. He feels we would be giving it away, and he thinks the little farmer ought to get the major share of it because we are going to give it away.

Does the gentleman realize that out of every dollar the farmer realizes out of this program he puts up a $1 or $2 in order to realize that $1 benefit out of the United States Government? Does the gentleman realize that fact? You are not giving him one red-copper cent. As a matter of fact, we are protecting for years to come the land, the most precious possession we own in this country.

There will be 175,000,000 people in America to feed in the year 1970, at least that many to feed and in addition the Nation's soil will be called upon to feed peoples in other lands. We must protect our soil. If you are going to let the share cropper and the tenant share in this program you must let the man who has acquired 200 or 300 acres of land come in too.

The family-sized farm has been mentioned. Let me tell you something about the man who has two, three, or five tenants. Those tenants are family-sized farmers. They would be deprived of participation, they could not come in at all, if the man who owned the land did not come in.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES. I am not talking about giving anything away.

Mr. GATHINGS. That is what I understood the gentleman to say.

Mr. REES. If you are going to share this money, if you are going to help the farmer, let us take care of the individual farmer.

Mr. GATHINGS. What does the gentleman mean, limit the size of a man's holdings? Does he advocate the philosophy the Communists are promulgating to cut down a man's acreage and not let a farmer who has saved his money and acquired 200 or 300 acres operate? Is the gentleman going to cut him out of the program completely and not conserve the soil on those farms?

Mr. REES. I am referring to the conservation program now.

Mr. GATHINGS. You would not save one penny at all.

Mr. REES. You could use the soil-conservation program to advantage.

Mr. GATHINGS. There was a $10,000 limitation up until the Republicans took over in the Eightieth Congress. They cut it down to $750 and the program would not work. So this committee saw fit to bring it back up to $2,500. Now this gentleman wants to cut it back down. Every year he has come in here with this amendment.

Mr. REES. That is right.

Mr. GATHINGS. Which has been contrary to what the sharecroppers and the tenants wanted.

Mr. REES. Oh, no; the sharecropper wants it.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. What is the nature of this program? Is it a soil conservation program?

Mr. GATHINGS. If you are going to have a soil conservation program you ought to conserve the soil and not limit it to a small plot of ground.

Mr. POAGE. This is a soil conservation program rather than a give-away program?

Mr. GATHINGS. It is not a give-away program.

Mr. POAGE. If the gentleman from Kansas looks upon it as a soil conservation program, then he should pay for the conservation of the soil, should he not? If you are going to look upon it merely as a subsidy or classify it merely as a subsidy, then there may be some justification for saying "Just give it to everybody who comes up and holds out his hand." I think we have got a good soil-conservation program. I hope we will not brand it as a subsidy.

Mr. GATHINGS. Yes; and it ought not to be wrecked by such an amendment as is offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES]. I trust that the amendment will not be agreed to.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes; if it does not come out of my time.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, this is an old story. When the triple A was set up some of the big farm operators in this country received as high as $110,000 a year out of the United States Treasury. Millions and millions of dollars have been spent in the name of soil conservation, and yet the facts are that today the soils of America are not as good as they were 10 years ago, and 10 years ago they were not as good as they were 20 years ago, and a lot of this talk about soil conservation has really not been soil conservation. In fact, we have been subsidizing and promoting the production of soil-depleting crops and have not really devoted the time or the energy or the money to really conserve the soil of the United States. Livestock farming has been discouraged in many instances.

Now, before the Eightieth Congress, there was a reduction of these funds from $110,000 down to the $10,000 limit. But, in the Eightieth Congress it was reduced to $750. As passed by the House it was $500 and $1,000 by the Senate, and they agreed to $750.

The philosophy of agriculture comes in here. We hear it every day. We hear a lot of talk about the family-sized farm. If you are interested in the family-sized farm, I say that we should do something to support the family-sized farm instead of just talking about it. One of the weaknesses of our whole agricultural program has been that we have had a landowners' program and a land speculators' program. One of the troubles we have in connection with the price-support program, if you please, because it is not the average farmer that is causing the trouble. There were a few producers that caused the trouble. So, I hope that we can pass this amendment because I refuse to believe in the philosophy that says that the United States Treasury will provide a $2,500 Christmas present to somebody that owns a large acreage of land and fails to maintain the fertility of his own soil.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES. It is made to appear here that if you do not pass this legislation you are taking something away from the farmer. Is it not true that the farmer himself, the owner of the land, would be expected to protect and conserve his land? Generally speaking, is not that true?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The facts of the case are that we have some two-hundred-million-plus dollars and over 6,000,000 farmers. We are talking about forty-some dollars per farm for the United States. I know my good colleague from Missouri tells me he gets $1,000 out of it. That is all well and good, but he took it away from 19 other fellows when he got it.

This is just a matter of whether you want to distribute it to the big landowners or want the average farmer to have the $40 or $50 that is provided under this legislation. That is all there is to this question, whether you want to confine this to family-size farms or whether you want to dissipate these funds to the big landowners. If any man owns a thousand acres of land, I would think he ought to be able to tend to his own fertility and not ask the general taxpayers, the rest of the people of the United States, to pay for his fertilizer. He ought to be able to do it himself, or let somebody else own the land. That is my own personal opinion.

Mr. REES. We do have a soil-conservation program separate and apart from this?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes, the Soil Conservation Service. We have this one that provides for forty-some dollars a year. If a farmer follows certain practices he can get a bigger share than the $40. It make a nice Christmas present of $2,500 for him. That is the issue here today.

Mr. REES. But it is separate and apart from the big soil-conservation program on which we spend some $56,000,000?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. That is purely technical service. This is where the money goes out. It has been improved during the years. A vote for this amendment is a vote for the family-sized farm and a vote against this amendment is a vote for the large landowner.

[Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Ninety-four Members are present, not a quorum.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 143]

Abbitt	Brehm	Davies, N. Y.
Addonizio	Buchanan	Dawson
Allen, La.	Buckley, N. Y.	Deane
Auchincloss	Bulwinkle	DeGraffenried
Bailey	Burke	Delaney
Barden	Byrne, N. Y.	Denton
Barrett, Pa.	Byrnes, Wis.	Dingell
Bates, Ky.	Canfield	Dollinger
Battle	Cavalcante	Donohue
Beckworth	Chatham	Douglas
Bennett, Fla.	Chudoff	Durham
Bentsen	Clemente	Eaton
Biemiller	Cole, Kans.	Ellsworth
Blackney	Cole, N. Y.	Engel, Mich.
Bolling	Coudert	Evins
Bolton, Md.	Crawford	Fallon
Bolton, Ohio	Crook	Feighan
Boykin	Crosser	Fogarty
Breen	Davenport	Fugate
Gamble	Klein	Rhodes
Garmatz	Kruse	Rich
Gavin	Kunkel	Riehlman
Gillette	Latham	Rodino
Gilmer	Lesinski	Rogers, Fla.
Golden	Lichtenwalter	Roosevelt
Gordon	Lodge	Sabath
Gore	McGrath	Sadlak
Gorski	McMillen, Ill.	Sadowski
Granahan	McSweeney	Sasscer
Granger	Macy	Saylor
Grant	Marcantonio	Scott, Hardie
Green	Martin, Iowa	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Gwinn	Martin, Mass.	Shelley
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Mason	Short
Hall, Leonard W.	Miles	Simpson, Pa.
Hand	Miller, Nebr.	Smathers
Harden	Monroney	Smith, Ohio
Harrison	Morgan	Smith, Wis.
Hart	Morrison	Spence
Harvey	Moulder	Staggers
Hébert	Murphy	Steed
Hedrick	Murray, Tenn.	Tauriello
Heffernan	Nelson	Taylor
Heller	Nixon	Thomas
Herter	Noland	Thompson
Hoffman, Ill.	Norblad	Thornberry
Hoffman, Mich.	Norton	Tollefson
Holifield	O'Brien, Mich.	Towe
Howell	O'Neill	Vinson
Jacobs	O'Toole	Wadsworth
James	Pfeifer, Joseph L.	Walsh
Javits	Pfeiffer, William L.	Whitaker
Jenkins	Plumley	White, Calif.
Johnson	Potter	White, Idaho
Jones, N. C.	Powell	Wilson, Ind.
Kearns	Quinn	Wilson, Tex.
Kee	Rains	Withrow
Keefe	Ramsay	Wolcott
Kelly, N. Y.	Redden	Wolverton
Keogh	Reed, N. Y.	Woodhouse
		Woodruff

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 7786, the general appropriation bill, and finding himself without a quorum, he caused the roll to be called, when 244 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be again read at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again read the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

(The Clerk again read the amendment.)

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may have the other 4 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment that always has appeal. I have seen it offered every year since I have been a Member of this House. But if the theory behind the proponents of this amendment be correct, you should strike out the soil-conservation program tomorrow.

If the soil-conservation program is no more than a grant of money to farmers, it should be eliminated. I do not so concede it to be, and as I said yesterday in opening the general debate on this bill, the whole Nation has an interest in

our soil. Check every country in the world that is having trouble making a living today and you will find that it results from inadequate attention to the welfare and fertility of their soil.

Mr. Eisenhower, who used to be head of the University of Kansas, and for years was active in agricultural matters, has estimated that there are only 2 acres of land for each individual in the world, to supply food, clothing, and shelter—only 2 acres for each person in the world. It has been shown by records in our own country that 70,000,000 acres of land have been eroded to the point that they are no longer productive and must be restored if we are to have the high rate of production in future years that we have enjoyed heretofore.

We have made the worst record in history in destroying the natural resources of our country in the length of time we have occupied it. You may say that the farmers themselves should take care of the fertility of the soil. I agree that they should, but they have not. I think we all have an interest in the soil.

Now this production payment business, the PMA business, let us get this straight, and I hope you are listening to me and will bear with me. It does not say that we will pay you $750, Mr. Farmer, if you adopt the gentleman's amendment; nor does it say that we will pay the farmer $2,500. Under this provision you let the people in the States select the things that are needed to restore the fertility of the soil in the State; you tell them to select those things that are needed, and you tell the farmer that if he does those things, build the terraces, drain the land, or whatever it may be, that for every $2 worth of material and money that he spends in that effort we will pay one-third of it.

I regret only that you did not hear the testimony before our committee. If you would just read a little of it, you would realize that this Nation with a nineteen million increase in population in 10 years cannot afford further waste of our natural resources.

You say: Let the farmer do it. That is all right, but he does not do it. The proper way to get him to do it is to lead and to assist, and that is what we are doing in this program. The only other way would be to force him to do it.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. HOPE. Is not the entire question here whether or not this is a soil-conservation program? If it is, should it not apply to every farm? And if it is not, should we not abandon it now?

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank the gentleman for his statement and appreciate his comment. He has rendered long and fine service in this House. I know of no man who is held in higher esteem on both sides of the aisle than the gentleman from Kansas, CLIFF HOPE.

If this is a soil-conservation program, if you were to set out to save the soil of this country you should build terraces where terraces are needed whether the land belongs to Ben Jensen or myself. It is not enough to tell the farmer to do it or to say that he ought to do it by himself; you have got to induce them to do it by leadership, education, and assistance. All we have to do is to look at China, India, and other countries throughout the world to see what neglect of the land brings to a country. You will find they are countries where they have taken more out of the soil than they have put back into it. Look elsewhere and you will see countries which in many instances do not have too much soil, but they have learned how to take care of it satisfactorily. In the northern part of Europe you will find prosperous countries where soil conservation is practiced.

You should realize that what happens under this program is not just another assistance program, but one wherein they say they will pay one-third of the cost per foot of terrace, per yard of ditch, or per unit of other practice.

It is not entirely a question of the size of the farm; it is based on work on the land. If the land happens to be in the ownership of one individual he has got to spend twice as much on 200 acres as he would on 100 acres in doing these things for the land. The amount of work he does on the land sets the amount of the contribution from the Federal Government.

By all means this amendment should not be adopted.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CHELF. They tell me that practically every day a good-sized farm is washed down the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers. Is that true or not?

Mr. WHITTEN. That statement has been made before our committee and if you will go down and look at the rivers you can see a great deal of soil is washed away and has gone away.

Mr. CHELF. If we do not protect the soil it is not going to protect us?

Mr. WHITTEN. That is right, and our farmers, as fine as their production is, have the worst record in the history of the world in the amount of soil fertility we have wasted. The farmers have not protected the land as they should, and in the interest of the national economy we are going to have to protect it. You either do it through leadership, cooperation and assistance or you do it by order of law. That is the Stalin and Hitler method. We do not want to reach that point.

Mr. Chairman, I want to point out one other thing. This payment is for work on land. It is not a payment to the man to do it. He has got to spend this money on the land plus $2 of his own for each dollar the Government gives him. He cannot pocket this money. He has got to spend this money and $2 of his own for improvements on the land. He has got to spend the money first. Then this contribution is made. If your large units of land are excluded, you exclude every tenant and small farmer on that land. You are defeating the very purpose that you seek to serve.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. Will the gentleman explain how much was spent in this fashion last year by the Government?

Mr. WHITTEN. Approximately $250,000,000.

Mr. CARROLL. Has the gentleman some idea of how many farmers received benefits under this program?

Mr. WHITTEN. My guess would be very rough. There are mighty few farmers who have not contributed to this program, who have not participated in it in one way or another. The rate of improvement in saving our soil and in restoring our soil has increased from 200 to 300 percent since this program was started.

Mr. CARROLL. How many farmers were actively engaged in soil conservation?

Mr. WHITTEN. It is estimated that we probably have about 6,000,000 farmers and it is reasonable to presume 5,000,000 of them are participating in this program.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas

Mr. REES. I want to take issue with the gentleman that we might as well throw this legislation out of the window. I am as much for soil conservation as is the gentleman from Mississippi and I want to say to him, as I said a while ago, that 80 percent of those participating received less than $100 apiece. I am in favor of a soil-conservation program, but I say you should be more liberal with the little fellow and not give away millions of dollars to the big fellows.

Mr. WHITTEN. If my friend were right I would be with him. If the facts were as he says, I would be for him; but this is not a payment to a farmer. They say to the farmer: "If you will build so many feet of terraces we will pay a third of the cost."

It is not a payment at all. They tell him that if he will do so much of the work he will be paid one-third of the cost. If it were a payment, as the gentleman insists, I would agree with him, that we ought to divide it equally and give the little fellows the big end of it. It is not that.

SOIL CONSERVATION FOR SOUTH CAROLINA'S PIEDMONT AND THE NATION

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Chairman, I received a letter the other day from a long-standing friend and neighbor of mine, suggesting that I make a speech here in the House on soil conservation. This man, Mr. S. B. Huff, of route 2, Piedmont, S. C., is just a plain, practical farmer. But he has a great passion for conserving our soil and water resources, and restoring the productiveness of some of our farming lands which have suffered much through years and generations of neglect or abuse.

Mr. Huff is chairman of the board of supervisors of the Greenville County Soil Conservation District. He knows what he is talking about when he says that an adequate soil-conservation program must constitute the basis of any long-range agricultural program. My personal observations likewise confirm his

statement that this is a matter of great interest and importance, not only to his neighbors and himself in the South Carolina Piedmont country, but also to farmers and other people everywhere. A permanent healthy agriculture is a matter of direct concern in every State and in every congressional district in the country. We, whose business it is to pass upon a great variety of legislation affecting the welfare of agriculture, certainly should take the time occasionally to discuss the progress and needs of such basic undertakings as those for conserving our production farm lands, our forests, our wildlife, and our other natural riches.

William Jennings Bryan said one time:

> Burn down our cities and leave our farms, and your cities will spring up again as if by magic; but destroy our farms, and the grass will grow in the streets of every city in the country.

Although I am a city man, I agree with Bryan's reasoning in this regard. No one needs to remind me, for example, that it was South Carolina land that actually provided my own education and has helped to support me in my law practice since. For it was cotton produced on the land around that kept the spindles turning in the Greenville mills where I worked for 15 years while going through school. And it is cotton, livestock, peaches and other products of this same land that today still provides the wealth upon which I and by fellow townsmen depend for our living. It is most certainly true that if agriculture succeeds, industry thrives; and if agriculture languishes, industry and all our business in town suffers accordingly.

Grass has not grown in the streets of Greenville, Laurens, Union, or Spartanburg, but we undeniably have paid a price through the years for agricultural setbacks in our part of the country. Not all of these can be charged against the cotton inset infestations of years past or to economic upsets. Thinking people know, even without the experts telling us, that wasteful use of our land and of the water which enables it to produce has reduced crops yields and lowered farm income and purchasing power. We know, too, that generations of preponderantly row-crop farming—cotton and corn—took heavy toll in damage to our farms, our mills and our public facilities such as highways, railroads, and industrial and city water supplies.

Sloping fields gashed with ugly, unproductive gullies; roads relocated one to several times because the old wheel tracks grew into impassible ditches where runoff water sluiced down them from bordering cropland; and muddy streams and silt-clogged ponds and reservoirs—these are our constant reminders that we have not always used our land and managed our rainwater too well in the past. I can show you more than one reservoir that has silted full or nearly so behind dams built in my day, filled with soil washed off the fields upon which we depend for growing our food, feed, and fiber crops. This process of man-made soil and water waste started long before my time, of course; but it is important to keep in mind that when our forefathers took over from Nature the job of managing the land and the waters of our Piedmont country, the land was covered with timber and our streams were, in the words of early-day writers, "of surpassing transparency." It has been a long, long time since anything like that could be said of our streams such as the Saluda, Enoree, Reedy, Tiger Rivers and others.

Today, in fact, siltation of our reservoirs, streams, and harbors and flood damage along most of the country's rivers are of major concern to all of us. We spend a great deal of time here in Congress, as you know, considering flood-control survey reports and appropriations. I think we are all pleased that since the Flood Control Act of 1936 was enacted proper weight now is being given to the important watershed phases of flood control, up on our farmlands and timber lands, with soil and water conservation playing a major part in such planning and operations by the United States Department of Argiculture through the Soil Conservation Service and the Forest Service.

In South Carolina, for example, preliminary examinations have been completed by the Soil Conservation Service and flood-control surveys are scheduled to start during the 1951 fiscal year in the Santee-Cooper watershed in which my counties lie, as well as on the lower Pee Dee and the Tar-Neuse watersheds and in the coastal drainage from the Savannah River to the Albemarle Sound. That is most of the State, except for the part included in the Savannah River watershed, on which a survey already is well under way. I certainly hope to see this important work carried on through.

My part of the country, of course, does not have any monopoly on our unenviable history of land and water use. It came about, not deliberately or maliciously, but through the course of conventional settlement and development of the land in the best accepted American tradition. I feel sure that the land story follows a similar pattern in most of your States and districts.

We can profit in looking back, though, only to the extent that we employ the lessons of the past in shaping our course for the present and the future. We lawyers find past court decisions indispensable in building up our cases day by day. Nature has rendered some sharp decisions on man's occupancy and use of the land; we who hold title to or rent the land today will do well to study those decisions and weigh the penalties and awards which have resulted. Frankly, I believe we have been doing a pretty honest job in this respect in recent years; and the good results are much in evidence.

Great strides have been made, as you know, in the last 17 years in many phases of our economy. We can think of an imposing list, ranging from the guaranteeing of bank deposits to social security and housing aid. The advancements in the field of agriculture have been especially noteworthy. Some of those we now accept as a matter of course as permanent, everlasting, stable improvements include: rural electrification, now expanded to extend rural telephones; Federal crop insurance; Farmers Home Administration lending for farm ownership or production and subsistence needs, with 28 percent of the ownership loans already paid up in full 30 or more years in advance, and the remainder paid an average of 2 years in advance; and the varied Production and Marketing Administration functions, from its marketing service and the school-lunch program to the agricultural conservation programs.

But I have no time to talk about these various worth-while activities today, even though some of them contribute materially to furthering of the country's soil- and water-conservation accomplishments. The agricultural conservation payments, for example, have helped the farmers to do more conservation work. Progress of soil conservation likewise has been hastened because of the educational program of the Extension Service; the cooperative research work of the experiment stations and the State colleges with the Soil Conservation Service; and the United States Forest Service's conservation and research on national forest lands. I shall confine my remarks principally to the work of our Greenville County Soil Conservation District and the approximately 2,200 other districts organized and run by local farmers of the 48 States and 4 Territories and insular possessions.

Generally speaking, I think that soil conservation as it is being carried on through these democratic, locally voted and managed districts is perhaps the greatest program in agriculture that has been hit upon in recent years, if not in all time. The purpose of soil conservation is to help all agriculture. Any number of our scientific agricultural achievements are of incalculable value or indispensable, such as crop, livestock, and poultry improvements, insect- and disease-control methods, and so on. But none of these alone can produce a bale of cotton, a pound of beef or pork, or a board foot of lumber unless there is productive land on which to grow our food, feed, fiber, oil, and timber crops.

Our Greenville County soil-conservation district is 9 years old. It is one of the 33 such districts which blanket the entire State of South Carolina—one of 8 States which are 100 percent covered by these districts. The other soil-conservation districts in my congressional district are the Laurens County district, of which Mr. Ryan F. Lawson, of Clinton, is chairman; the Spartanburg district, Mr. J. A. Bridwell, of Moore, chairman; and the Broad River district in Union County, Mr. W. C. Camp, of route 2, Gaffney, chairman. Each of them has its own report of splendid conservation accomplishment; but I have time to discuss in any detail only the work of the Greenville County district, with which I naturally am most familiar.

I can say with certainty that the conservation work they report is actually out there on the land. I have been out and have seen the results of this soil- and water-conservation planning and land treatment. I have observed the systems of terracing, the conservation drainage

improvements, the conservation farm wildlife developments that are providing us with better hunting and fishing, the cover cropping, the farm ponds, and other practices and measures. Thus I have had the opportunity of observing at first-hand the great contribution these farmer districts have made toward restoring the permanent productiveness of the farm lands in our part of the country where cotton has placed a heavy drain on the land.

In the Greenville County district's 1949 annual report which Chairman Huff sent me, I was impressed by such indicators of healthy progress in district accomplishment as the growth in the number of conservation farm plans. That has been from 75 plans covering 7,599 acres at the close of 1940 to 865 plans covering 900,000 acres at the end of 1949. Some of the individual accomplishments reported included about 4,000 acres of pasture established, more than 6,000 tons of lime, and a thousand tons of superphosphate used, 100,000 trees planted, and 162,000 pounds of summer legume seed and 34,000 pounds of winter legume seed planted.

The Soil Conservation Service, as the technical agency which helps the Greenville County and the other districts in conservation surveying, planning, and initial application of these measures, at the request of the district supervisors, has supplied me with some additional figures. They show, among other accomplishments, that our Greenville County district farmers to the first of this year have done 17,000 acres of contour farming and developed 3,700 acres of new cover crops, done nearly 13,000 acres of strip cropping, built 1,428 miles of terraces, and put conservation woodland management into effect on 18,000 acres.

Those figures, you understand, represent only a few of the conservation measures actually put on the land in the one soil-conservation district in one county. I could give you comparable facts about the others in my congressional district, elsewhere in South Carolina, and for the country as a whole. I think it is enough to point out at this time, through, some more general State and national figures. For example, I find that to January 1 approximately 29,000 complete conservation farm plans had been worked up by district farmers and assisting Soil Conservation Service technicians in South Carolina. These plans called for the treatment of 4⅓ million acres, and the land treatment reported as already applied totaled more than 3,000,000 acres in our South Carolina soil-conservation districts.

Also, I was interested in knowing that 11¼ million acres in my State alone already have had the benefit of detailed conservation surveys, which the Soil Conservation Service assists the districts to make to find out what conservation treatments the land needs on each farm, and how each acre may be used most profitably and safety. If any of you are not acquainted with this basic land inventory on which the districts' conservation planning and land treatment are based, I am sure you would find it worth while to post yourselves on it.

These land capability surveys, as I understand them, develop for every acre on every farm such pertinent information as to the type of soil, the slope of the land, the amount of erosion it has had in the past, and its susceptibility to further erosion under prevailing climatic conditions with different kinds of use cultivation, pasture, and so forth. With such facts available it is then possible for the farmer to separate the best land from the less productive and more hazardous lands, and plan his farming accordingly. It seems to me this ought to be good information for us to have for the entire country, and that such a national land inventory could have many important uses in the planning and carrying out of almost all the different agricultural programs, whether they be strictly soil conservation, farm credit, production, allotments, or whatever.

Dr. H. H. Bennett, Chief of the Soil Conservation Service, tells me that by the first of this year, January 1, 1950, detailed soil conservation surveys adequate for farm planning had been made on 321,000,000 acres in the country as a whole. He pointed out, though, that the demands from the districts for help in planning and applying conservation measures had been so heavy that the survey work had not been able to go forward as rapidly as it should of late.

I also asked Dr. Bennett for other Nation-wide soil conservation accomplishment figures. They showed that up to January 1, 1950, about 807,000 complete soil conservation plans had been prepared in districts alone, covering nearly 222,000,000 acres. More than 112,000,000 acres of that had been treated with needed conservation measures by the first of this year, just in the soil conservation districts and not including past work done in the erosion control demonstration projects, CCC camp areas, and through other programs in which the Soil Conservation Service has participated. Nor do they include the important soil and water conservation research activities which this agency is carrying on all the time in cooperation with the State experiment stations.

But enough for figures. Meantime, let us go back to Mr. Huff's report from the Greenville County Soil Conservation District and consider a couple of points brought out which I think are most important in connection with the successful undertaking of our whole conservation program. One is the local community-group approach which our Greenville County farmers are using to help speed up their programs. I find that just about everybody agrees on the need for going ahead as fast as possible with this soil- and water-conservation work; and I understand that this group-action procedure is getting splendid results, both in our local district and in other districts all over the country.

As it is worked out in the Greenville County district, this method consists of organizing communities into groups for the purpose of getting a pattern of soil conservation over entire neighborhoods, without regard to farm boundary lines. The district has five of these neighborhood groups, with two Negro groups. These organized farmers select a leader for each group within the soil-conservation district; and, as Chairman Huff points out, these farmer-leaders have in many instances "become true conservationists and are rendering a real service to the cause of soil conservation." I think you will agree with me that this is the basic, democratic way of going about a job of this kind. It is no wonder that our Greenville County conservation groups have attracted the attention of agricultural leaders from different parts of the United States and from foreign countries.

Closely related to this successful farmer-group approach to the conservation problem is the emphasis which our Greenville County district is giving to community-wide support of its program. As Mr. Huff wrote:

> As we soil conservation district supervisors understood our duties better, we came to believe that people, other than farmers, have a responsibility to the land. As we saw the success of groups of farmers working together, we realized that the help of these other people would give impetus to the soil-conservation program and that it would be well to seek this outside help and give them the opportunity to have a part in the soil-conservation movement. In considering the fact that every citizen has a stake in the land, district supervisors have called upon all types of business, banking, manufacturing, commerce, and industry to help with the job. We have sought the help of teachers, preachers, newspapers, radio, civic clubs, and private citizens.

I personally can vouch for the success which has attended their efforts in this common-sense attitude toward the conservation program. For example, I had the pleasure of attending the Greenville County district meeting in Mauldin at the close of the district's 1949 pasture contest, which the supervisors have sponsored each year since 1947. Business firms of Greenville furnish prizes in the contest and put on a dinner at the close of each year's event. The supervisors report that these pasture contests have resulted in the planting of 4,000 acres of fescue and Ladino clover. I wish I had time to tell you of some of the outstanding results which our individual district farmers have had with their pasture-livestock programs.

The Greenville County district supervisors call attention in their report to what I agree is a particularly significant phase of this whole matter of conserving our soil and water resources. That is, "the tremendous influence for good among young folk of the community—influence that will keep these boys and girls on the farm, continuing the type of farming their fathers advocate." During the past year, the Greenville County district also sponsored a soil-conservation contest among 4–H Club boys, with prizes provided by the Greenville Kiwanis Club through its agricultural committee.

The district supervisors also are cooperating with veterans' classes, by getting motion pictures for the classes and cooperating with the instructors in ob-

servational tours. Over the country generally, I understand that a most constructive soil conservation training program for veterans has been under way. Also, that many veterans are among the approximately 16,000 private contractors who have found most profitable opportunities in terracing, drainage, pond building, and other conservation-construction work for soil conservation district farmers.

I want to mention another outstanding conservation contest activity in my county. That is the 2-year Piedmont communities soil-conservation contest. Originally sponsored by the Spartanburg Herald-Journal, the second contest now under way is being sponsored by supervisors of the Spartanburg, Laurens County, and Broad River, Union County, soil-conservation districts in my own congressional district and the districts in Cherokee, Polk, and Rutherford Counties. I am told that 370 farmers and 28 groups are participating in Spartanburg County, with $10,000 in prizes offered by business firms; 145 farmers in 10 groups in Union County, with $3,000 in prizes; and 269 farmers in 14 groups in Laurens County, with $2,800 in prizes. Every cotton mill in Laurens County is offering a prize in the contest. This will give you a further idea of the way all of us down in my part of the country believe in getting behind this important work of soil conservation.

Nor is this just another do-good movement that all these varied interests enter into because it seems to be a genteel and proper thing to do. Our mill owners and business and professional people of all kinds appreciate all too well the fact that we people in town are not going to prosper unless the farmers of Greenville County and the rest of the country can keep up their income and maintain their purchasing power. Soil-conservation farming, it has been demonstrated over and over, is the most efficient and hence the most economical and profitable. It enables the farmer to adjust his production best to meet changing market and other conditions.

As I have pointed out to this body before, my home is the center of the South's thriving and growing cotton textile industry. None of us, naturally, want to see cotton driven from the South; but neither do we want to see our good land needlessly exhausted in growing quantities of cotton which may not be needed at a given time, or our already depleted and low-producing lands needlessly pushed to produce surplus cotton. Instead, we want to grow the cotton which is needed on our good land, economically and profitably, and produce other, needed commodities like feed and livestock, fruit, timber, and so on on the lands best suited to produce them safely and profitably. I should say that the same general goal would hold for the Wheat Belt and other cash-crop areas.

The agricultural pattern in our southland already is changing definitely in that very direction, to the everlasting benefit and well-being of us all. While our industries thrive, many of our people are living better than they ever did before. Soil-conservation farming unquestionably has played an important part in this. And new agricultural developments are bringing new prosperity to many localities. In my home district, for example, peach growing has become an important part of our agriculture in recent years. In fact, Spartanburg County has become one of the Nation's peach centers, now that South Carolina has forged ahead of even Georgia in peach production in some recent years.

Mr. Huff in his letter reminded me that the farmers of Greenville County and the Nation are concerned over the type of agricultural legislation that may be considered and passed by Congress this year. We now are working under the greatest pressure to economize and are trying to slash off every unnecessary expenditure possible. But for us to curtail or hinder this sound soil-conservation program which is so successfully under way would be false economy, and the resultant loss to the country would be too terrible to contemplate.

As you know, busy farmers like Mr. Huff do not sit down and write letters to their Congressman just to be doing something. He and his fellow farmers are sincere in their efforts to help improve our agriculture and our whole economy with it. They are standing on their own feet, and giving liberally of their own time and sometimes cash money to get the job done. All they ask is that we make available to them such facilities which they need as the technical assistance provided by the Soil Conservation Service, along with the continued educational help of the Extension Service and PMA conservation incentive payments.

Dr. Bennett tells me that the demands from soil-conservation districts for Soil Conservation Service technical aid continues to be far in excess of the personnel available for giving such assistance. In my own State, for example, the backlog of farmer applications for conservation surveying, planning, and application help through their districts totaled about 2,850 on January 1. I know that this agency is just about as efficient as it could be in assigning all but a very small percentage of its employees to work directly with the farmers or to duties involved specifically in getting conservation onto the land. I have visited the Service's southeastern regional office in Spartanburg, and am personally acquainted with Dr. T. S. Buie, the regional director, and different members of his staff in Spartanburg and in the field offices in my counties. I also have had the pleasure of attending a meeting of the local chapter of the Soil Conservation Society of America, composed of members from different agencies and groups and individuals whose work has to do with soil, water, forest, and wildlife conservation.

It is good to see all these people working together toward the common objective of conserving and making more satisfying use of our land and other resources—the farmers, agricultural and other scientists, business and professional people, and just about everybody else. This teamwork is going to continue to pay us big dividends. And, as Mr. Huff wrote:

Until—

The soil-conservation district—

supervisors can add all our State and national lawmakers to the enlisted group of Americans who are helping farmers to save the soil, then we will be minus an assistance that can do much to encourage good land use.

I hope it may be said of all of us here that we are going to meet this challenge squarely and wholeheartedly.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. REES) there were—ayes 63, noes 98.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Michigan.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SHAFER) there were—ayes 67, noes 93.

So the motion was rejected.

(Mr. MURDOCK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.)

(Mr. BRYSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at that point following the remarks made by the gentleman from Mississippi on soil conservation.)

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 189, line 10, strike out the figure "$282,500,000" and insert "$400,000,000."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is not authorized by law.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, I have had that amendment on the Clerk's desk all afternoon, and I have been seeking recognition.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, prior to the ruling, I wonder if I could have the attention of the gentleman from Missouri, the author of the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would be pleased to hear the gentleman.

Mr. WHITTEN. I want to state this, that the gentleman's amendment is directed to the payment for the soil conservation program. This program was announced last year. The orders and all the regulations and all the commitments were made last year, and this is in payment of the program in this amount. I am not trying to say what the gentleman intended, but apparently the gentleman has directed his efforts along the line of the announcement of the next year's program, rather than increasing the payment this year beyond the obligation we have. I mention that to clarify the situation, I hope.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, last year the amount that is now carried was authorized, and that is the only authoriza-

tion there is for it. The amendment is entirely without authority in law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Missouri has offered an amendment, which has been reported. The gentleman from New York makes a point of order against the amendment. However, the Chair invites attention to the fact that all the amendment does is seek to increase the amount of the appropriation carried in the bill.

Mr. TABER. That is correct, but the amount that is authorized to be carried is limited to the authorization that was in the bill last year, and that was the amount that now stands in the bill. That is the only authority there is. The $400,000,000 that is now being offered by way of amendment is not authorized by law.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. No; I do not desire to be heard on the point of order, but I know that the soil of the United States needs $400,000,000 for its conservation during the coming year. If the law is so written that we cannot have it, then I will turn my attention to changing the law, if possible.

The CHAIRMAN. The point presented here is whether the amount provided in the bill is the amount authorized by law, and whether the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri would exceed the amount authorized by law.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I do not know.

The CHAIRMAN. The burden would be on the gentleman to show that the amount provided in his amendment did not exceed the amount authorized by law.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, I have offered my amendment. If it is more than is authorized by law, the burden of proof is on the objector and not on me. If he can prove it, okay.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rules and precedents of the House, the burden of proof is always on the proponent of the amendment.

In view of the information given the Chair, which is assumed to be correct, that the amount proposed by the amendment exceeds the amount authorized by law, the Chair would be forced to sustain the point of order.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to take just a minute or two to discuss how payments are set up on the farm for soil conservation. First, waste land is excluded from the farm acreage. Then the lands that the buildings and the lots are on are excluded. Then a payment is set up on the crop acreage. That is the plowable acres or the tillable acres. Out in my neighborhood in Missouri, it is about 68 cents an acre. That is only paid to the farmer if he does about $2 or $2.50 worth of soil conservation work for each dollar that is paid to him. I am not quarreling about that. He should do this soil conservation work and he does do it if he gets his payments. But the man who does soil-conservation work over 300 acres of land is entitled to three times as much payment as the man who does the same amount of work per acre over 100 acres of land. That should be evident to anybody. This PMA program is not a hand-out and it is not a gift. It is the only soil-conservation program that has got anything done and is getting anything done. Let us see just what is needed in the United States. We need 8,000,00 acres of land terraced and the PMA has gotten terraces built on 738,000 acres. That is less than one-eighth of the job. On pasture and range improvements we need 129,000,000 acres reseeded. The PMA has succeeded in getting 37,000,000 acres reseeded. On green manure crops the PMA has 109,000,000 acres of green manure crops most of which was used and plowed under in a 12-year period. That should happen every year in the United States. We need 30,000,000 acres for tree planting and the PMA has succeeded in replanting 627,000 acres. On phosphates we need 17,000,000 tons a year spread on the farms of the United States and slightly more than 10 percent of that, or a million and a half tons, are being spread each year. For earthen dams for livestock water and erosion control, we need 2,000,000 dams and we have 730,000. On lime we need 65,000,000 tons a year and we are spreading 25,000,000 tons. There are 5,858,000 farms in the United States and the allotment for soil conservation this year figures $48.25 a farm. It costs $150 to build a mile of terrace and it costs a $10 bill to lime an acre of sour land. How much do you expect the farmer in our low-income groups to do, the farmer whose income is less than $1,500 a year per family? How do you expect them to do effective soil-conservation work unless the Government will match the dollars that they pay to the extent of at least $68.25 a farm?

Those are things I would like to know. I want you to get these figures because they are correct. Our soil conservation appropriation for 1939 was $500,000,000. In 1940 it was $532,500,000 approximately. In 1941 it was $465,500,000. In 1942 it was four hundred ninety-nine and one-third million dollars. In 1943 it was $450,000,000. In 1944 it was $400,000,000. That is the amount to which I am trying to raise it today. In 1945 it was $302,500,000. In 1946 it was $355,000,000. In 1949 it was $159,734,500, and certain people bragged that they would take that off next year but they did not have the courage to do it. In 1950 it was set at $257,043,439. I am trying by this amendment today to raise the appropriation to the place it occupied in 1944, $400,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CHRISTOPHER] has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 215, line 4, insert a new subsection 411 to read as follows:

"(a) No part of any funds appropriated or made available to the Department of Agriculture under this chapter shall be used for paying any of the expenses (including per diem, transportation or other expense) of the Secretary of Agriculture, or of any officer or employee of the Department of Agriculture (including State, county, or community production and marketing administration committeemen or their successors) in connection with their attendance or participation in any meeting, conference or gathering outside the Department of Agriculture (except before, or at the request of, the committees of Congress having jurisdiction of the legislation) if such meetings, conferences, or gatherings are utilized for the purpose or with the effect of promoting, fostering, discussing, analyzing or explaining, or effecting the adoption or nonadoption, of any plan, bill, proposal, measure, or other proposed legislation which has been submitted, in whole or in part, to the Congress of the United States or any authorized committee thereof but which has not been enacted into law."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment. I do not wish to preclude discussion of the amendment, but I reserve the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi reserves a point of order against the amendment.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is recognized for 5 minutes in support of the amendment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment, which is clearly a limitation and clearly in order, for the purpose of preventing the use of the people's money to propagandize, in calling conventions, drawing in committee men, and other employees of the Department of Agriculture, so that they might be organized for political propaganda in behalf of legislation.

Such a meeting as this was held in Minnesota a little while back. Other meetings have been held from time to time. Millions of dollars, over all, have been wasted by departments, spending travel money for such purposes and drawing people in for the purpose of conference, to promote particular legislation. I hope that this Committee will vote for this amendment, and that we can begin to stop that sort of thing. It is a disgrace to the United States that that situation could exist.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. As I understand it, this amendment simply provides that the Department or the Secretary of Agriculture cannot call in their committeemen for the purpose of promoting legislation that has not been presented to the Congress.

Mr. TABER. Or that has been; either way. Anything that has not been enacted into law.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is right. So, if it has been presented to the Congress, then they cannot call in those people; or if it has been enacted into law, then they can call them in to interpret the law and to administer it?

Mr. TABER. To administer it, but not for the purpose of creating the law.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. As a matter of fact, if the present law, generally speaking, were enforced, such an

amendment would not be necessary, because the employees at the present time, under the Hatch Act and other acts, are not permitted to carry on these activities. So this becomes a very necessary amendment to declare the policy of the Congress.

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr TABER. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. I also believe that the members of the Department of Agriculture have been guilty of criticizing existing law and the way it is administered. Strangely enough, out in my area they have been doing that—tearing down the confidence of the people in laws that exist.

Mr. TABER. That is true, with the idea of promoting a change, in their own interest.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. As I understand the amendment, it would make it impossible for the Secretary of Agriculture or any employee of the Department to use funds to pay the traveling expenses or per diem expenses of anybody to arrange a meeting or to attend a meeting to explain or promote the Brannan plan.

Mr. TABER. It would.

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. FURCOLO. I agree with the gentleman's idea that we do not want to have any politics in this. As I understand the gentleman's amendment, if a thousand farmers, for example, wanted to have the Brannan plan explained to them by the Secretary so they could determine whether they wanted it or not, the gentleman's amendment would prevent that; would it not?

Mr. TABER. No; it would not. It would not prevent anybody's going to any meeting that he wanted to voluntarily and at his own expense.

Mr. FURCOLO. Would not the gentleman's amendment prevent payment to the Secretary of Agriculture to go to this meeting that had been called for him to explain his plan?

Mr. TABER. No; it would not prevent his going, but he would have to go at his own expense or at the expense of those who wanted him to go and explain it.

Mr. FURCOLO. Does not the gentleman feel that the farmers, or any other segment of the people of the country, are entitled to have explained to them a plan suggested by the Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. TABER. I do not believe that the taxpayers of the United States should pay the traveling expenses of anybody to go out and promote particular types of legislation; I think it is absolutely contrary to a republican form of government.

Mr. FURCOLO. But not to a democratic form.

Mr. TABER. If a democratic form of government means a Stalin form of government that could be so.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. If the gentleman will permit, I think the answer is found right in the amendment. The amendment states that if the committee authorizes or requests him to go he can get his expenses—any committee in the Congress; and I am sure the chairman will agree that it would be tickled to death to pay Mr. Brannan's expenses or the expenses of anyone who could explain the Brannan plan to the farmers of the country.

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. FURCOLO. As I understand the amendment, it states that if legislation has been presented to the Congress, the Secretary of Agriculture, or anyone else cannot travel and have his expenses paid to go and explain that to the farmers or anyone who wants it explained to them.

Mr. TABER. He cannot have his expenses paid to promote any particular type or piece of legislation.

Mr. FURCOLO. This goes farther than to promote; it states "analyze, explain," and so on. Under it, if a thousand farmers wanted him to come out and explain the plan to them, he could not have his expenses paid by the Government for going there.

Mr. TABER. But he can by a committee of Congress, of course.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York may proceed for three additional minutes.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object to this request, I wonder if we cannot find some way of limiting debate. We want to get through this evening, otherwise the whole chapter goes over until next Wednesday.

The CHAIRMAN. Permit the Chair to inquire if the gentleman withdraws his point of order or desires to press it?

Mr. WHITTEN. After further consideration—I had not had the privilege of seeing the gentleman's amendment at the time I made the point of order—we seem to be agreed that the point of order was not well taken. For that reason, I withdraw it.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi desire to submit a consent request?

Mr. WHITTEN. Yes. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment be limited to 10 minutes, the last five to be reserved to the committee.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, would not the gentleman amend his request to make it 20 minutes so that each of us may have at least 2 minutes?

Mr. WHITTEN. If there is 20 minutes on this amendment, the next amendment, and the other amendments, we do not know how long we would be here. That is the only point.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I will withdraw my request if you will honestly quit here; but if you are going to continue on and on, then I want this gentleman to be heard.

Mr. WHITTEN. I do, too.

Mr. Chairman, I modify my request and ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment be limited to 12 minutes, the last 4 to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

(Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, much as I dislike to disagree with the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], who has performed a most valuable service to the country in holding down expenditures, I fear that his amendment goes too far. I have observed for years the workings of our AAA and county and community committeemen, and I cannot agree to any limitations on their rights to attend meetings for the purpose of studying and analyzing whatever programs might be proposed. Let us remember that our township committeemen are elected by their fellow farmers in their township. The county committeemen are in turn selected by the township committee from among their number. What can be fairer or more democratic? Let us remember, also, that generally these men are among the best and most respected farmers of their communities. They give much more of their time than they are ever paid for.

May I point out to the House that last year the average county committeemen, of whom there are three in each county, received only an average of $525 a year for the 77 days they were officially paid for on an average. Ask any county committeeman and he will tell of the many additional hours he puts in at his home without compensation, listening to the problems of his neighboring farmers who depend upon him as a source of information on matters relating to the farm programs. I well remember the hours I have personally taken of the time of a good friend, Mr. Frank Brandt, of Tyler, Minn., and the willingness he has always shown in helping me with matters pertaining to my grain-sealing operations.

May I also point out that the approximate 4,200 township or community committeemen in Minnesota, together with the others in our Nation, only averaged $75 last year for the 11 official days of work for which they were paid. Do you not think that these men are worth that small sum of less than $100 a year to pay them in part for the time they spend making our farm programs work? I certainly do and will not begrudge them a trip once a year to some central point in our State to hear any farm program discussed.

It has been extremely unfortunate that politics were injected into the April 4 meeting at St. Paul, but please do

not lay the blame for this upon this 4,400 county and township committeemen who may have attended that gathering. Please also keep in mind that during that 2 days conclave, at least six speakers made addresses relative to certain phases of our farm program.

Knowing these men as I do, and having the confidence in their desire for as good a farm program as we can devise, I ask the House to defeat the Taber amendment.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MILLS). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. Is it not the custom when a chamber of commerce or a medical association or any other group invites a Government official to come to a convention or other meeting to give an address or discuss any proposal, that the organization usually provides the traveling expenses of that Government official?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is true.

Mr. JUDD. Why should that not be true when farmers have a meeting and have an official of the Department of Agriculture come out to explain a program to them?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Explain some new proposal?

Mr. JUDD. Yes, or explain a program that has been adopted that would help them in their operation of it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. This permits payment of expenses to explain programs that have been enacted into law.

Mr. JUDD. Personally, I do not think the Government should pay their traveling expenses when farmers invite them to any meeting and certainly not if it is in regard to something that is being proposed or propagandized, which is all that is prohibited in this amendment.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the 2 minutes allotted to me may be given the gentleman from South Dakota.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, this is a rather long amendment, but, as nearly as I can read it, all it does is to say that no part of the funds appropriated or made available to the Department of Agriculture under this chapter shall be used for paying any of the expenses for somebody to go out and lobby for a new law. That is, it says in effect that you cannot lobby or put on the heat at the expense of the Government.

May I ask the gentleman from New York if that is a fair interpretation of his amendment?

Mr. TABER. It is.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman from Minnesota was mistaken if he thought this would prohibit the explanation of existing programs.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes. The last clause is "but which has not been enacted into law." It permits the explanation of law, but it prevents lobbying or putting on the heat at the expense of the Government for bills which are not yet law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I hope you know what you are doing. I doubt it. You might go all the way and say that neither can the President of the United States visit parts of this country and explain the proposals he has made to the Congress. It may be that there are faults in the Brannan plan, but I think what you seek to do by this amendment will contribute toward a revolt among the farmers of this Nation and the people of this Nation. They desire to know, need to know and are entitled to know the full terms and effect of the so-called Brannan plan and every other proposal which the Secretary makes, which I make and which you make. I have great respect for, I have great confidence in, Secretary Brannan. I think he is an honest man. I think he is sincere, and I think he is concerned about the expenditure of public funds. For my part I shall not subscribe to this amendment or any comparable amendment which strikes directly at the Secretary of Agriculture, which strikes by such indirection at a proposal which he has submitted to the Congress. If it is true as the gentleman from Minnesota says, that the more the Secretary explains his proposal the less popular it becomes, then why are you here trying to strangle, yes, trying to prevent, yes, trying to prohibit an important member of the administration from submitting to the farmers of this Nation for their judgment, not for the judgment of any group in the Congress or elsewhere, whether or not his proposal is one under which they desire to operate? I hope this amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, my remarks will be directed along the line of my colleague from Georgia [Mr. PACE]. I believe you will recall that I made the closing argument against the Brannan plan in this House last fall when this trial run was up in the House of Representatives. I made that because, based on my experience on this committee, I did not believe that it would work, and I believe I am sound in that reasoning. But, as I said this year when the Secretary of Agriculture was before our committee, that this problem is sufficiently big and it has got sufficient problems connected with it, such as your potato surplus and a number of other things, that not only did I think that all of us were entitled to our views as to how to correct these ills, but I thought that we all should be giving some attention to it, and while I differed with him, not only did I think he had a right to his thinking in the matter, but I thought that he had a duty to consider these problems and to arrive at the conclusion that he believed was best to handle these ills.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Why pick out one Secretary; why not all?

Mr. WHITTEN. Well, that is the point.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Does the gentleman think that the taxpayers of the United States ought to pay the Secretary to run around and do it rather than have him pay his own way, just like you and I would have to?

Mr. WHITTEN. No. I want to say this. I do not think the Federal Government should pay the expenses of anybody to run around and promote anything. On the other hand, I think whoever the Secretary of the Department is, if he cannot discuss the programs of his Department, past, present, and future, we are trying to dictate to the executive departments of the Government.

The thing you are trying to drive at in this amendment I think has more dangers than the thing you are trying to cure. If Mr. Brannan goes down into my district and talks to the farmers there, with all due deference to him, and I think he is a high-class gentleman, I think the more he talks about the Brannan plan the fewer people there will be for it. I am willing to let the plan stand on its own merits. I think the plan would defeat itself. But I do say that the head of any department certainly should have the right to have and discuss his own views, and to express them wherever he wants to.

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FURCOLO. It is not so much a question of consideration for the Secretary or what he wants, it is a question of consideration for the American people. They have a right to information from the top servants of the Government.

Mr. WHITTEN. I was speaking of the Secretary as a position rather than the individual who now occupies that position. The American people are entitled to a full discussion on the part of its top employees as to what their programs are.

The thing that is supposed to have happened in this instance, as the facts have been related to me, is this. The administrative people in the PMA committes were called in to a State committee, which happens each and every year in each and every State. On this occasion the Secretary of Agriculture was asked there to talk. I do not think that is anything unusual. The unusual thing, and it is unfortunate in this case, is that the State head of that committee wrote all these fellows and said that if they attended this meeting the Secretary would be there, and they would be paid for it. They would have been paid for this meeting if he had not gone there. They would have been paid if the letter had not been written.

I am advised they are having a meeting in the State of Vermont next month, and Senator AIKEN is invited up there.

Those fellows will be paid their expenses, because their primary purpose in being there will be to attend to the business of the PMA, and to take occasion there to hear these departmental representatives is not out of order.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARSHALL. Will the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York prevent a county agricultural agent from attending a 4–H Club meeting?

The CHAIRMAN. That is not a parliamentary inquiry.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 47, noes 89.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this chapter and all amendments thereto close in not to exceed 16 minutes with the last 4 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LECOMPTE: On page 172, line 25, strike out "$4,100,000: *Provided*" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "$4,200,000: *Provided*, That $100,000 shall be available for European corn borer research: *Provided further*."

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, at this late hour all I want to say is that this is the same amendment which I offered a while ago as an amendment to an amendment. We are spending fabulous sums all over the world. The infestations of the corn borer are a very serious threat to the food supply of the country and of the world. We are spending over $100,000,000 to stop the spread of foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico, and I heartily approve of this for our livestock industry is worth billions, and we are sending a great deal of money abroad. This calls for only $100,000—not $100,000,000, but $100,000. There is a conservation angle in this also. At this late hour I do not desire to take the time of the House, but let me say this is very important, and it is later than you think. We can well afford to spend $100,000 to stop the spread of the corn borer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LECOMPTE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LECOMPTE) there were—ayes 31, noes 51.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is on the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CHRISTOPHER: On page 190, line 24, strike out "$285,000,000" and insert "$400,000,000."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that this is language that is not authorized by law.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, I am informed by rather reliable sources that the authorization is for a $500,000,000 program.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. COOPER). The Chair is prepared to rule. The Chair would invite attention to the fact that this is for the future. Unless there is some limitation of law to which the attention of the Chair has not been called, this amendment is in order.

The Chair overrules the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized in support of his amendment.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I yield.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted to me be given to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CHRISTOPHER]. I am supporting his position, and I ask unanimous consent that my remarks may follow his in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 6 minutes.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, I do not think I will require 6 minutes.

It was 1948 before the appropriation for soil conservation sunk to as low a figure as $285,000,000. In 1940 the appropriation was for $532,538,497. We need soil conservation in the United States, and this is the one program in the United States that is getting terraces built, getting lime spread, getting sweet-clover plowed under. Drive across the country and look. The plow has followed the ax up the mountainside just as far as it can reach. I heard a man in Arkansas say that a fellow fell out of his potato patch three times in 1 day. The last time he fell he landed in Missouri. There are some places in the mountains out in the West, which I drive through on the way home, where men have little corn patches up on the mountainside where these men are in danger of falling out of the cornfield. How they take anything up there more than a hoe is more than I can understand.

We have got enough money to take care of Europe and Asia, but we do not have any money to conserve the soil of the United States. I would like to do something for somebody at home. I know what we need, whether we can get it or not. I have only asked that the appropriation be set up to $400,000,000. It ought to be $500,000,000. If we have got billions for Europe, we can undoubtedly save our own land, because agriculture is the foundation under our house.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I yield.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask the gentleman whether or not, in the past, we provided twice as much for soil conservation as the gentleman is asking today.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Yes. I have the figures all the way from 1948 clear back to 1939. In 1939 it was $500,000,000; in 1940 it was $532,500,000; and I gave the figures a while ago for the other years. For the year 1948 it got down to $228,000,000, and in 1949, $159,000,000, and for 1950 it came back up to $257,000,000.

I ask you to vote for my amendment and let us put soil conservation back up to $68.25 per farm. That payment of $68.25 per farm reminds me of the old farmer who had a wife and 11 children; he bought six bananas, peeled them, cut them in the middle, gave each one half a banana and said "Now, eat until you bust." The present program is like that; that is a case in point.

Here is a chance to see whether the Members want to practice soil conservation with their lips or whether they believe in it with their hearts.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I yield.

Mr. MARSHALL. I take it the gentleman's experience as a farmer and observation of soil conservation shows him that it is much cheaper for the taxpayers to maintain the farm than it is to dig it out of the river, does it not?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. That is true.

My son came back from 4 years in the southwest Pacific. He said: "Dad, let's take care of this soil." He said: "I saw women carrying mud in buckets on their heads up mountainsides to pour into rice paddies in order that they might raise enough rice to live."

I hope we do not come to that in this country but unless we all bend every effort to save the soil we still have we will soon find that with our population going up a million per year and our soil resources going down we will leave to our children and grandchildren a land that will not feed and clothe the population.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CHRISTOPHER], has informed the House of the need for $400,000,000 for soil conservation and I wish to concur in what he has said.

This Nation must conserve its soil. All informed people know that. The future of this country rests upon our ability to maintain and conserve our natural resources. I doubt if the history of man can show another instance of the waste of natural resources that has taken place in this country in the past 100 years. Land has been denuded of its forests. Mineral resources have been dissipated. Our fields have become gullied. The results of wind erosion in the Dust Bowl will never be forgotten by us. This must stop. It is of benefit to all the people of this great Nation that remedial steps be taken now.

We talk of crop surpluses. Is not that the time when we should retire some of our soil from the strain of unwise production and by carrying out good soil-conservation practices restore it to a state of greater fertility? Every dollar spent in building up our soil adds to the future national income.

This program is one of cooperative effort. Every farmer who complies with

the program pays out his own money and contributes the labor necessary to put sound conservation practices into effect. In return his Government repays him a portion of the cost incurred by him. That is the democratic way of doing what is required. No farmer is forced to engage in this program. If he does, he is reimbursed for a portion of the costs. What are the alternatives? We cannot continue to ruin our soil. All intelligent people agree with that. If the farmer does not voluntarily participate in this worthwhile effort, might it not then be possible that the people of this country will demand the putting into effect of mandatory controls over the care a farmer has for his fields? That certainly would be statism in a disliked form. Nations of Europe would not condone farmers ruining their fields as we do. Farmers would not be allowed to farm that way. Some would end up in the salt mines of Siberia. Some nations show a contempt for democracies saying that we cannot put into effect things necessary for the public welfare. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CHRISTOPHER], who preceded me, gave us the answers. We are doing it in a cooperative way and we are doing it successfully. Farmer community and county committeemen are elected by their neighbors. Then, under the direction of the Department of Agriculture, they, the committeemen, talk soil conservation with their neighbors. They put into effect the necessary practices. They decide what needs to be done on the farm and proceed to do it. They see that the practices agreed on are carried out before payments are made by the Government. Is there anything more democratic than that?

The place to stop erosion and waste of fertile land is on the fields. We have through AAA and now PMA made remarkable strides in spite of a war which placed a terrific strain on our frams. We are succeeding; the records prove that. These records are available to every Congressman. Those of you who can, should visit the countuy PMA offices. You ought to spend some time with a few committemen and have them take you out and show you the work that is being done. They are proud of it and I am proud of them and what they have done. The farmer committeemen are outstanding men in their communities. They are doing a good job, and they will do a better one if we give them the funds to work with. The solution of the problem rests with us. They have proven their ability. We can do no less than to assure them the necessary funds to do their work.

Remember we spend millions for silt control. Let us put into effect soil conservation practices that will cut down the necessity for spending so much for this purpose. I repeat PMA farmer committeemen have the know-how and the proven ability to accomplish the task.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, there is no better friend of agriculture in the Congress than the gentleman from Missouri who has just addressed you. In my own period of service in the Congress I expect I have spent greater time and effort trying to provide and take care of the soil-conservation program than on anything else. I remember several years ago when this program was cut to $150,000,000. Then it was that those of us who had been trying to carry the fight for the soil-conservation program concluded that it was best to have a consistent program rather than an up-one-year-and-down-another sort of program if you were going to reap the most benefits. And in that connection the gentleman from Minnesota, myself, and others on this subcommittee decided that we would stand shoulder to shoulder for $285,000,000, believing that by so doing we would have a better program of soil conservation than to have it up one year and down another. I call the attention of the membership to that, for I believe it is a sound principle.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman has stated the facts. We are working for a consistent and sustained soil-conservation program.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. I wish to verify everything our chairman has said regarding the fight for soil conservation in the committee.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. PACE. But does not the gentleman agree that under the control program, with thirty or forty million acres of land being taken out of production next year and the years to follow, that this makes more necessary a greater expenditure for soil conservation than we made in the last 2 years?

Mr. WHITTEN. That is probably true. In this connection we have outlined the committee's conservation program recognizing that such a thing would probably occur.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CHRISTOPHER) there were—ayes 35, noes 72.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. COOPER). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CARNAHAN].

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CARNAHAN: On page 194, line 4, strike out "$83,500,000" and insert "$85,000,000."

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment deals with the school-lunch program and will raise the appropriation from $83,500,000 to $85,000,000. I offer it in an attempt to be of some help to the schools in their effort to provide adequate lunches for our school children.

The appropriation carried in this bill is the same as was appropriated last year; however, each year there are many new schools entering the program and, of course, the contribution per child then must necessarily go down each year from what it was the year before.

I regret that I do not have more time to argue the amendment but I do wish to invite your attention to this very worthy program. It should be extended and I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CARNAHAN].

Mr. Chairman, it is mighty hard to talk against an increased school-lunch program. The only basis on which you can do so is the present financial condition of the Federal Treasury. We do have in addition to the $83,500,000 appearing in this bill approximately $30,000,000 of commodities made available under section 32 purchases from the Commodity Credit Corporation. The sky is the limit as to what many people would like to do for this program and we have to fit the pattern to the cloth. For this reason I believe it is better for us to stand by the figures that we have in this bill. Increases have been badly needed for many years but I believe that the States and local municipalities are in just as sound financial condition to take care of these increases as is the Federal Government which has a debt of $257,000,000,000 at the present time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CARNAHAN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CARNAHAN) there were—ayes 37, noes 76.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments to this chapter of the pending bill? [After a pause.] If not, general debate is now in order to chapter VII.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Federal Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA AND HAWAII

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, in a short time, certain momentous events of vital interest to all Americans will take place. I refer to the impending statehood for Alaska and Hawaii. The manifest destiny, which pushed our borders logically westward to the Pacific, has now

moved us closer to Asia. To the Americans who have pioneered in Alaska and Hawaii, and to the peoples of those Territories, we are about to offer full and equal citizenship, with all the duties and responsibilities as well as privileges of our present 48 States.

The House has already acted to include Alaska and Hawaii in the roster of American States and expected action by the Senate will bring the total of States to 50.

One of the problems occasioned by the inclusion of these two fine Territories as States deals with our flag. Our flag, which is a symbol of democracy and peace to peoples most everywhere, must undergo a change when Alaska and Hawaii become States.

In fact, I should like to point out that our flag has undergone a change every time a new State has joined the Union. We who are of the present generation think of the flag as a permanent display of 48 white stars on a blue union with 13 alternate red and white stripes. Yes, this was the flag hoisted so proudly over that barren hill at Iwo Jima. This was the flag carried by our brave troops in World War I.

But the flag viewed by Francis Scott Key at Fort McHenry, when he wrote his immortal words, "gave proof through the night that our flag was still there," had 15 stars and 15 stripes. The flag at George Washington's inauguration in New York in the spring of 1789 had 13 stars and stripes. The standard carried by Union troops into Richmond during the Civil War had 36 stars. And the flag we carried in the Spanish-American War of 1898 had 45 stars.

Today, when we give thought to the impending statehood for Alaska and Hawaii, we must also give thought to our flag. We are the only major nation whose flag changes every time an integral addition is made to its total authority. We are one of the few nations on this earth which does not have an official custodian of the flag.

Nowhere in our Constitution or in our body of statutory law is detailed provision made for changing our flag—as we have had to do so many times in our history. All we have to go by is the vague law of April 4, 1818, which said merely that when a new State comes into the Union, an additional star must be added to the flag the following Fourth of July.

Nowhere is provision made for determining who should alter the flag or how it should be done. The result has been a chaotic state of affairs. Shortly before the Civil War, an observer in New York harbor counted varous totals of stars on the harbor and ship flags. In addition, he noted 9 different arrangements of the stars.

The present arrangement of the stars we owe to an executive order by President Howard Taft in 1912, when Arizona and New Mexico joined the Union. If we accept this as a precedent we can expect another executive order by the President when Alaska and Hawaii enter the Union.

However, I do not believe that this is the most satisfactory method to solve the problem of our ever-changing flag. I believe the time has come for Congress to determine once and for all who should alter the flag and how it should be done. This is clearly a job for Congress and not for the President.

For this reason, I have introduced today a resolution which would establish a five-man committee to inquire into the entire problem of our flag. This committee will hold hearings to which all interested Americans will be invited to state their views on the coming flag. We will also want the advice of heraldists, both professional and amateurs, who have made flags their vocation and avocation. And at the conclusion of such hearings and investigations, the committee would make its recommendations to the House.

It is with deep nostalgia that most Americans will say farewell to the flag of 48 stars. For this has been the flag which they have known through wars, depressions, peace and prosperity. Let us pray that our next flag will fly over a world at peace; a world with a high standard of living; a world with an understanding and a compassion of man for man.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. HARRIS (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to address the House today for 10 minutes following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House today for 10 minutes following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

CORRECTION OF THE RECORD

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD of April 26 at page 5862 be corrected. Where it says "I had to assure the responsibility" should read "I had to assume the responsibility."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the Appendix of the RECORD the remarks that I made yesterday afternoon which, through some inadvertence, did not get into the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

NATURAL GAS

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, to say that I was sorely disappointed by the action of the President in vetoing H. R. 1758, as amended by the Kerr amendment to the Natural Gas Act, is putting it very mildly indeed.

The consumers of this country who are pleading and begging for natural gas in their homes have been sold down the river.

The consumers of this country who have been hoping they could have natural gas as a fuel in their homes have by the most malicious and willful propaganda had the wool pulled over their eyes.

It is a strange and sad commentary that certain interests, including some business interests, selfish interests, would join in vilification and baseless untruth at the expense of the consumer and the destruction of a basic and fundamental principle known only in America.

In my opinion time will reveal that the action of the President on this fundamental issue was a grave mistake.

Through the most willful and vile propaganda campaign, the people of this country who are so anxious for this fuel believe they will not get more gas at less cost.

The American people, Mr. Speaker, will in due time be brought to a stark realization that these interests have, through such false propaganda, in fact, preyed on them as a wolf in sheep's clothing.

Truth will be brought to light and when the consumers find that they will get less and less gas for fuel in their homes at higher cost, there will assuredly be some very red faces.

I wonder if there are those so naive as not to remember what happened in the OPA days of 1946. Ah, Mr. Speaker, how we remember those who came to the well of this House, who issued statements and how the press throughout the country, yea, the column writers, changed their attitude overnight publicly proclaiming that such unwarranted controls be abandoned. I remind my party, Mr. Speaker, what happened in that cold November.

Let me remind you that in the Eightieth Congress, when the so-called Rizley bill was before the Congress, no such baseless and false propaganda campaign was undertaken and that bill, as every Member here knows, would have gone so far as to destroy certain provisions of the Natural Gas Act and the intention of the Congress when that act was passed.

The veto message mentioned monopoly because of the relatively few companies owning the gas reserves.

Obviously, the President is grossly misinformed when there are thousands of people throughout this Nation, who have explored, discovered, and own the reserves, even those with the Leland Olds' philosophy admit that a large percentage of the gas reserves is owned by more than 70 companies.

Yet, the big natural-gas companies where the monopoly really prevails are limited to a very, very few. In this challege to a great industry in this country, I charge, Mr. Speaker, that some of these selfish interests gigantic interstate natural-gas companies entered into a conspiracy in helping to bring about this unfortunate action.

Even one company appeared before the committee in opposition and another

rior. Generally speaking, the officers and employees of these different branches and departments are interested in their work, but a few of the top officials do very little other than to run all over the country making political speeches on the taxpayers' time. You will notice in going through the report that the chairman has seen fit to criticize, and I think justly so. I hope there will be some improvements made.

The Bureau of Land Management is a very important branch of the Department of the Interior.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. How many employees are there in the Department of the Interior?

Mr. JENSEN. Around 60,000, as I remember.

Mr. STEFAN. Did you go into the question with the security officer whether or not the employees have been checked for loyalty?

Mr. JENSEN. We did that 2 years ago, but very little has been done about it this year or last year. We were rushed every minute. We were on a strict schedule. Our chairman was ordered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] to follow that schedule, and if you were not through asking questions, of course, that was just too bad.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman knows that the saboteurs captured on Long Island had a list of strategic places in the United States that they planned to bomb, and I thought perhaps you went into the question of loyalty like we do in other departments of Government.

Mr. JENSEN. I might tell the gentleman that we have got our eyes on a few of the boys in the Department. I am happy to say that a few of them chose to get out before they were investigated or brought before the bar of justice.

I want to talk about a few items in the bill. We have 180,000,000 acres of public land in America, and we spend annually the large sum of one-fifth of a cent an acre for soil and moisture conservation on that 180,000,000 acres. My friends, that is nothing less than criminal.

When the Director of Indian Affairs, Mr. Nichols, who was Director just a few short months and all at once found himself out in the cold, testified before the committee, he said he had traveled all over the world and he thought the first thing that we should do to help the Indians was to give them a good education and good health. Now, Mr. Nichols is a very able man. I think he would have done a wonderful job if he had been permitted to stay as Director of the Indian Bureau, but you see he had a mind of his own. He was honest, straightforward, and said what he thought. I asked him this question: "You say you traveled all over the world. Now, did you ever in all your travels find healthy, happy, well educated people where the soil was poor?" He said, "No, I must admit I never have."

"Well," I said, "then do you not think the first thing we have to do for the Indians, especially the Navajos and the Hopis, is to build up their soil so that they can become healthy and happy?" Then we can also bring education to those people because then they will have income from the production of farm products to carry on their educational program. He then admitted that soil conservation, the building of our soil, good land did come first, because he admitted he had never seen a happy, healthy, well-educated people where they had poor, run-down, badly eroded soil.

So here we are spending the large sum of one-fifth of 1 cent an acre on public lands for soil and moisture conservation, while we are wasting billions of dollars for other things that are not necessary, as is good soil for our own welfare and for the welfare of those who come after us.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. In reference to the soil conditions as pertaining to the land occupied by the Indians, what has been the practice in recent years in the way of the Federal Government's encouraging them to keep sheep, goats, and other livestock on these lands? Have they encouraged that as a soil-building measure, or has the sheep population gone down? Has the gentleman's committee gone into that?

Mr. JENSEN. The Grazing Service limits the number of cattle and sheep that can be grazed.

Mr. CURTIS. I understand that.

Mr. JENSEN. But we are not seeding enough; grasses build up this soil. It is going down. The soil on our public lands is being depleted every day at a rapid rate, much of it is already beyond redemption.

Mr. CURTIS. Perhaps I can make my question a little more plain. Referring only to the Indian reservations, I have heard reports that the Bureau of Indian Affairs in some instances has discouraged the Indians from owning goats and sheep and everything else that not only produce food but improve the soil.

Mr. JENSEN. That is quite a long story. There was a former Commissioner of Indian Affairs, Mr. Collier by name, who about 15 years ago decided the Indians should get rid of most of their goats and buy sheep. That was on the Navajo and Hopi Reservations. So they did. Then they did not have the milk they and their children should have. Then, along came the Grazing Service and said, "You have too many sheep, you have to sell half of them." So they made the Indians sell half of their sheep. From that day to this, and I will leave it to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ] if it is not a fact, from the day the Indians were forced to dispose of a lot of their goats the standard of living of the Indians has gone down, down, down.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. I want to compliment the gentleman not only on his remarks with reference to soil conservation on public lands but also because he has always been an outstanding and intelligent advocate of soil conservation and flood control. I have heard him before our Committee on Agriculture. I think one of the crying needs of our time is to have more attention and more money spent on the conservation of the soil. The gentleman from Iowa is certainly one of the outstanding exponents of this great program.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman. I can say as much for him. I appreciate working with him in the important job we have to do in conserving our soil.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the next Governor of the great State of Michigan, an able, honest legislator and patriot.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. It might interest the gentleman to learn that Soil Conservation District No. 1 was organized some 10 years ago in my district, at Grand Haven, Ottawa County, Mich. Ottawa County is on Lake Michigan, with the great sand dunes. They have planted 1,400,000 pine trees on the sand dunes and other lands. Today you can see the pine trees growing 4, 5, 6, and 7 feet tall on what is nothing but white sand.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman. It is surprising what can be done in a very few years in building up our soil and stopping erosion if the people are determined to do it and it costs so little compared to the profits derived. I am proud of the farmers and the people of my district, the Seventh District of Iowa, for the great job they are doing in conserving the soil. I think the record will show we have more miles of terraces and more acres of contoured land in my district than any district of the United States.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. The gentleman asked me a question with respect to the Indian livestock program. Former Indian Affairs Commissioner Collier not only reduced the number of goats but reduced the number of sheep and other stock to the extent that he set a trend which we have been unable to stop. In 1939 the Navajo Indians had 29,000 head of cattle. Today they have only 9,000. It is not because Collier reduced them to that extent, but because there is a trend which we have not been able to stop and they are in that situation because of the trend which was established.

Mr. JENSEN. That program has set the Navajo and Hopi Indians back at least 25 years.

Mr. Chairman, the thing that is very disturbing too at this very minute and which is giving the folks all over the Missouri Valley a great deal of concern is the terrible floods now raging in that valley. Even though the Missouri Valley covers one-sixth of the area of the United States the leadership saw fit to take about $10,000,000 out of this appropriation for the Missouri Valley which amounted to almost one-fifth of the amount of reduction in the entire bill while barely touching any other item in the bill for reclamation. In addition

to that the democratic leadership saw fit to reduce the flood-control items in the civil-functions bill by more than 25 percent. On August 3, 1947, the day after Congress adjourned and all we Members of Congress were safely out of town. President Truman froze 50 percent of all the flood-control funds that Congress had appropriated. What happened, floods occurred all over the country. Then he accused the Eightieth Congress of being at fault for that job. Right this minute terrible floods are raging, in North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, and Iowa. I have a clipping in my hand from the Council Bluffs (Iowa) Nonpareil which I am going to read to show you just what is happening in western Iowa, eastern Nebraska. Listen to it and then you will know just why I am so concerned:

MISSOURI CREST HIGHEST SINCE 1943—FLOODWATERS ROLL INTO LOWLANDS; SEE 22-FOOT RIVER STAGE

The highest crest of flood waters in the Missouri River since 1943 is moving down on southwestern Iowa.

Northward, it has overflowed thousands of acres of lowland, started taking toll of livestock.

A stage of 22 feet is forecast for Council Bluffs Friday. This is an increase of one-half a foot from the high forecast made last week end.

This means water above official flood marks for at least 5 days. It will be a severe test for many levees, drainage officials indicated.

The long crest of the river is apparently in the Yankton, S. Dak., area where a rise of only four-tenths of a foot was reported in the last 24 hours, the weather bureau said.

The river reached 19.2 feet here Monday. This is two-tenths of a foot over the official flood mark.

* * * * *

TWO LEVEE BREAKS

Two levee breaks were reported just north of Council Bluffs.

The Paxton levee west of Crescent broke Sunday night or Monday morning. Water was flooding the Findley Frost farm through a levee hole 100 to 150 feet wide.

A break in the Pigeon Creek levee overflowed the old Hanthorn lake bed. Waters were backing through the old Boyer River bed and over farmland of M. A. Smith.

Flood waters from the two breaks were expected to join and begin flooding land to the east.

Bottom-land farmers between Crescent and Honey Creek were moving livestock and furniture Monday morning. Levees were being built up on Honey Creek ditch and near Hoffman's saw mill, west of Honey Creek.

Just north of Council Bluffs, the river was flowing over the road near the Tyson farm, said Peace Justice Frank Larsen. It was covering adjoining wheat fields. This land is outside of the levee area.

Army engineers reported two additional breaks near the Blair bridge. About 320 acres were overflowed by a break in the Mencke levee on the Nebraska side, 2 miles above the bridge. Still another 320-acre area was inundated by a break in the Rand levee on the Iowa side just below the bridge.

BLENCOE THREATENED

Blencoe was threatened with floodwaters in its city streets Monday. Mayor Wayne Gotschall said the water had swept around the upper ends of the levee there and was within half a mile of the city limits. He plans to ask Gov. William Beardsley for National Guard "shovel battalions" if the situation becomes worse.

West of Whiting, the Sedig dike along the Missouri River broke and water rushed over 1,600 acres of land. Back waters coming through the Adams and Gard Lakes backed across Highway 366 at Onawa.

PMA officials were attempting to release all sealed corn in the flood's path and around Blencoe shellers were delivering free corn which is not under seal.

Farm facilities evacuated themselves and their livestock in the area southwest of Blencoe around Pickle City. Army engineers are advising all farmers west of Highway 75 from Blencoe to the Harrison County line to be prepared to move before Wednesday.

The Sioux City Board Club's Elmwood golf course, across the river in South Dakota, was "pretty well covered," an official reported.

Seventy-five volunteers, headed by Marion Lockwood, chairman of the Dakota County flood-control committee, patrolled the 4-mile dike protecting South Sioux City.

The volunteers, many of whom, Lockwood said, have not "closed their eyes in three nights," dumped 1,000 sandbags along the river Sunday night, working under the powerful lights of a portable electric plant.

Nearly 5,000 acres of farm land were reported flooded in Dakota County, Nebr., across the river from Sioux City. About 10 families have evacuated the area and others are preparing to move.

A crest of 18 feet is expected at Sioux City Tuesday morning.

* * * * *

After a high of 90° Sunday, highs in the low 50's were predicted for Tuesday, which will be partly cloudy, windy and cool.

Monday was a gray day, mostly cloudy with light showers and mercury reading in the mid 50's. Northwesterly winds blew between 25 and 35 miles an hour here.

Some hail and a half inch of rain were unofficially reported Monday morning at Hamburg.

We tried to get a valley-wide soil conservation and flood prevention adopted in the last session of the Eightieth Congress. That Congress authorized a survey to be made of the Missouri Valley in its entirety to determine what we could do to prevent floods and to build up our soil. But the head office of the Department of Agriculture saw fit to carry on a greater research program which would cost $3,500,000,000 over a period of 30 years instead of the $1,000,000,000 program which we authorized. To this very day we have not been able even to get a bill before a committee of Congress to consider either report. That report which was submitted by the Soil Conservation and Forest Services was to cover the whole Missouri Valley and would have done a grand job. Had it been put in operation last year it would have lowered the flood crest considerably. So what have we been getting? We have been getting a good run-around and a good smack in the face—we folks who need flood control so badly in the Missouri Valley. I refer you to my speech of April 5, page 4822 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

My people are getting pretty sick and tired of it, and all the folks in the Missouri Valley area see the handwriting on the wall and know the purpose behind the whole thing. The whole purpose is to force, by hook or crook, a Missouri Valley Authority on the people of that great Missouri Valley, so that a few boys appointed by the President can run the people of that valley to suit themselves. Most of the people in the Missouri Valley can see through this Socialist trick and will fight it to the last ditch.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has again expired.

Mr. JENSEN. I yield myself one additional minute, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I am grateful for the gentleman's interest in the Missouri Valley. He has done a lot of work on it. I want to point out that the work of the Bureau of Reclamation in the Missouri Valley is also flood control.

Mr. JENSEN. That is right.

Mr. CURTIS. It is in that area where the arid and semiarid lands meet, and the same structure is both flood control and irrigation, and there is flood control in this chapter. I also want to commend the gentleman's fine work in soil conservation, because the more conservation we have of our soil the more service we will get out of these dams that the Government is building, and the longer they will last.

Mr. JENSEN. Soil conservation is also flood prevention.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to my friend who is having plenty of flood worries just as myself right now.

Mr. LEMKE. I want to suggest that about one-quarter of my State has been under water all the way from 2 to 10 feet, and more, and that a great deal of feed and seed has been destroyed. Also roads and bridges, and therefore we will need an appropriation, because these people cannot take care of it now. It has been a real disaster, and I hope that some of the millions taken out of this bill may be put back somewhere so as to help out in this disaster.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] has again expired.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] may be granted permission to revise and extend his remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, at the outset I would like to pay my tribute to the distinguished chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], who has done an outstanding job as chairman of this committee. He has taken a real interest in the development of our great natural resources. I wish to say the same about my colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL], as well as my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, the distinguished ranking minority member, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Dr. FENTON.

It also should be pointed out that our clerk, Claude Hobbs, has been of invaluable assistance in providing the kind of

Mr. ANGELL. I compliment the gentleman for the excellent presentation he is making and also commend him for the work he has done while he has been a Member of the Congress to preserve the great natural resources of the Northwest from which section of the country both of us come. Is it not a fact that in the Bonneville project which the gentleman has mentioned in his discussion the pay-out schedule is some 10 years ahead of schedule? That is, that they are paying back the funds to the Federal Government 10 years faster thus far under the repayment schedule for amortization than was originally decided upon and that eventually every dollar with interest which the Federal Government has invested in that great project will have been repaid?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. It is my understanding that the power feature of the Bonneville investment will be paid back with interest and that they are ahead on their pay-out schedule. Just how many years I do not know.

Mr. ANGELL. My understanding is that it is some 10 years.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of California. I congratulate the gentleman on his fine statement as well as the other members of the committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] and others who have spoken. I would like to pose this question for the gentleman. Can we afford to remain static in this program or must we continually and progressively go forward? I have in mind the fact that some of the funds for surveys and investigations are curtailed somewhat in this bill whereas I also know the plans that we made for the great Central Valley which we felt were adequate some years ago now have proven to be inadequate due to the great increases in population in the West. I wonder what the gentleman thinks on that score.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. We have tried to strike a balance as the chairman of our committee pointed out. We really should be spending $2,000,000 on the resources of America in this bill. But unfortunately considerations with which we are all familiar make it impossible. We have, however, I believe, gone forward on the assumption that the very basis of our economy is an expanding one and that we cannot stand still if we hope to survive. That is what we are trying to do.

(Mr. ASPINALL (at the request of Mr. JACKSON of Washington) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I think that it is admitted by all of us that an effective approach to a sound and efficient management program in Government is one of the major accomplishments of this administration. In making this statement I do not wish to minimize any of the accomplishments that have been made heretofore. Neither do I desire to leave the impression that it is my thought that there is no further need in such respect. However, the fact remains that more has been done in this particular recently, than in a long, long time.

The President's budget took into full account the need for economy while at the same time recognizing the dangers of cutting too deeply into Federal expenditures necessary for continued development of our country.

In a day when the people of the Nation are deeply concerned over the financial situation in our Government, and are demanding economies whenever and wherever it is possible to bring them about, there is a likelihood that Congress and its committees may unintentionally promote a program which is penny-wise and pound-foolish. I am deeply concerned regarding some of the cuts that have been made by the Committee on Appropriations wherein such cuts appear to have resulted in amounts far below those prepared by the budget. In my opinion there are many specific items which should be reconsidered and restudied. Some of these are to be found among the proposed appropriations for the Bureau of Land Management for the Department of the Interior. One is an item of $1,651,530 for the grazing administration; and another is an amount of $844,220 for land classification. Still others have to do with appropriations necessary to carry forward the entire Bureau program of disposal and management of the public domain.

It is not my intention at this time to offer any amendments to the bill before us. However, I do wish to call to the attention of the members of this committee that by following the proposals as now set forth in the bill, we are more than likely precipitating a program which in the end will cost our Government more money and will permit of less efficiency in this particular agency of Government.

My own State of Colorado contains 25,000,000 acres of public-domain lands that through careful management and selective disposal can reap large revenues for the State and Federal Governments. We are especially aware in Colorado of the importance of safeguarding the watershed areas of public-domain lands. Our irrigated farmlands will suffer seriously if lack of management on watershed areas fills irrigation reservoirs with silt. We have spent millions of dollars for soil-conservation work, construction of dams, and flood-control work. However, many of the benefits of this work are lost if we do not furnish sufficient money to manage properly the vast areas of public-domain land that are an important segment of the watersheds in the West.

I mention also the item of land classification for this is closely connected with any of the management programs of the Bureau. There are millions of acres of public-domain lands that have not been classified for use. What are they good for? We don't know. The Government cannot manage them until they know what treatment is required or to what use they should be put. Money for land classification should be restored in full to this appropriation. Without money to classify them, these public lands cannot be turned into productive acres for the people's use.

The people are seeking opportunity to develop the public lands. This is evident in the greater number of applications received for oil and gas development. In my own State of Colorado we are especially concerned with the need for adequate help in the land office to handle the expected volume of oil-shale cases. Failure to provide sufficient land-office personnel will slow down this development. I seriously ask your reconsideration of the Bureau of Land Management appropriation.

This agency needs increased personnel to properly manage and protect the public domain and to carry increasing loads of land-use applications.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, the Bonneville project, as you know, is situated on the Columbia River and lies within my district on the Oregon side and I am deeply interested in the Bonneville Power Administration and the excellent record it has made under the direction of Administrator Paul J. Raver.

The item in this appropriation bill, H. R. 7786 for construction, operation, and maintenance for the Bonneville Power Administration appears on page 219 of the bill as follows:

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

Construction: For construction and acquisition of transmission lines, substations, and appurtenant facilities, as authorized by law, to remain available until expended, $41,500,000, of which not to exceed $17,000,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority previously granted; and, in addition, the Administrator is authorized to enter into contracts for the purposes of this appropriation in an amount not to exceed $21,750,000: *Provided*, That unexpended balances of prior year appropriations, including unused balances of related contract authorizations, for the foregoing purposes shall be transferred to and merged with this appropriation.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance of the Bonneville transmission system and of marketing electric power and energy, $5,000,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations of the Bonneville Power Administration shall be available to carry out all the duties imposed upon the Administrator pursuant to law, including personal services in the District of Columbia; purchase (not to exceed 17 of which 12 shall be for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; purchase (not to exceed 2) of aircraft; and printing and binding. Appropriations made herein to the Bonneville Power Administration shall be available in one fund, except that the appropriation herein made for operation and maintenance shall be available only for the service of the current fiscal year.

In the committee report, page 162, this appropriation is discussed, as follows:

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

Construction: The 1950 appropriation for construction by Bonneville Power Administration amounted to $26,284,500 and $16,239,500 of contractual authority. The 1951 estimate is $42,000,000, of which $17,000,000 is for liquidation of previously authorized contractual obligations, and additional contractual authority of $21,750,000. The committee recommends approval of a direct appropriation of $41,500,000 and contractual authority in the amount of $21,750,000. This

would provide a net increase of approximately $14,000,000 in obligational authority for the fiscal year 1951. This increase is to continue the transmission construction program already approved and to provide additional transmission facilities needed to market power from new generating facilities presently under construction and approaching completion in the near future.

Operation and maintenance: The 1950 appropriation for operation, maintenance, power marketing, and general administrative expenses was $4,000,000. The 1951 estimate for these activities is $5,250,000. The committee recommends an appropriation of $5,000,000. The requested increase of $571,975 for maintenance of transmission system and $295,150 for operation of transmission system is approved, owing to the fact that the Administration will be operating a larger system in 1951. Also, there are certain items of deferred maintenance which need to be corrected. The reduction of $250,000 in the 1951 estimate should be applied against the total increase requested for power marketing and general administrative activities, since the estimates for the latter do not appear to be adequately justified.

Mr. Chairman, the hydroelectric-power projects on the Columbia River under the operation of the Bonneville Power Administration have proven themselves to be excellent investments for the United States Government. They are self-sustaining and are returning revenues to the Federal Government sufficient to repay all costs, together with interest, maintenance, and expenses.

As regards the financial side of the picture, Bonneville has continued to show an excellent record of financial pay-out of all power facilities in accordance with law. Not only have they met pay-out requirements, but they have exceeded these requirements. For instance, at the moment Bonneville Dam financial requirements are 10 years ahead of schedule, reducing the pay-out period, if further payments are made on schedule, from 50 years to 40 years. Pay-out requirements of Grand Coulee Dam and of the Bonneville transmission system have likewise been exceeded by substantial percentages. During the fiscal year 1949 the total operating revenue of the Bonneville Power Administration was $27,821,029, representing an increase over 1948 of 13.5 percent. Surplus net revenues for the same year, after deduction of all expenses of operation and maintenance, provision for depreciation, interest, and other deductions, was $10,665,769. Total gross operating revenues from the beginning of operations to June 30, 1949, were $157,687,195, and, after all required expenses have been met, this has left a surplus net revenue of $42,735,094. This is a clear demonstration that all moneys expended in the Pacific Northwest for power facilities represent only a loan that will be paid back with interest. It also represents an increase in wealth of the whole Nation, and, as such, the Federal Government will be repaid many times over its investments in my area.

I would like to say a word about some of the things that have been done by Bonneville in order to insure efficient operation and a financial picture such as I have described at power rates that are the lowest in the country. Many things have been done to achieve this goal, and one of these is advances in engineering developments that have resulted in decreases in construction costs, as well as operation and maintenance costs. For instance, by keeping constantly abreast of engineering developments and by moving into fields previously unexplored, it has been determined that insulation requirements of certain electrical equipment could be reduced, resulting in net over-all savings. In 1940, the average costs of large transformers were $7.25 per kilowatt of installed capacity. In 1949 these same costs were $3.81 per kilovolt-ampere of installed capacity. This, despite the fact that over-all costs of equipment nearly doubled over that period. The costs of steel towers have been reduced by the use of a tower design made by Bonneville engineers and which upon test proved to be entirely satisfactory for high-voltage transmission lines. These are only examples of many such things that have been done in order to insure that the Federal Government gets the utmost in value for every dollar invested.

Yes, the people entrusted with this job in my area have done an excellent job of using the facilities that were given them. We need additional facilities, and it is my hope that the power resources will be provided us as now scheduled, to prevent deterioration of our economic prospects by virtue of a lack of the most essential ingredient—power.

Mr. Chairman, I represent in the House the Third Congressional District in which the Bonneville Dam project is situated. My parents, as ox-team pioneers, tra-My parents, as ox-team pioneers, traversed that great northwestern country almost within the sound of the Columbia River and having spent my life in the Pacific Northwest, I have developed a deep and abiding interest in the abundant natural resources of that area. During my service here I have deemed it a privilege and an honor to devote much of my time to the conservation, development and full utilization of these great natural resources in the Columbia River basin which are the key to the economic welfare of that great region.

During my service I have seen the Bonneville and Grand Coulee projects through the development stage. Bonneville, as you know, is completed and the Grand Coulee Dam is near completion. We have in addition now under construction the McNary Dam on the Columbia and in the early stages the Chief Joseph Dam on the same river. The Columbia River and its tributaries has the greatest potential storehouse of electric power of any waterway in the Nation, some 20,000 kilowatts, of which less than 10 percent having been developed. The remainder of this great source of energy and power is flowing to the sea without let or hindrance with a resulting loss of untold millions of revenues which could come into the coffers of the United States.

The Bonneville plant during the war turned out 570,000 continuous kilowatts, which is equivalent to 8,800,000 barrels of oil. The 15-unit completed Grand Coulee plant is equivalent to 28,000,000 barrels annually. When McNary Dam is completed the oil saving will be about 15,500,000 barrels annually. The existing usable steam generation in the Pacific Northwest is about 275,000 kilowatts and when this capacity is running to meet low-water conditions, 5,000,000 barrels will be consumed. If this displacement energy were developed, the oil saving would be, in round numbers, 290,000,000 barrels annually, or about 95 percent of the total European consumption, or a quarter of our own prewar consumption. I cite these facts to show the importance of undeveloped hydro power in our future economy.

Unfortunately, we have no large deposits of coal or of oil in the Pacific Northwest, but the enormous pool of hydroelectric power stored in the Columbia and other rivers compensates for this loss. The McNary Dam project alone will provide the necessary energy for industries which have aggregated a total investment of $100,000,000 and supply employment to 100,000 residents of the Northwest. It is estimated that benefits to navigation from this great dam will reach a million dollars a year and it will reduce pumping costs for lands adjacent to the pool approximately $300,000 a year. The power alone generated at this huge project will return to the Government $17,500,000 a year to produce which which 3,000,000 tons of coal or 11,000,000 barrels of oil would be required. It is significant to recall that hydroelectric power is not expendable like oil, gas, or coal, and that as long as the sun shines and water falls this great source of energy will work round the clock in the interests of the great industries of the Pacific Northwest.

I am proud to say that I have been a vigorous advocate of the development of these great resources of the Northwest not alone because they spell prosperity for the area but because they are wise investments for the Nation as a whole. The power developments are returning every dollar invested together with interest and maintenance and other costs properly allocated to the projects. This Nation in the exercise of wisdom, instead of curtailing the development of these great revenue-producing projects, should make available the necessary funds for full development as rapidly as the demand for electric energy requires.

On a number of occasions in the past I have addressed the House on the matter of the power-supply situation in the Pacific Northwest. These reports were given in support of appropriations to be made for hydroelectric generating plants and for transmission facilities critically needed if that region were to make reasonable approach to a solution of this very serious problem. My purpose now is to give a further report as regards this situation at the present time.

Before proceeding further, I must acknowledge the work of the many Members of the House and commend them for what they have done toward the solution of the power-shortage problem in the Pacific Northwest. I wish to thank those Members very sincerely for what they have done in this regard.

For the past 2 years this region has been increasingly short of power. A few months ago I would have said that the last winter had been the most crucial period to date. I must now say that so far, this winter has been the most crucial to date. The situations are very similar in that there has been inadequate capacity to carry the maximum loads and, although over-all water supplies turned out to be better than minimum, there has still been insufficient power available to carry the loads that have developed. This has been very detrimental to the region not only by reason of the necessity for voluntary load curtailment but also by reason of the fact that certain new industries which desired to commence operations could not do so because the required power is not available. By mutual agreement among the power operators, no new loads above 500 kilowatts are being accepted in the Pacific Northwest because there is not power available to serve them. Many existing businesses and industrial plants have had to rearrange their operations to reduce power consumption during peak hours and, in some cases, it was actually necessary to cut back production to conserve power.

This last requirement has been very definitely true this winter with regard to the aluminum industry. For a period of about 6 weeks, between October and December, so-called interruptible power supplies to the aluminum plants were cut off because of the threat that occurred at that time that a low-water period was in the offing. Fortunately, early in December the water situation improved, and these supplies of power were restored. It should be pointed out, however, that curtailment of aluminum operations by virtue of this interrupted power supply was responsible for increased unemployment, but for that matter the whole power situation tends in that direction, because curtailment in any degree must necessarily be reflected in employment figures.

This restoration of interruptible power to the aluminum industry, made early in December, was not the complete picture, however. This winter has been most severe throughout the Pacific Northwest area, and this has resulted in peak loads beyond those estimated. During January it became necessary to cut off interruptible power deliveries during the evening peak loads for a good part of the month, and sometimes it was necessary during the morning peak loads. On January 31 it was necessary to cut off interruptible power for most of the day. The highest peak load on the Bonneville Power Administration's system occurred on January 4 and was 2,106,000 kilowatts. The peak load for the previous year occurred on January 4 and amounted to 1,698,000 kilowatts. It is significant that in January 1950 at the highest peak period, the Bonneville Power Administration was delivering 408,000 kilowatts more than in the corresponding period for the previous year, whereas only 324,000 kilowatts of generating capacity were added during the year. This has been possible by the simple expedient of overloading the machinery as far as it was reasonably possible to do so, but operating conditions were certainly not of the best. In 1949, during the high-peak period, frequency sagged to 59 cycles. In 1950 frequency sag was 59.4 cycles at this peak period. I should further point out that a decrease in frequency occurred a number of times over the peak periods in January 1950. What this means is simply that the load was greater than the ability of the generators to supply it, causing them to slow down, and this further results in unsatisfactory operating conditions throughout the area. May I again emphasize that this was the result of the load on the system at that time. It does not take into account the load that could have been served had there been facilities for generating and transmitting the power. I should further point out that during these heavy-load periods, every available resource in my region, either steam or hydro, was operating at its utmost capacity, leaving absolutely no reserve. This is not only an intolerable operating situation but is an exceedingly dangerous one. It leaves nothing to take care of load fluctuations that constantly occur and, if trouble developed with any of the generating equipment in the area, it is difficult to predict what the result would be, except that whatever it was it would not be good.

As I indicated previously, three new generators were installed at the Grand Coulee plant during 1949, and it is planned to install three additional units in 1950. It is further planned to install the last three units in this plant during 1951, but even with these additional installations the power-shortage situation will still prevail. A dependable power supply will become available only if construction of hydroelectric projects is maintained in accordance with the so-called schedule S that has been worked out between the Bonneville Power Administration, the Corps of Engineers, and the Bureau of Reclamation. Even assuming the most rapid construction of new plants physically possible under normal procedures, the region's total requirements for power cannot be met in full on a dependable basis until the winter period of 1957–58. Until that time, cumulative load growth will exceed additions to firm generating capacity. In the interim period, if poor water conditions should occur, it will make it impossible to serve the potential loads in the area. I might further point out that in calculating potential capacity to serve expected loads, there is included imports from Canada, as well as all of the available steam capacity in the region. If construction proceeds on schedule, it is expected that by the 1957–58 period there will be available capacity to serve all potential loads, with a small margin of reserve. This is the forecast at this time of people who are experts in these matters, and represents their conservative judgment as of now. However, it is entirely possible that the shortage period may extend beyond that on the basis of later forecasts, because the present expectations do now extend this shortage period beyond that forecast several years ago.

There are a number of projects now under construction that will come into operation within the next few years. The Hungry Horse project is scheduled to go into operation in December of 1952. McNary Dam and Detroit Dam will come into operation in 1953, and, as I mentioned previously, additional generation will be installed to complete the Grand Coulee powerhouse. These facilities will add 1,200,000 kilowatts of new capacity to the area by 1953, which to many must seem to be a tremendous amount of power to take care of all foreseeable needs. This is not the case, however. This new generation will be absorbed as rapidly as it comes into operation, and will still leave a situation much the same as we are facing now due to the rapid increase in loads that has taken place and will take place between now and that time. Appropriations have been requested by the Corps of Engineers this year to start construction of Chief Joseph Dam that is scheduled to come into operation in 1956, with final installations being made in 1961, and this project will add another million kilowatts to available supplies by 1961. It is imperative that construction of this project be maintained on schedule, along with others included in schedule S.

The growth in power requirements are the result of an extremely rapid growth in population, coupled with expansion and electrification of farms, businesses, and industries in the area. In population growth, the Pacific Northwest has far outstripped the United States as a whole. In the period between 1940 and 1949, which is the major development period of the Bonneville Power Administration, the population of my State of Oregon has increased 59.3 percent. The population of our neighbor State of Washington has increased 48.7 percent. The Pacific Northwest average increase in population is 44 percent, compared with the United States average of 13 percent. We confidently expect a continued upward swing in population, and it is predicted that the increase for the next 10 years will equal that of the last 10 in number of people. Population increase, however, is only a part of the reason for growth in the region's nonindustrial power requirements. More electricity than ever before is being used by all classes of customers. Farms and businesses are rapidly finding new uses for power, and home consumption is steadily increasing.

Increases in industrial uses of power have likewise been rapid. The number of Northwest production workers has increased over 50 percent between 1939 and 1947, and value added by manufacture in the region increased from $454,000,000 in 1939 to $1,655,000,000 in 1947. It is expected that this trend will continue and that industrial use will more than double within the next 10 years, assuming that generating capacity is added as scheduled.

Along with the need for more generating capacity, an equivalent increase in transmission capacity will also be needed.

The Bonneville Power Administration has included in their 1951 budget, requests for authorization of nine additional circuits that will be needed to transmit the additional 1,200,000 kilowatts of power that will come into operation between now and 1953. As new capacity is added, additional transmission lines will be needed. The major part, in fact approximately 80 percent of Bonneville's 1951 requests, are for major grid lines that are needed to carry the power to load centers to integrate projects and to relieve presently overloaded facilities.

The situation as regards generating capacity is closely paralleled by that of transmission capacity. There is no reserve at all. This is demonstrated by the fact that during the past year, five major power interruptions were experienced in the area, during which all major components of the Northwest Power Pool separated. The immediate cause of these were such things as lightning striking a transmission line, but their seriousness is a direct result of a badly overloaded transmission system that is constantly on the brink of instability. In one such instance, two lines that were originally designed to carry approximately 110,000 kilowatts, each were carrying 300,000 kilowatts when lightning struck one of the lines. The net result was a complete pool break-up because, when such overloaded line was interrupted by reason of the lightning stroke, this load was thrown on other lines already overloaded and they in turn were interrupted by automatic devices necessary for line protection. It is extremely important that these necessary transmission lines be provided in order to spare my region these costly service interruptions.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely trust that these appropriations in this bill for construction, maintenance, and operation of the Bonneville Power Administration will not be disturbed. In fact, if any changes should be made in the allocation it should be by increasing the amounts rather than decreasing them. These projects are among the few operations of the Federal Government that are carried on with a profit to the Government and which pay their own way. As I have pointed out approximately 50 percent of the potential hydroelectric power in the United States is locked up in the Columbia River and its tributaries and only about 10 percent of this great pool of energy is now developed and put to useful purposes. The program for additional construction of hydroelectric projects should be carried on at an increasing speed in order to make available hydroelectric energy so vital to the economy of this great region in the Pacific Northwest and to fill the industrial, agricultural and domestic needs which are not being met by the generating capacity now available. This accelerated program can be carried out by the Federal Government without loss on a pay-as-you-go basis with full reimbursement to the Federal Government.

I want to thank my colleagues for their support of my efforts in the past to secure the needed appropriations for carrying forward this program of resources development in the Columbia River area.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, about 3 weeks ago I spoke at some length on this particular chapter of the appropriation bill. I am not going to take up very much time today. Rather, I would yield my time to some of the Members who have not had an opportunity to speak on the bill.

However, I do want to make a few observations.

I listened to my very dear and charming chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], and while I can agree substantially with most of his remarks, I must confess that I do not think the great United States is such a bad place to live in.

I enjoyed the remarks of my colleague the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], as I did the remarks of my colleague the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON]. While we do not agree on policy, there are a great many things on which we are in accord.

I was very much interested in the remarks of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] regarding the aluminum production. I am glad that he has an aluminum plant out there which, through cheap power, I might say, is able to take on 2,500 employees in his district. I am glad that he said the object of this great hydroelectric plant and the reclamation policy is for cheap power. Up until this time all we have heard is that they were afraid of brown-outs there, but today he has admitted on the floor that it is the cheap power they are interested in.

I have an aluminum plant in my district. It is capable of employing 3,500 men, but at the present time the anthracite region is in a very distressed condition. It is one of the topmost distressed areas in the United States. Yet that aluminum plant, which happens not to be in the good graces of the United States Government, the Aluminum Co. of America, is held down to about a thousand men, when they could readily employ 3,600. So this story has two sides to it.

I do come from the East, and I may say to my good friend the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER], that I have not for 1 minute tried to thwart the progress of the West. I believe my membership on this subcommittee has been such as to prove that I have tried to develop this great America of ours.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FENTON. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I certainly agree with what the gentleman has said. The gentleman has certainly been fair in everything he has done for the development of the West, and everything else that pertains to this subcommittee. I want to say this: that the gentleman is a physician by profession, and he has been a most valuable member of that committee in looking after the health problems of the Indians; not only the Indians but the Eskimos in Alaska. He has done wonderful work. He was also chairman of the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining of our committee during the Eightieth Congress. He traveled over 12,000 miles looking into the laboratories and mines and other problems, and he learned a great deal about them, and he has been very valuable because of that.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FENTON. I yield.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I, as a colleague of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON], want the membership to know how much we appreciate his work, and what he has done on this great committee. It has been stated that he is a doctor by profession. He comes from one of the blighted areas of America, the anthracite-coal region. Ours is a great industrial State. The district in which I live is the fourth industrial district in Pennsylvania, and the seventh in the world. We contribute nearly 12 percent to the national income. This man who stands before you modestly, quietly, yet efficiently, has done more, in our judgment, than any man we have ever had in this committee in recent years. I am glad to pay this tribute to him.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FENTON. I will have to yield to my friend from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. I hope the distinguished gentleman did not misinterpret any clumsy language I might have used. Certainly, it was my intention to pay the gentleman a very well-deserved compliment, and it was not criticism at all.

Mr. FENTON. Not at all. I certainly appreciate the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. Chairman, on April 6—3 weeks ago—I addressed the membership of the House in the general debate on this one-package bill. I outlined to you the routine and the mechanics of this one-package bill and the treatment afforded most of the members of the Appropriations Committee.

But I will not take up too much time today in the debate on the Interior Department appropriation bill. I shall gladly yield the most of my time to others who would like to talk on it. However, I would like to make a few observations which I have gathered in listening to the debate for the past few weeks.

You may recall that in my remarks on April 6, I dwelt at considerable length on the hospital situation in regards to our armed forces and the Veterans' Administration. Well, after 3 weeks or more there is still indecision as far as the Army hospitals are concerned and a defiant refusal of the VA to take over the Army hospital at Valley Forge. In the meantime, our veterans are still "hanging on the limb" waiting their turn for hospital admission.

One arm of our Government wants to get rid of hospitals. Another arm of our Government does not want to take them over and so the veteran is being kicked around. And let me say right here and now that this is not a political statement. It comes from one who, as a battalion surgeon of infantry in World War I, saw scores and scores killed in action and who treated hundreds on the field of battle. It sickens me to think that there are 2,785 veterans in Penn-

Mr. D'EWART. That is true of all who attempt to take on a concession in a park. You are not giving us an individual example. You are giving us an illustration of the thing that has developed and faces the organization in all the parks.

Mr. HUMMELL. In view of the statement of policy that we have been given in the proposed contract, I think we would all be in exactly the same position.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL].

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, as a new Member of the House and a member of the Committee on Public Lands, I should like to pay my respects to the gentleman from Montana who just preceded me. Mr. D'EWART is an untiring worker. I do not know of any member of our committee who more regularly attends committee meetings than does the gentleman from Montana. He and I quite often disagree. However, I want to say to him that he is a real statesman, a hard worker, and an excellent gentleman. He is considerate. He has a thorough analysis of every problem that comes before our committee. It is my hope that at some time I can be at least partly as good a legislator as the distinguished gentleman from Montana.

Mr. Chairman, at this point I would like to call the attention of the House to the fact that though an appropriation of $17,758,000 is recommended for the conservation and development of mineral resources, little work is being done to develop the vast peat resources of the United States.

In items for the Bureau of Mines an increase of $90,000 is provided for lignite research and an increase of $80,000 is recommended for the anthracite research laboratory. An increase of $200,000 is recommended for research and demonstration work in synthetic liquid fuels.

I think that every effort should be made to develop all of our natural resources. It is therefore necessary to undertake research in the effective utilization of peat. Legislation to authorize this work is now pending before the Committee on Public Lands where hearings have begun. I hope my bill is favorably reported to the House and that the United States will begin to seriously investigate the potential value of our 15,000,000,000 tons of peat, about half of which is found in Minnesota.

I would also like to point out that imports of peat continued to rise in 1949, totaling 94,747 short tons, an increase of about 21 percent over the 1939 prewar figures. These imports of peat for last year were valued at $3,184,409. At the same time the already limited American production decreased slightly.

From this we can see that further research and demonstration is imperative if we are to reap the benefits of this great untapped resource. I hope that next year will find an appropriation for this work, just as we are now considering funds for lignite, anthracite, and liquid fuel research. These resources are enough alike so that research could be done at the same time, thus saving taxpayers money.

(Mr. MARSHALL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS].

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to comment on the work of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the funds recommended in the bill now before us for carrying out the Bureau's functions. Those of you who do not represent areas embracing Indian reservations, or having a large Indian population, may not be familiar with those Federal activities administered through the Bureau of Indian Affairs. As compared with other bureaus of the Federal Government, the Bureau of Indian Affairs may be described as a government within a government because of its extensive and varied activities. Through these activities the Indian is afforded similar services provided his non-Indian neighbor through the many activities of other Federal agencies, either by direct assistance or through State and local governments.

Because of historical relations existing between the United States and the various Indian tribes, the Federal Government, as trustee, administers the affairs of Indians by numerous treaties and laws through the Bureau of Indian Affairs. As a result of this trusteeship, large segments of our Indian population would be denied benefits accorded non-Indian citizens were it not for the functions of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

The bill now before us recommends appropriations totaling $76,293,000 for the work of this Bureau. This represents a reduction of $9,703,375 below the budget estimates of which approximately $2,500,000 pertains to health, education, and welfare services, $1,500,000 to the development and management of resources, $4,600,000 to capital improvements, including the construction of schools, hospitals, road, and irrigation systems, and $1,000,000 for administering these programs.

The House Committee on Appropriations is to be commended for its action in approving substantial amounts for health, education, and welfare services. Except for the elimination of funds to be used in the State of California, which I am informed would result in the discharge of Indians with active tuberculosis from hospitals, close Sherman Institute, a nonreservation boarding school enrolling over-age, non-English-speaking Navajo and Papago Indians and deny Federal assistance to local school districts in the education of Indian children who live on nontaxable Indian-owned land, the House committee recommended the full amount of the budget estimate for health and education activities. While recognizing the need for these services, other than in the State of California, the committee at the same time eliminated funds from the estimates for the operation of vessels which serve hospitals and schools in Alaska by transporting supplies and materials to isolated stations in the Territory of Alaska, where commercial shipping is either not available or is too expensive.

Also eliminated from this bill are funds for an apprentice-training program proposed for the Navajo and Hopi Indians in conjunction with the Navajo-Hopi rehabilitation program authorized by recent law. This phase of the rehabilitation program is to acquaint untrained Indians with certain fundamentals in the trades and crafts before and while they are engaged on work projects. This type of education and training appears to me to be an essential factor in the success of the off-reservation resettlement program to reestablish Navajo and Hopi Indians permanently and satisfactorily at off-reservation locations where permanent employment opportunities exist. The Congress last year provided funds for placing Indians in off-reservation jobs and the Bureau of Indian Affairs has rightly recognized the need for apprentice training to insure the success of this program.

It is not difficult to visualize the situations that exist on Indian reservations where no law enforcement program is carried on or where enforcement is attempted with insufficient law enforcement officers. Reports from several sources indicate that the budget estimate for this purpose would not provide adequate protection against disorder and crime on Indian reservations. I am informed that the Bureau has been requested by the Senate Appropriations Committee to submit revised estimates for this work.

Although the items in the field of community services which I have discussed are of utmost importance to isolated segments of our Indian population, the development and management of resources in these areas are equally important to the economy and well-being of the individual and the Nation. Groups populating these areas are primarily dependent upon forest and range lands, irrigation and road systems, agricultural and industrial enterprises, and soil and moisture conservation practices for a livelihood. The development and utilization of these resource facilities cannot be ignored if a stable economy is to prevail among the people in these areas.

In addition to the reduction of $4,680,400 for the construction of buildings and utilities, road and irrigation system, the House committee denied contract authority for construction work in the amount of $6,500,000, of which $5,275,000 was for construction work proposed in connection with the Navajo-Hopi rehabilitation program and $1,000,000 for the construction of a hospital authorized by Public Law 438, Eighty-first Congress. Restoration of the contract authority should be made it seems to me in order that construction can go forward on the hospital authorized by Public Law 438 and to avoid the elimination of projects proposed in the rehabilitation program which would disrupt and delay this program twice approved by the Congress.

I am informed that the position of the Bureau of Indian Affairs is, and I quote:

1. Another serious reduction in the budget estimates is the reduction of $1,035,000 for general administrative ex-

penses. Increasing program activities, resulting in increased administrative requirements from the headquarters office level to the smallest field office, have overloaded the administrative staff to such an extent that the effectiveness of the Bureau's program activities is endangered. Of the $15,181,564 increase provided in this bill for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, only $109,831 is for administrative management purposes. This will throw the Bureau's functions so far out of balance as to make it virtually impossible to control and administer activities efficiently and economically. Operating under such adverse conditions the Bureau could not be expected to meet present budgetary, accounting, and other administrative requirements much less give attention to the modernization and improvement of work methods and procedures.

2. As compared with 1950 appropriations, adjusted to include the proposed supplemental appropriations to meet pay increases authorized by Public Law 429, and the supplemental appropriation for welfare of Indians contained in the recent Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act, the House committee allowance provided increases totaling $15,181,564. It may appear that this substantial increase would provide adequately for the Bureau's regular activities. However after providing $11,353,470 of this increase for the long-range program for the rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Indians, and $1,737,500 for the liquidation of prior year contract authorizations, a comparatively small increase of $2,090,594 is available for allocation to the many regular activities of the Bureau. An analysis of the Bureau's many functions and the far-reaching effects of its work in relation to the present and future development of isolated and backward areas of the Nation appear to fully justify the approval of the Budget estimates for the Bureau as submitted to this Congress by the President.

I hope that the membership of the House will give careful and earnest consideration to this whole matter before final determination is made on this chapter of the bill.

(Mr. MORRIS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. WERDEL].

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Chairman, I have requested this time so that I may point out what I believe to be an oversight on the part of the committee in regard to funds for Indians in California. There was deleted from the recommendations of the Bureau $2,647,871, which was all of the money that was recommended for Indian affairs in California. On the testimony of four or five Indians and an attorney, I believe from here in Washington, that money was deleted.

I have prepared amendments to reinstate those funds. However, I do not intend to offer them when the proper time arrives because of the fact that the evidence which should have been before the committee, but which was not of record during the recent hearings, could not be presented in a matter of 5 minutes, as stipulated under the 5-minute rule. I have conferred with the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] and also personally appeared and testified in behalf of the restoration of these funds before the Senate Interior Subcommittee on Appropriations. The subject is being fully covered in the Senate and I have every reason to believe that there would be no objection raised in that body to the reinstatement of these funds in the bill as recommended by the Bureau of the Budget.

I merely want to call the attention of the Committee to the fact that the deletion of the funds has totally deprived California and its contract for the education of Indians of $800,000 for the construction of a school building on the Indian reservation that has not a single acre of ground accessible for school purposes.

It deletes $322,000 for the education of 2,300 Indian children. It destroys all supervision over Indian contracts, such as logging contracts, and so forth, that total well into the millions of dollars. The supervision is needed.

Again, I am calling the attention of the Committee to these facts so that in conference it will be understood that there is something more in the Senate record than was before the House committee. The situation is very disturbing to the Department of Education of California, to all the county superintendents of schools who have Indian reservations, and to the tribes themselves and their advisers.

As set out in a pamphlet entitled "Program for Termination of Indian Bureau Activities in the State of California," which was submitted to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs in June of 1948, we have a plan for the granting of complete rights to Indians in that State. It should be done uniformly, and the supervision of these contracts should be carried out in an orderly manner.

I appreciate the intention and the desires of many of the members of the committee when they took their action, but I believe it was ill-advised because all of the facts were not before the committee.

(Mr. WERDEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a statement relative to the Bureau of Reclamation's program for the Colorado-Big Thompson project contained in the General Appropriation bill, 1951, under chapter 7, Department of Interior.

It pleases me deeply that the House Appropriations Committee saw fit to provide the full amount of the estimate for the irrigation production facilities on the Colorado-Big Thompson project. This project is essential to assure an adequate supply of supplemental water to irrigate 615,000 acres of land in the northeastern part of the State. In addition to supplying water for the lands, the project is designed to produce electrical energy for use on the project for pumping purposes and to provide more adequate supplies for rural and municipal use on both the eastern and western slopes of the Continental Divide. The project's power system is now interconnected with the Wyoming system to the north and with the Missouri Basin system in the far northeastern corner of the State. Many municipalities and rural cooperatives are receiving benefits of Federal power from this interconnected system, with the present source being power plants in Wyoming. Supplies are inadequate, and the completion of the generating and transmission facilities on the eastern slope of the project are essential to assure more adequate supplies.

I was indeed disappointed at the action taken by the House Appropriations Committee in deleting funds for the contruction of the Estes-Leyner-Plains 115-kilovolt line and the Leyner substation, and also, the elimination of the extension of the Flatiron-Brighton line eastward toward Hoyt and Brush, Colo. These lines are an essential component of the Colorado-Big Thompson project and do not represent new starts, but an extension of the existing system to provide the necessary outlet for power which will be soon available at the eastern slope power plants. The Estes-Leyner-Plains line and Leyner substation will provide an interconnection with the facilities of the Colorado Public Service Co. in order to make available to the company surplus power from the project and to permit the interchange of energy with the company in order to firm up the project's power supply during times when hydroelectric generation is not sufficient. It will also provide a secondary source of power to the Brighton-Hoyt-Brush transmission line.

The extension of the Flatiron-Brighton line from Brighton to Hoyt and Brush, Colo., in no way duplicates present facilities. It is not a new feature but an extension proposed to deliver the additional power to be generated on the eastern slope to the Hoyt and Brush area. An existing line now runs from Estes to Flatiron and eastward to Brush. The capacity of this line, however, is not adequate to carry the additional power, which will son be available, to the large rural area in the northeastern part of the State. I have been advised that the construction of the extension from Brighton to Brush will provide the necessary capacity at the most economical cost to the project. It will also provide a secondary source of power to existing customers and make service available to an REA by construction of a substation at Kiowa, Colo.

I sincerely believe that the elimination of these transmission lines from the program for the fiscal year 1951 will serve no other purpose than to delay essential service to rural customers who have been anxiously waiting for the completion of the Colorado-Big Thompson project. Additional generating capacity will be available, but service will be limited to those customers now being served within the limited capacity of the present transmission lines.

I submit for the consideration of the Members of the House that the reductions made in the estimate for the Colorado-Big Thompson project are serious and should be restored to permit the construction of these essential extensions of the transmission system.

At this point in my remarks on this important rural electrification and water conservancy project for Colorado and the Nation, I am including the statement I made before the Interior Sub-

committee of the Senate Appropriations Committee on April 25, 1950.

I urgently requested the committee to reconsider and restore the funds for the Colorado-Big Thompson project which were eliminated by the House Appropriations Committee.

It is my contention that the House committee was unjustified in eliminating these funds from the Bureau of Reclamation appropriation. The committee maintained that the funds were for "certain new power facilities," basing its decision on the declared policy of the President's budget message for 1950–51, that appropriations should be limited to continuation of work on projects started in prior years.

An investigation will reveal that these funds were to be used on projects already under construction.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. WILLIAM S. HILL, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, SECOND DISTRICT, COLORADO, BEFORE THE INTERIOR SUBCOMMITTEE, SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE, APRIL 25, 1950

Mr. Chairman, I wish to call your attention to an injustice which has developed with respect to the construction of needed and planned rural electrification facilities in my district, the Second District of Colorado.

In his statement in the budget message for 1950–51, the President said, in part: "The activities of the Bureau of Reclamation and flood-control program of the Corps of Engineers, involving the construction of dams, power facilities, canals, channels, and levees, will be limited in 1951 to continuation of work on projects started in prior years."

In view of this policy laid down by the President, the House Appropriations Committee cut $928,000 from the Colorado-Big Thompson project in my district. The committee denied authorization of funds for the Estes-Leyner-Plains 115-kilovolt line and substation totaling $160,000; the Leyner substation, $264,000; and the Brighton-Hoyt-Brush portion of the Flatiron-Leyner-Brighton-Brush 115-kilovolt line and substation, $504,000. In explaining its elimination of these funds, the House committee maintained they were for certain new power facilities.

Because of this unjustified interpretation of the President's statement with reference to the Colorado-Big Thompson, I urge your reconsideration of this reduction in funds. Upon further investigation, I am confident that you will discover that the funds requested by the Bureau of Reclamation in this instance are for the continuation of existing projects and are not new starts. Interruption of the outlined construction program will curtail the plans for providing rural power for thousands of ranchers and farmers who have no other source of power available. If the funds are not provided, it means the Government is failing to meet an obligation to these rural people.

As a consistent proponent of a sound, progressive rural-electrification program wherever needed in the Nation, I have been greatly disturbed by the President's budget statement. It is similar to the one he made in 1949–50. If further misconstrued, like in the Colorado-Big Thompson case, it could result in the complete disruption of the rural-electrification program. This program has been beneficial to the people and has been no burden to the taxpayers, since it is self-liquidating.

Therefore, I urge this committee to restore these funds and permit the continuation of the Colorado-Big Thompson project as planned and under construction by the Bureau of Reclamation.

(Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

(Mr. JENSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

(Mr. FENTON (at the request of Mr. JENSEN) was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

CHAPTER VIII—EXECUTIVE AND INDEPENDENT OFFICES

The CHAIRMAN. Under the order of the House, chapter VIII is now subject to general debate.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this chapter be limited to 1 hour, 30 minutes, to be controlled by the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] and 30 minutes by myself.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to take up too much of the committee's time, and I will briefly summarize the bill. It includes about $8,000,000,000 of appropriations, and $510,000,000 in contract authorizations.

Before I discuss the bill I would like to say something about the membership of this subcommittee that I have the honor and privilege and pleasure of serving with. On the Democratic side we have the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], who is also a very hard worker, an able parliamentarian, and a man of great human understanding with a wealth of good old common horse sense that can be called good judgment.

There is the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS], who is always present at the hearings. His contribution in committee work is outstanding. Of course, when we come down to the difficult task of trying to allocate and prorate the funds to the various governmental agencies, his good judgment is always of monumental strength to the remainder of his colleagues on the subcommittee.

I might say that this subcommittee has as little partisanship in it as it is humanly possible to have in the consideration of estimates for 33 governmental agencies which are independent in character. Most of these agencies operate as commissions, made up of both Democrats and Republicans, and we also conduct our committee hearings along nonpartisan lines.

The ranking minority member of our subcommittee is the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. I might add that the House is in imminent danger of losing his services. In fact, I understand that we will lose his services at the next election, because he is going over to another body. Of course, the other body will be the winner, because they are getting one of the outstanding men, not only of this House, but one of the outstanding men in public life in this country. Of course, their gain will be our loss. The service that he has rendered in this House to his great State of South Dakota has been nothing short of phenomenal. He has really carried wood and water for those fine people, and I know that they appreciate his outstanding ability and his tireless efforts in service, just as the membership of this House appreciates it. I know that you all join me in wishing him the best of success in all of his many undertakings.

The other Member on the Republican side is our distinguished friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS]. The gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] is unquestionably one of the outstanding men of this House. He is a man of fine judgment and boundless energy. Sometimes I think that the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] does not mind working 15 or 16 hours a day. Even though he puts in those hours, he seems to enjoy it. He, too, has rendered great service, not only to his district in California but, being the only minority representative on this committee from California, naturally he has had to carry the whole weight for his great State, and he has certainly done an outstanding job.

Let me say again, it is worth repeating, there is absolutely no partisanship on this committee. We have done a fine job, we believe, and certainly, if we have done a good job for you gentlemen, it must be partly attributed to our staff too, Mr. Duvall and Mr. Skarin. I do not know of two finer gentlemen in our entire staff. They are hard workers. They know what the answers are. They have made our work much easier. The budget estimate for 1951 for these 33 independent agencies was approximately $8,500,000,000. After some 2 or 3 months work we effected cuts in appropriations and contract authorizations totaling $501,000,000. We have not crippled any essential service of Government, and I believe most of the agencies will agree to that even though dollar-wise—this subcommittee has made cuts more than 100 percent greater than any other subcommittee.

I think it is worth while to mention here briefly that there are two agencies as now provided for in the bill that are going to have to be revised provided certain legislation is enacted; one is the selective service, which at the time we considered their budget estimate, was in the process of liquidation, but which if Congress continues selective service for another year will require more funds and necessitate reconsideration by our committee of the item now in the bill. They are no more than a liquidating agency for fiscal 1951. The other agency I have in mind is the Displaced Persons Commission. It is our understanding that the House and the other body are now in conference on that legislation and a conference report will be brought back in due time. Assuming that is true, we

will then have to reconsider what we have done for the DP Commission.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. GRAHAM. It so happens I am one of the conferees on that bill. I may say that we expect to have our report report ready in about 2 weeks.

Mr. THOMAS. If we are through with this bill at that time, I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the matter can be taken care of on the Senate side and in conference. We will have ample opportunity to do it that way.

I am not going to take up the time of the House in going through all these agencies now; we will do that when the bill is read under the 5-minute rule. The big money in this bill goes to three agencies: The Veterans' Administration, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the General Services Administration.

For 1951 the Veterans' Administration funds in the bill total about $5,800,000,000 as against appropriations totaling $6,330,000,000 for 1950. The primary reason the 1950 figure is in excess of the 1951 appropriation is that we have recently given the Veterans' Administration a deficiency appropriation for 1950 of $720,000,000 for use in connection with the item for readjustment benefits, recent increases in enrollment for trade and vocational training and other training below the college level being the primary reason for this increase.

Another agency requesting a large appropriation is the Atomic Energy Commission. This year they requested about $1,043,000,000. That is divided between cash and contract authority. The agency is doing a tremendously important job, and every Member here knows how valuable their work is. It will not serve any useful purpose to go into its plans. I want to point out, however, that the Committee has urged, is urging, and will continue to urge upon the Commission in spite of the very important work, to be as economical as possible. We reserve to ourselves as your representatives the right to carefully scrutinize their expenditures. We have placed some limitations on them in here. Sometimes we felt they have spent too much money in spots where they should not have spent it in connection with their town operations. For instance, there is the little city of Oak Ridge, a town of between 32 and 35 thousand people in the great State of Tennessee, a Government-owned and operated town. The Government repairs the houses, it owns the houses, it paints the houses, it maintains the security of the town, it gathers the garbage, it paves the streets, and it runs the transportation system. But for the life of us we have not been able to understand why they had to pay a town manager $180,000 a year when the duties are in most respects comparable to a city manager's job which would not pay more than from $25,000 to $35,000.

In addition to the Government running the transportation system at Oak Ridge it owns all of the trucks, busses, and automobiles, and pays the salaries of all the drivers, all of the mechanics, it buys all of the tires, the gasoline and oil and pays a fee of $90,000 for doing perhaps a $15,000 job. Bear in mind that the taxpayers of the United States pay the salaries of the policemen, the firemen, the school teachers and of all the maintenance and operating people in the town.

The third agency to which I have referred is the General Services Administration. This is a new activity established by the Federal Property Act of 1949. Actually it represents the consolidation of a number of old agencies, consisting primarily of the former Bureau of Federal Supply, the Federal Works Agency, the National Archives, and the liquidation of the affairs of the War Assets Administration. The committee considered total estimates of $861,883,000 and has included in the bill $836,126,000 for the several activities making up this agency. In effect, we have made a saving of $25,756,000. We feel that the General Services Administrator is in a position to effect real economies and increase efficiency in these activities and we have confidence that he will do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I wish to concur wholeheartedly in the nice things that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] said with reference to our colleague the gentleman from South Dakota, FRANCIS CASE, who has been away part of the time recently and has not been with us as much as we would like. We understand he is leaving us and we shall miss him from this body.

I have been associated with the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] in committee for a number of years and I want to make the statement that there is a no more industrious Member of this House than is the gentleman from South Dakota, FRANCIS CASE. His judgment is good, he is as sound as a lawyer, he is one of the first Members of this Congress. We shall miss him, of course, when he leaves us, but I wish for him always the things that he wants most in life and the things that will make him happy.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I have had the pleasure of serving in committee for 3 years with our distinguished friend from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. I am thoroughly familiar with his work. I know of no harder-working Member in the Congress of the United States than is the gentleman from South Dakota, FRANCIS CASE. I too shall miss him when he leaves, but I certainly wish him the best of luck.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, the first time I had the opportunity of meeting the distinguished gentleman from South Dakota was when we were in the Marine Corps on Mare Island. I have always had a great interest in the gentleman and have watched him on the floor. As a very proud ex-marine I want to pay my compliments to one of the hardest workers that we have ever had in the Congress of the United States. His interests have been largely my interests, and many of us from the West have relied on his good judgment to be the spokesman, and in many ways our leader, in getting the things that were beneficial especially to the West. Certainly, as a westerner, I regret that he is leaving this body, and I wish him every success in the world in any other aspirations he might have.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. I realize, knowing the extreme modesty of the gentleman, that these are perhaps embarrassing moments to him. But, I simply want to concur in what has been said here by these gentlemen. There is no clearer thinker in the House of Representatives than FRANCIS CASE, and he certainly shall be missed in this body. Whatever his fortunes may be, and we hope they will be good in the future, we shall all be pulling for him.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I certainly am thrown off balance by having these requests to yield made. No one can hear such remarks about himself without having some sense of embarrassment. Perhaps it is accentuated by the fact that no one knows, at least I do not have any firm knowledge, what is going to happen to me in the direction to which some of these remarks have alluded. But, I do assure each and every one of you that I deeply appreciate the kind remarks you have made. It happened that I was coming through the door when the distinguished chairman of our subcommittee was making his remarks, and they were so glowing and so far beyond my deserts that I hesitated to come on in. I thought perhaps I should stay outside in the lobby. But, I do appreciate them, and I can assure each and every one of you that my thoughts and my feelings are going to be with the Members of the House of Representatives, and particularly with those of you with whom I have labored in the Committee on Appropriations and in these other matters of interest to the West.

Mr. Chairman, in reporting the chapter of the appropriation bill that deals with independent offices, it has been my privilege to work with as fine a subcommittee, and as able a subcommittee, myself excluded, as there is among the subcommittees of the great Committee on Appropriations. And we have had the benefit of a very able and experienced staff in William Duvall and Homer Skarin. Their services have been invaluable.

Mr. TEAGUE, Mr. BURTON, Mr. HAYS of Ohio, Mr. CANNON, Mr. SASSCER, Mr. BEALL, Mr. KARSTEN, Mr. JACKSON of California, and Mr. WAGNER changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and in each include an editorial.

Mr. CLEVENGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and in each include an editorial.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include an article.

Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include certain information.

Mr. POTTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include two newspaper articles.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address by Alvin Bloch on the subject Cargoes and Pacific Northwest Power.

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter.

Mr. KENNEDY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

Mr. EBERHARTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an eritorial appearing in the Christian Science Monitor.

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Brooklyn Eagle.

Mr. BLATNIK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include two articles.

Mr. KARST asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article from the magazine Machinists.

Mr. MITCHELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous material.

Mrs. WOODHOUSE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include two editorials.

Mr. GORDON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a speech commemorating the one hundred and fifty-ninth anniversary of the Polish Constitution.

Mr. BOLLING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article entitled "Congressional Subpena Upon the President."

Mr. GORSKI, Mr. CHESNEY, and Mr. ELSTON asked and were given permission to extend their remarks.

Mr. BIEMILLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. ROOSEVELT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a copy of the bill entitled "Niagara Redevelopment Act of 1950" and an analysis of the bill.

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in five instances and in each include extraneous matter.

GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1951

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7786, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

CHAPTER VII. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

The CHAIRMAN. General debate on all chapters of the bill has been concluded.

The Clerk will now continue reading the bill for amendments, beginning with chapter VII, page 216, line 1.

The Clerk read as follows:

WORKING-CAPITAL FUND

For establishment of a working-capital fund, to be available without fiscal year limitation, for expenses necessary for the maintenance and operation of (1) a central reproduction service; (2) communication services; (3) a central supply service for stationery, supplies, equipment, blank forms, and miscellaneous materials, for which adequate stocks may be maintained to meet in whole or in part requirements of the bureaus and offices of the Department in the city of Washington and eleswhere; (4) a central library service; (5) health services; and (6) such other similar service functions as the Secretary determines may be performed more advantageously on a reimbursable basis; $300,000. Said fund shall be reimbursed from available funds of bureaus, offices, and agencies for which services are performed at rates which will return in full all expenses of operation, including reserves for accrued annual leave and depreciation of equipment.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language on page 217, lines 4 to 6, beginning with the figure "6," and reading as follows:

(6) such other similar service functions as the Secretary determines may be performed more advantageously on a reimbursable basis.

I ask leave to reserve the point of order and to propound a question of the chairman of the subcommittee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman reserves the point of order.

Mr. KEATING. Will the chairman of the subcommittee or the ranking minority member of the committee explain the purpose of this provision?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. In response to the inquiry of the gentleman, may I say that the purpose of this language is to centralize the service functions within the department of the office of the Secretary. It does not involve any additional expenditures. Frankly, the purpose of it is to save money.

Mr. KEATING. Has this language been carried in previous appropriation bills?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. The identical language has not been carried before, but the substance has been very much the same.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONSTRUCTION, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

For construction and acquisition of transmission lines, substations, and appurtenant facilities, and for administrative expenses connected therewith, in carrying out the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U. S. C. 825s), as applied to the southwestern power area, to remain available until expended, $10,350,000, of which not to exceed $5,000,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority previously granted; and, in addition, the Secretary is authorized to enter into contracts for the purposes of this appropriation in an amount not to exceed $6,000,000: *Provided*, That the unexpended balances of funds appropriated under the head "Construction, operation, and maintenance, power transmission facilities" in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1950, for the foregoing purposes shall be transferred to and merged with this appropriation.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language on page 218, starting in line 5, reading as follows: "And, in addition, the Secretary is authorized to enter into contracts for the purposes of this appropriation in an amount not to exceed $6,000,000: *Provided*, That the unexpended balances of funds appropriated under the head 'Construction, operation, and maintenance, power-transmission facilities' in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1950, for the foregoing purposes shall be transferred to and merged with this appropriation" on the ground it involves legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman reserve the point of order?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I will be glad to reserve the point of order.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, this is the same thing that has been happening around here for several years and occurs every time we have reached the item covering the Southwestern Power Administration. I think every Member of the Committee will agree with me when I say that the Southwestern Power Administration has given one demonstration in the United States of America where the Government and private industry can get along.

About 2 or 3 years ago the Southwestern Power Administration and the Department of the Interior made a contract with the Texas Power & Light Co.

for the interchange and the distribution of power at this place. It is one contract that the Southwestern Power Administration has lived up to 100 percent and that the Texas Power & Light Co. has lived up to 100 percent. It has been a valuable contract both for the Government and for the Texas Power & Light Co., and neither the Government nor the Texas Power & Light Co. would for a moment think of doing away with that contract today.

The Administrator of the Southwestern Power Administration sat down with the utilities of the State of Oklahoma and they have drawn a contract that the utilities themselves are very much for and that the Southwestern Power Administration is also for. That contract is on the desk of the Secretary of the Interior now. If it is signed the $6,000,000 provided for in this bill will not be expended because instead of building these lines there will be a contract between them.

When this thing first came up for consideration here I stood up on the floor of this House and said: "I do not believe in the confiscation of property."

There is a certain group of people in the United States who do not think there ought to be any public power. There is another group that does not think there ought to be any private power. I do not belong to either group. If we are allowed to, we are going to endeavor to make a satisfactory contract with every power company in that part of the country that, as I say, will be mutually beneficial to the Government and beneficial to the power companies themselves.

We have never paralleled a line of any power company. I made the statement here, and let me repeat, that I am not out to confiscate anybody's property, that where the power companies with an existing line had the capacity to carry the power of the Southwestern Power Administration and would carry it at a reasonable rate, that we would not parallel or build any line adjacent thereto, and that has not been done in one instance in the State of Texas where the Texas Power & Light Co. operates. We hope to get that same kind of an arrangement in Oklahoma, and we will have it if this contract that is now lying on the desk of the Secretary of the Interior is approved by him.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I want to say that the distinguished Speaker has explained this matter exactly and in accordance with the facts, and that we are, as the gentleman has just explained, working out a very satisfactory program between the Southwestern Power Administration and the private utilities in the Southwest area. Now, for the first time in the history of this Nation, do we have a working agreement that is going to be good for everyone concerned. I am happy to say that the Speaker and I see this thing exactly alike. As the Speaker has just said, there are some folks who think there should be no public power and there are some folks who think there should be no private power. The Speaker and I belong to neither one of those groups. Certainly, by striking this out, it would interfere with the program that we have in progress now and we are working out and solving these differences which have bothered us for years and years. I am sorry the gentleman from New York made the point of order, and I hope he will withdraw it.

Mr. RAYBURN. I trust that under the circumstances the gentleman may feel that he could, in good conscience, withdraw his point of order, because, following up exactly what the gentleman from Iowa has said, we are trying to make things work down in the Southwest, and as far as we have been able to go, they are working.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished Speaker yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I associate myself with the views of the Speaker and the gentleman from Iowa in reference to public and private power. Do I understand from the Speaker that, if the negotiations pending are concluded, that this $6,000,000 contract authority will not be exercised?

Mr. RAYBURN. The gentleman is right. The Administrator of the Southwestern Power Administration stated before both a House committee and a Senate committee that, if this contract was signed, this money would not be expended.

Mr. KEATING. And the Speaker, from his knowledge of this situation, would be led to believe that the contract is likely to be signed?

Mr. RAYBURN. Well, I hope that the contract is signed. I have seen it; I have gone over it very thoroughly, as I did the Texas Power & Light Co. contract. I think it is a good contract, and I trust that the Secretary of the Interior does sign it.

Mr. KEATING. This particular contract authority would only need to be exercised in the event the contract did not come into being.

Mr. RAYBURN. I think that is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York withdraw his point of order?

Mr. KEATING. I would like to reserve it further, if I may.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CANNON. I did not hear the point of order submitted, Mr. Chairman, but I fail to see where the debate we have had up to this time touches on any point of order. Merely as a matter of information, what is the purpose of the debate?

Mr. RAYBURN. The purpose of this debate was that I was hoping, feeling that I was right, that I could prevail upon the gentleman from New York to withdraw his point of order. That was the purpose of my taking the floor for the only time I have taken it in the 2 or 3 weeks since this bill has been under consideration.

Mr. CANNON. I am told that the Secretary and the friends of REA are opposed to the Texas contract and do not think it ought to be signed in this form.

Mr. RAYBURN. It does not make any difference to anybody whether or not they are opposed to the Texas contract. It has been in operation for more than 2 years.

The Secretary of the Interior found some parts of the contract to which he is objecting. I am trusting that Mr. Wright and the power companies can get together and yet bring about an amendment to that contract that the Secretary of the Interior will sign.

Mr. CANNON. I am not familiar with the merits of the various forms of contract but it is my understanding that the cooperatives in my State and other States do not favor the Texas contract and as a result this particular contract has been on the desk of the Secretary for many weeks; for a very long time, at least.

Mr. RAYBURN. It has not been there a very long time. I hope the gentleman does not get me into personalities, but I know there is one man in the country that claims to represent the co-ops of the country, but the principal thing he is doing is going around stirring up trouble between the Southwestern Power Administration and the co-ops of the country. He is performing no service, in my opinion, either to public power or to the co-ops.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. May I say to the Speaker and to the House that I think you know how I have felt all along about public and private power. They tell me the Texas contract has acted decently, and has been a constructive step in the relationship of public and private power. It was a good step.

The Speaker is correct when he says that the Oklahoma utilities will enter this same contract. May I say to the Speaker that the Arkansas utilities will do the same thing.

I join the Speaker in asking that this contract, similar to the Texas contract, be approved by the Secretary of the Interior regardless of what somebody may say because, as the Speaker has so well said, some people want to take over the whole thing and make it public, while others would not have any public power at all. As the solution is reached here, public and private power can live together, if the Interior Department will be governed by what the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] has said.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FENTON. I join my colleagues in saying that Mr. Wright made a very fine presentation to the subcommittee. Everything the Speaker has said is absolutely true, because I took occasion to

call up the Secretary of the Interior a day or two ago and ask him the status of the various contracts that were on his table. He said he was hopeful that very shortly he could make final arrangements for those contracts.

Mr. Douglas Wright is to be commended on his explanation. He made a very fine presentation. Of course, he has taken the position that we do, that where private enterprise can supply power it should be supplied by them, and the same goes for transmission lines. I hope the distinguished gentleman from Texas will try to expedite these contracts so that we can protect free enterprise in this business.

Mr. RAYBURN. That is what the gentleman from Texas is trying to do.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I want first to make clear that I am not claiming to speak for all the REA cooperatives throughout the Nation. I have felt that they have done great work, their leadership was good, and that I do not claim to have done more than my share, but there have been times when I have tried to be as helpful toward this program as possible. I do, therefore, believe I can fairly speak as a friend of the REA program and as one who lives in the area that is served by the Texas Power & Light Co. and by some of these REA-financed cooperatives and some public dams, and by one of the largest REA transmission cooperatives, I want to point out that the "Texas contract" has been working in our area over the past 2 years and that we now have the best relations between the private power companies, the public dams, and the REA cooperatives, both local and transmission cooperatives, that we have ever had. It seems to me that, under this contract, we have the assurance we are going to have all of these agencies working in cooperation without any duplication of effort or lines. A few years ago we had no cooperation and no way of getting the private companies to cooperate except to build competitive facilities. When we proved we could and would do just that the companies signed the Texas contract, and we are today enjoying the best of relations. If you deny the people of Oklahoma and Arkansas the bargaining power that this bill gives, I fear that you are going to force them into a useless war of duplication, which should be avoided.

Mr. RAYBURN. The contract has worked. We are getting plenty of power and getting it at reasonable rates.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Does the gentleman feel that to eliminate this provision would interfere with the negotiations and arrangements which are under way to which he has referred?

Mr. RAYBURN. It might take away from one side a little of its argument, I am afraid.

Mr. KEATING. In view of the representations of our Speaker, in whom we all have so much confidence, Mr. Chairman, I do not feel I care to take the responsibility of striking this provision out on a point of order. If some other Member wishes to do so that is their privilege.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Chairman, some of the preceding speeches, unintentionally I am sure, have tended to becloud the issue. Some of the preceding speakers, both pro and con, have assumed that the provision in the pending bill to which the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] has interposed a point of order in some way involves a conflict or controversy between the Southwestern Power Administration and private utility companies. This is completely erroneous. My colleague from Texas, the distinguished Speaker of the House, pointed out in the course of his speech that a contract has been negotiated between the Southwestern Power Administration and all of the utility companies of the area, which contract is now awaiting approval of the Secretary of the Interior. The contract is a lengthy one, and I have made no special study of it. But I have read it and understand the purpose it is intended to accomplish.

The contract in no wise gives private electric companies a monopoly on federally owned power. The effect is just the opposite. It would give priority to such preferred customers as REA and others which the Government desires to sell power from the federally owned generating plants and installations. What it would do is to intergrade the power transmission facilities owned by the Southwestern Power Administration and those owned by the private companies, thus making it unnecessary for the Government to spend large sums of money in the construction of transmission lines paralleling those of the private companies. These contracts have been strongly recommended by Mr. Douglas Wright of the Southwestern Power Administration. As has already been stated, Mr. Wright told the Appropriations Committee that if the contract is approved he will not need to spend a penny or contract for a penny of the $5,000,000 authorized to which the point of order has been interposed. By intergrading the distribution system of the private companies and the Southwestern Power Administration millions of dollars will be saved to the public in the years ahead. It is foolish and wasteful to duplicate distribution systems when by proper cooperation and coordination it is wholly unnecessary.

The negotiation of the contract, in my judgment, is a fine things. I think it will set a proper pattern for the distribution of public power. It will mark out the territory and proper field of service of such Government instrumentalities as Southwestern Power Administration and the private utility companies. I, for one, do not want to see private utility companies or other private enterprises absorbed or driven out of business by the Federal Government. On the other hand, power produced by these huge hydroelectric plants, made possible and paid for by the taxpayers of the United States, belongs to all our people and should never be allowed either to be owned or monopolized by private concerns. I think the contracts in question point the way to a proper cooperation between the private companies and Government power corporations. It will mean cheaper and better electric service than either the Government or the private utility companies could supply alone. It is subject to Government regulation and supervision in the interest of the public good. The approval of the contract by the Secretary of Interior, and I sincerely trust he will approve it, will go a long way to stop the clamor of those who argue that it is the purpose of the Government to take over or socialize the private utility business. And it will, in my judgment, work to the great benefit of the users of electric power and to the American people.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance of power transmission facilities and of marketing electric power and energy pursuant to the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U. S. C. 825s), as applied to the southwestern power area, $760,000.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot agree with what has been said about my distinguished friend Clyde Ellis, former Member of the House, and the association which he represents.

This is public power that is generated by the Southwest Power Administration. It is created by the Government and belongs to the public.

We had the same battle in the Tennessee Valley. If we had capitulated and turned it over to the Electric Bond & Share, and that is who the Texas Power & Light Co. is, we would be paying through the nose for our electricity today.

The State that ought to have the cheapest electricity on earth is the State of Texas. They have natural gas spouting into thin air, enough to generate electricity for four or five States the size of Texas. They also have an abundance of oil to run all the Diesel engines necessary to supply electricity to the people of Texas. Yet, I want to read you the statistics for 1948. In 1948 the State of Texas used 8,484,641,000 kilowatt hours of electricity for which it paid $165,000,000. That is the ultimate consumers paid $165,000,000. Under the TVA rate they would have paid $86,000,000 and would have saved about $78,000,000. I know some of you will say that the TVA pays no taxes. We pay more money in lieu of taxes than was paid by the private power company before the TVA was established.

In 1948 the people of Texas used 8,484,000,000 kilowatt hours of electricity, and the people of Tennessee used 4,848,000,000 kilowatt hours. The people of Tennessee paid $68,000,000 for their electricity, and the people of Texas paid $165,000,000, or $97,000,000 more than did the people of Tennessee.

Let us see what would happen under the Tacoma, Wash., rates. I have used

Tacoma, Wash., for years, because it is one city in America which has a public power system operated by water power generated at dams 100 miles around the city. Tacoma has built her own dams. Instead of paying $165,000,000 for that power, the people of Texas, under Tacoma rates, would have paid $74,000,000, or about $90,000,000 less than they did pay. They would have paid $82,000,000 under the Ontario and would have saved about the same amount—$82,000,000.

I do not agree that this power should be monopolized by the Electric Bond & Share Co. I know what the Electric Bond & Share Co. is, because I have had to fight them in Mississippi. They do not own an insulator in the district which I have the honor to represent.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. I just wanted to ask the gentleman if the area in which Tacoma, Wash., is located is not the only area that had a power shortage during the war and after the war.

Mr. RANKIN. The area in which Tacoma is located did what they did on the Tennessee River. They helped produce the atomic bomb. If it had not been for the Columbia River development and the Tennessee Valley Authority, there would not have been any atomic bomb. The reason was that they put these enterprises there because they had the power; and because they used more than anybody thought they would use, there was a shortage in some of the area.

Mr. NORRELL. There was a power shortage.

Mr. RANKIN. Not in Tacoma, Wash., where they have their own power facilities.

The situation in Arkansas is worse than it is in Texas.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] spends considerable time at every opportunity telling you people how much money you are losing by allowing private enterprise to survive. He tells you exactly how many dollars you could save on your electric bill if the Government owned and sold all of the electricity. He could just as easily tell you that you could buy your clothes a lot cheaper at a Government-owned clothing store that is free from taxation and is being subsidized by the taxpayers. There is not one speck of difference in the arguments.

Those who would have public power and drive private enterprise out of the field are the same ones that would like to see the Federal Government run and own everything in this whole country.

I was amused the other day when the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] jumped up on the floor of the House during the farm-program debate and said, "If you keep going like you are going now, it is not going to be long until the Federal Government is going to be telling you farmers exactly how many hogs you can raise, how many chickens you can feed, and how many cows you can milk." He was exactly right at that time. But when public power is concerned he does not seem to care if the rural people of this country are regimented even by a contract circumventing the wishes of those people, and their Congress. You notice he never could find Arkansas in his list of mistreated people because of high rates.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TACKETT. Not now. You have had the floor ever since I have been here. The little rural electric co-ops in the Tennessee Valley are paying more for their electricity than they are in Arkansas. The cheapest electricity to the rural co-ops in the whole United States of America is in the State of Arkansas, and we do not have any Tennessee Valley Authority that is dodging taxes and having their accounts so hidden that you cannot tell what it costs to make electricity.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TACKETT. I yield to my friend from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Douglas Wright testified before my subcommittee that the utilities in Arkansas, especially in my area, were selling power cheaper to the REA than the Southwest Power Administration could sell or the TVA. That is in the public hearings.

Mr. TACKETT. And that is exactly correct. The electricity being sold to the co-ops in my district is sold at between 4.6 mills and 4.9 mills. Can you buy it like that over in the Tennessee Valley?

Mr. RANKIN. I will give you the figures. The residential consumers of Arkansas last year paid $10,260,00 for electricity which, under the TVA yardstick would have cost $4,980,000. In other words, they paid a hundred percent more than they should.

Mr. TACKETT. What would they have paid for it from the Federal Government?

Mr. RANKIN. They would have paid just what I am talking about. You are plundering the ultimate consumers of electricity all over the State of Arkansas.

Mr. TACKETT. What would they have paid for it?

Mr. RANKIN. They would have paid a whole lot less than they paid in Arkansas.

Mr. TACKETT. The gentleman does not know what electricity is selling for and does not seem to care; he is just trying to fool the people. TVA does not and cannot sell electricity for 4.6 or 4.9 mills.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Arkansas does not seem to realize the difference between public and private business.

Mr. TACKETT. I think I have sense enough to know that if the Federal Government is running something for the people that it is public business. When private people in this country get out here and compete on the theory of supply and demand, that is the kind of business that has made this the greatest country upon the face of the earth, but it cannot be for long if we are going to permit the Federal Government to gobble up the business of the people of this country. Did the gentleman from Iowa want me to yield to him?

Mr. JENSEN. I think it might be well to point out that private industry, whether it be private utilities, the farmer, the peanut vendor on the corner, the corner grocery store, or anything else, pays taxes, and if it were not for those taxes coming into the Federal Government, just as the gentleman from Pennsylvania stated a while ago, there would be no money to build these great things like TVA. The private utility companies last year paid over $650,000,000 in local, State, and Federal taxes. That is considerably more than what the gentleman from Mississippi said, and all the figures he puts in the RECORD trying to prove benefit to the people.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TACKETT. The gentleman from Mississippi, if the gentleman will pardon me, has proved one thing, that the Federal Government without paying taxes, that the Federal Government being subsidized by the taxpayers, that the Federal Government by hiding the figures that it actually costs to produce electricity can sell electricity cheaper than private enterprise can produce and sell it. That is exactly what he said; and the same thing is true of groceries, clothing, or anything else. I am wondering how the gentleman proposes to operate this Government after taxpaying enterprise has been abolished.

I should like to call your attention for just a moment to the Southwestern Power Administration. It came before this House and asked for money to build steam power generating units and transmission lines. Congress said: "No; we are not going to put the Federal Government into competition with private enterprise; we still believe in the principles of democracy."

They came back again and they said: "We have got to have the money to build steam-power units and transmission lines because there is just so much water coming down the river at certain seasons of the year; we need to firm up the power and sell it the year round."

Congress said: "No; we are still not going to build a TVA all over the United States."

Then, what did the Southwestern Power Administration do? They oozed over here and got hold of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association's executive manager from my great State of Arkansas, Mr. Clyde Ellis. They said: "Now, Clyde, we cannot get Congress to go along with us, but we can work out a deal here whereby we can circumvent the very Congress that is refusing to go along with us. Here is what we will do: Let us enter into a contract whereby rural co-ops will build electric generating and transmission facilities for the use

and benefit of the Southwestern Power Administration. We will pretend that those facilities are for the use and benefit of the co-ops, and thereby circumvent Congress and fool the people. Mr. Wickard will do whatever you want him to do; he has a blank check provided by Congress to do whatever needs to be done for the REA program. You ask for loans to build some facilities down there in the State of Arkansas and elsewhere. Then you go in there and build for the SPA some steam power units and transmission lines that Congress would not give us, and then the Southwestern Power Administration will use those generating facilities and transmission lines for a period of 40 years for a certain rent to be paid by the taxpayers that will retire the construction cost. Southwestern Power Administration is all set to operate and to buy those transmission lines from the date they are constructed. The generating facilities will be worn out before they are paid for, but we will have the transmission facilities and be well on our way toward the abolishment of private enterprise."

The SPA gets the money from the taxpayers through the continuing fund to carry out the very thing the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is working for, the abolition of free enterprise in the power field. That contract even provides, I may say to the gentleman from Mississippi who has been fighting FEPC with all the power at his command, for the civil-rights program, including the FEPC features so detested by the gentleman from Mississippi. If the gentleman would read what he is hollering about, he would not be so condoing of the public-power contract. That contract provides that the Southwestern Power Administration shall determine the policies of the little rural electric co-ops in your State and in my State. In other words, that little group of rural electric co-op board members will no longer determine the policies; and the wishes of the little co-ops will not amount to a tinker's hoot because the Federal Government through the Southwestern Power Administration is going to socialize, federalize, and nationalize the electric industry and regiment the farmers of this county to such an extent that it will not be long until the Government is going to be telling the farmers, as you have predicted Mr. RANKIN, how many chickens they can feed, how many hogs they can raise, and how many cows they can milk.

I wish that the gentleman, if he actually believes in what he has been saying in the past, would find out what the electrification program of the Southwestern Power Administration is actually doing to our rural people.

Mr. RANKIN. Doing them more good all the time. Public power is doing the people I represent more good than anything that has ever come along.

Mr. TACKETT. The gentleman is unable to distinguish public power from rural electrification. Public power is socialistic, while rural electrification is operating in free enterprise.

Mr. RANKIN. The Electric Bond & Share Co., which is a holding company, is bleeding the people of Arkansas and Texas to the extent of over $150,000,000 a year in overcharges.

Mr. TACKETT. May I say to the gentleman from Mississippi that every Socialist who has even advocated taking over the principles of democracy has advocated, first, taking over the electric-power systems, second, taking over the telephone and communication systems, and third, taking over the railways and other transportation systems, the necessary steps to socialize America. The gentleman is helping them to climb these steps.

Mr. RANKIN. When I took this up in 1934——

Mr. TACKETT. That is popular, Mr. RANKIN, but it is not right and you know it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is too bad we do not have something in the House to blow the smoke away so we could take a look around. We have just listened to a Power Trust speech so good that I doubt if anybody on the left-hand side of this aisle could equal it. I do not think I ever heard a better one from that standpoint.

There are a few little things I want to discuss that are happening out in Missouri. You know, we are not so far from Arkansas. In fact, I have been across the State line down there two different times at least. My REA co-op, the Osage Valley Electric co-op, is paying 1.6 for current wholesale right now, and I hope to be able to hitch on with a couple of lines in the State of Arkansas and get a little hydroelectric current up there so that we can reduce the price at wholesale.

We have had two steam plants authorized for our State and there has been quite a lot of objection to it. I want to tell you Members of the House something. Independence, which is the home of President Truman at the present time, is a suburb of Kansas City. When you drive out Truman Road you cannot tell when you are driving out of Kansas City and entering Independence. It is all one town.

The Kansas City Power & Light Co. has been one of the utilities that has been fighting the construction of these lines into Missouri and tose two steam-generating plants on the Missouri River. But I want to tell you something. Independence, Mo., will not buy its current from the Kansas City Power & Light Co. although it is generated in the same city. Independence has its own municipal power and light plant and generates its own current. I do not know that the following is a fact but it is a suspicion of mine that the reason they do not buy current from the Kansas City Power & Light Co. is because they can build their own plant and generate their own current and save money. Those men in Independence are good hard-headed businessmen and they try to get a dollar's worth of current for every dollar they spend.

Let me tell you another thing. There are 41 other cities and towns in the State of Missouri that have their own municipal light plant and that generate their own current. Why? The only reason they do it is because they can do it cheaper than they can get the power from the Power Trust in Missouri. If it is all right for 42 cities and towns in the State of Missouri to generate the current they use and distribute it to their customers, why in the name of all things good is it wrong for all the farmers in all the State of Missouri to have two transmission lines and two generating plants? If it is all right for cities and towns in Missouri to have 42 generating plants why is it wrong for all the farmers in that great State to have two such plants?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TACKETT] does not seem to know that the power business is a public business and that the clothing business is a private business. His argument is the same old "stuff" we heard when they were fighting against the creation of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. If the Government was producing the wool that the clothes were made out of, we would have a case in point, but the Government does not.

Mr. RANKIN. We also heard the same stuff when they were fighting the development of the Columbia River. If we had not succeeded in those two enterprises the American people today would be paying from one to three billion dollars more for their electricity than they are paying.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. If the private power companies in the State of Missouri would sign a contract to sell to REA wholesale at 6 mills per kilowatt-hour and deliver the current to the points of need for a period of 20 years, we would not need the lines and we would not need the generating plants, but they will not do it. They have not done it, and they are not going to do it.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. TACKETT. Does the gentleman think that the REA's in Missouri are building those cooperative generating plants down there?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. They will be, if they get the money.

Mr. TACKETT. Does the gentleman not know that the Federal Government, through the guise of the Southwestern Power Administration, will build them?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. And every dollar of the money will be repaid into the Federal Treasury with interest, so whose business is it?

Mr. TACKETT. Does the gentleman not know that it is not going to be repaid, as long as SPA takes the produced power and spend the proceeds from the sale there of nationalizing the electric industry? None of the proceeds from the sale of such electricity reaches the

United States Treasury. Does the gentleman know anything about what he is talking about?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. The REA is already ahead on its entire schedule of payment and will pay for these lines and plants with interest. I do not know what the gentleman considers I know or I do not know, and I am not worried about his consideration along that line.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. As a matter of fact, is not the gentleman from Arkansas, and the rest of the gentlemen, for that matter, talking about an entirely different contract? We started out talking about a contract between the power companies and the Southwestern Power Administration to use the power that is being generated by the Southwestern Power Administration. The gentleman from Arkansas is discussing a contract that somebody has with some local cooperative, or maybe it is a transmission cooperative down in the State of Oklahoma. We are talking about an entirely different contract; and when he is talking about whether or not it will be paid back, it will all be paid back.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I would like to point out to the gentleman that I think the people in your State ought to build your generating plants yourselves. Why do you have to come and ask the Federal Government to do such work; if you need the power, build your own plants. Up in my State of Pennsylvania last year in the city of Warren, Pa., in my district, the Penelec Co. built a $14,000,000 generating plant. They did not ask the State to help, and they did not ask the Federal Government to help. The need for power was evident. The plant was built. They put their own cash on the barrel head to do the job to furnish the power needed in the area.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. The Government put up the cash to build the White River Dam as a flood-control and generating project, and its cost will be repaid from the sale of current generated; and we have as much right to that current as the Arkansas Power & Light Co. has.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimou sconsent that the gentleman from Missouri be permitted to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I wish to point out some facts to the gentleman in regard to the Arkansas Power & Light Co. There was never before gathered in America such a group of licensed burglars working for the Wall Street monopoly which owns the company as the group running the Arkansas Power & Light Co. for Electric Bond & Share. If the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TACKETT] will read the hearings of the subcommittee for the Department of Interior of the House Appropriations Committee of which I was a member, I believe it was back in March of 1946 for fiscal year 1947, he will see ample justification for the statement that I make. The greatest thing that ever happened in the five great States of the Southwest has been the creation of the Southwestern Power Administration.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I thank the gentleman. I agree with him 100 percent.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I agree with what the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] has said. What I am afraid of is this: I am afraid of these attempts to turn that power over to the power trust, that is the Electric Bond & Share, not the Arkansas Power & Light Co., not the Texas Power & Light Co., not the Louisiana Power & Light Co., not the Mississippi Power & Light Co.; it is the Electric Bond & Share, a holding company which is really owned in Wall Street, New York. And what I am afraid of is that they will bleed those people for this power, that is public power to begin with, and that the consumers should get at the lowest possible rate. I have been in this fight a long time. In 1933 I along with Senator NORRIS introduced a bill and fought it through to create the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CHRISTOPHER] be permitted to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. I led the drive here for rural electrification when Arkansas had 1.2 percent of her farms electrified. If we had lost that fight, there would not have been an electric light in the average home in Arkansas for the next 40 years. This is not a question of the Government going into private business; the power business is a public business. Our water power is public property, and we do not intend for it to be taken over and monopolized by the power trust.

Mr. ROONEY. If the gentleman from Missouri will yield to me further, I wonder if the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TACKETT] has ever heard of the acquisitions of properties by Ham Moses' Arkansas Power and Light in the State of Arkansas, where properties were acquired at one price and put on their books at a phony price which was millions and millions of dollars over the price at which they were actually acquired? The facts in regard to this may be found beginning at page 379 of part 3 of the hearings on the 1947 Interior appropriations bill.

I wonder if the gentleman from Arkansas knows that the Arkansas Power & Light Co. is well represented in every golf club in the State of Arkansas. Ham's boys are in every Chamber of Commerce, Lions Club, Kiwanis, and everything else. In a great number of instances the cost of dues and contributions is added to the farmers' electric bills. They sell the bill of goods that good old Arkansas Power & Light belongs to Arkansas, not Wall Street, New York, the real owner. In the interest of their alma mater, Electric Bond & Share, they have opposed the building of every dam and transmission line in the Southwest. Very few members from the State of Arkansas do not hear from the various organizations in which the Arkansas Power & Light is so well represented and from the newspapers in every town in which the Arkansas Power & Light advertises.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. The gentleman from New York is interested in Arkansas, and I am glad he is, and cheaper rates, but I just want to ask him what he is doing to get cheaper rates in New York and to clean out the crookedness in that State?

Mr. ROONEY. We are not as fortunate in New York in getting cheap power rates as the people are in the gentleman's State. I have always supported public power and the best interests of the people of Arkansas, as the gentleman well knows, from my service with him, in the subcommittee on Interior Department appropriations. There is no good reason why, if in my State we have to pay 7 and 8 times as much for electric power, I should take it out on the good people of the State of Arkansas.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I just want to say to my distinguished friend from New York, too, that there is no reason why the taxpayers of Pennsylvania should put their money up to build power plants all over the United States.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, while some of these gentlemen are taking credit for having brought electricity to the rural areas of Arkansas, I should like to take some credit for assisting to electrify rural Arkansas. A glance at the legislative record of 1937 within the State of Arkansas will reveal that BOYD TACKETT voted to bring rural electrification to the State of Arkansas when it was not nearly so popular as now. I have never yet failed to vote at every possible opportunity for rural electrification, and I shall never vote against rural electrification.

But I want to tell you who are hollering long and loud for public power to replace the rural electrification program and to allow the rural electrification system to be abolished by the greatest monopoly that was ever known to man, that you can talk about electric power monopolies all you like, but there is no greater or more drastic monopoly than a Government monopoly, and all of you know that. You public power advocates condemn monopolies on one hand while creating on the other hand the most dangerous monopoly known to man—a great Government monopoly.

When a boy on the farm, like my neighboring boyhood friends, I longed for the day when I could live in the small town nearby that I might enjoy some of the comforts and entitlements of life principally afforded by electric service. However, it is now possible to visualize a near future when the people of the metropolitan areas will be living for that day when it will be possible for them to move to and reside within the wide open rural spaces where they will at the same time be afforded equal comforts of life to those within the metropolitan areas.

Hamstring the rural electrification program? No. I would do absolutely nothing detrimental to this great enterprise and will always use every honorable means at my command to further this most meritorious project. I am a devout advocate of rural electrification, and I am just as anxious as any person in this country to see every farm within the United States electrified at the earliest possible date.

The REA and the SPA are distinct and separate programs, and the SPA has contributed nothing to advance or promote the high standards of rural electrification. The rural electrification program is a successful, meritorious, free, and independent organization—the respective electric cooperatives being owned, controlled, governed, and operated by and for the membership, with justifiable authority under our American way of life to freely engage in bringing electric service to the rural areas of our country.

The Southwestern Power Administration, on the other hand, is an agency of the Federal Government under the Department of the Interior with limited congressional authority to pool power and energy produced from Government multiple-purpose dams and distribute such power and energy as provided by law at rates to be approved by the Federal Power Commission.

I wholeheartedly concur in the statements of one of my fellow colleagues that rural electrification has been a long and hard struggle; that the remaining unserved 33 percent of rural Arkansas should be electrified under the splendid rural electrification program without delay; and that rural electrification is just now coming into full fruition. However, these facts do not in anywise justify the activities of the SPA. It cannot be contended that the SPA should be credited with having electrified 67 percent of the rural areas within the State of Arkansas, but, to the contrary, these achievements have been realized under the authority granted by the Rural Electrification Act of 1936. It is not necessary to allow the Department of the Interior, through the Southwestern Power Administration, to nationalize, federalize, and socialize the rural electric cooperatives in order to bring electricity to the remaining 33 percent of the unserved rural area of our State.

Yes; the rural electric cooperatives should be and are authorized and entitled to construct electric-generating units and tranmission lines that the cheapest possible electric energy may be made available to the membership in accordance with good business principles under our system of free enterprise. However, I insist that the Southwestern Power Administration is not justifiably entitled to similar authorizations if we are to maintain our principles of democracy, assist our rural electrification program, and uphold our belief in private ownership.

To allow the Federal Government, through its SPA agency, to establish and dictate policies for the rural electric cooperatives, and to use, control, and receive all benefits from electric generating and transmission facilities constructed by the cooperatives is nothing less than an authorization to federalize the rural electric cooperatives, permit the SPA to expand its legal jurisdiction, and place the Government in direct competition with its citizens.

Those proposing to place the Government into the power field as a competitor in order to assure cheaper energy than the electric cooperatives and others engaged in the power industry can produce could just as successfully contend that we should have Government-owned parallel and duplicating railway and streetcar tracks; airplane, boat, bus, and truck routes; telephone and telegraph lines; and radio and television channels. Petroleum, gas, and coal could be produced cheaper by the Government. No doubt all of these businesses are in the plans of those seeking to use the Government as a competitor to free enterprise. The ultimate results of such a plan can only mean Government operation and eventual ownership.

The rural electric cooperatives within the Southwest have today three sources of electricity:

First. Government flood-control dams over transmission lines owned by the Government, private companies, or those that the cooperatives build, own and operate themselves;

Second. Private power companies;

Third. Electric-generating plants that the cooperatives build, own, and operate themselves.

Right now the rural cooperatives have the private companies and the Federal Government SPA agency right where they should want them. Both are doing everything possible to do business with the cooperatives. The Southwestern Power Administration and the private companies are competing for the cooperatives' business, and they fully realize the possibility of the cooperatives' building their own steam-power units and transmission lines should the electric rates not be sufficiently low to make justifiable such action on behalf of their membership. As long as this situation prevails it is the rural electric cooperatives within the Southwest that stand to benefit. They have their freedom of choice—the American way.

Once, however, these cooperatives lose their advantage by negotiating a long-term contract, permitting themselves to be tied irrevocably to the apron strings of the SPA for a period of 40 years, the opportunity to buy electricity upon a competitive market is gone and the right to produce and transmit electricity by means of their own facilities has vanished.

SPA is not in the power field with the rural cooperatives and others engaged in the power industry with my good graces. TVA was established not only for flood control and navigation but as a "yardstick" of electric costs for regulating private-power companies. The Public Service Commission in my State of Arkansas, as well as the Federal Power Commission, regulates the involved electric rates. The SPA must sell electricity from the Government flood-control dams at rates approved by the Federal Power Commission. The SPA renders only a power marketing service. The Corps of Engineers build and operate the flood-control dams, and could distribute the electricity from that source to the rural electric cooperatives and others engaged in the power industry over transmission lines built by the engineers, the private companies, or the cooperatives at a great savings to the taxpayers. Were the SPA completely out of the power field the rural electric cooperatives could still obtain electricity from the Government flood-control dams over transmission lines owned by the Government, the private companies, or those that the cooperatives build, own, and operate themselves. Alternative sources would come from private power companies or from electric-generating plants that the cooperatives build, own, operate themselves, and tie in with the Federal power projects.

If the rural electric cooperative membership throughout this country could in some manner be given the true picture of the situation at hand, it would take no action by Congress to preclude the federalization efforts now being made through the SPA plan. A great majority of the people are aware of the Federal Government gradually encroaching more and more upon the lives, happiness, and freedom of the American people. My people do not want Federal regimentation; they will not stand for it; and so long as I am a Member of Congress I shall do all in my power to keep it from being forced upon them.

I hold no brief for the private electric utilities; recognize them as monopolies requiring strict Federal regulation and supervision; but I feel that all water, telephone, electric, fuel, and like utilities have a definite place in our economic picture, and should not be permitted to be abolished by the competition of the Federal Government. No monopoly

could ever exist so dangerous and devastating to democracy as a Federal Government monopoly.

However, you may be assured that I do hold a brief, and a strong one, for the American system of free enterprise upon which this Nation was founded and has become the greatest upon the face of this earth. It alarms me and it should concern all of us tremendously when we see the Federal Government taking steps toward nationalization, which would result eventually in a completely socialized state. The founders of American democracy never intended that we employ such a system. The great strength of America today lies in the fact that our individuals and industries have been encouraged and inspired by the right of free enterprise—the right to earn a legitimate, honest dollar without working in direct competition with the Federal Government, or without being taken over, lock, stock, and barrel, by the Federal Government.

The Southwestern Power Administration activities are of far-reaching significance—going beyond the electric-power field—going into the very heart of our right for free enterprise which was guaranteed to each and every one of us by the pioneers who built our Nation and our Government. I, for one, want to preserve that right, and the future rights of our children to which they are justly entitled by American democracy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TACKETT] never touched side, edge, or bottom of the real issue before us.

The power business is a public business. The water power of this Nation already belongs to the Federal Government. That was decided by the Supreme Court of the United States in both the Ashwander case and the Appalachian Power case.

It was 17 years ago that we had this same fight on the floor of the House. They were trying to force us to turn the power generated in the Tennessee River over to the private power interests. If we had done that, and had turned the power on the Columbia River over to them, the average householder today would be paying from 15 to 25 cents a kilowatt-hour for his electricity, and the average farmer would not have seen an electric light in his home during this generation.

He criticizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY]. We have tried for years to develop the St. Lawrence to give them a yardstick which would probably save the people of New York State $150,000,000 a year on their light and power bills.

The gentleman from Arkansas confuses the issue when he attempts to talk about private business being owned by the Government. Why, the clothing business is a private business, but the power business is a public business. Why? Because electricity has become a necessity of our modern life. It has to be handled by a monopoly and the water power already belongs to the Federal Government. It is public power to begin with, and that applies to the energy generated by the Southwest Power Administration.

So we are dealing here with a public business. As the result of the battle that we have carried on for the last 17 years, we have managed to reduce power rates to the American people, while prices of everything else has been increasing. If it had not been for these yardsticks, such as the TVA, you would not only be paying the rate you are paying now in other areas, but you would be paying twice or three times as much. The American people would be paying from two to three, and probably four, billion dollars a year more for their electricity than they are now paying. In Arkansas they had 1.2 percent of their farms electrified before 1934. Today they have more than 70 percent. Where did it come from? It came through the REA. That is where it came from.

I remember the battle I had here in 1938 to secure the first $100,000,000 for rural electrification. I just won by seven votes. If the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TACKETT] had been here, I probably would have won by only six votes. That was when the REA really began to move forward.

Now, do not forget this: There are 33,000,000 residential power consumers in this country; people who turn on electric switches every day and every night. They are not willing to be robbed and plundered by the power trust in order to gratify the cupidity of a group of monopolists in Wall Street. There are 66,000,000 voters in this country that are not going to sit idly by, even in Arkansas or in Texas—they are not going to sit by and see this monopoly overcharge them with rates that are outrageously unreasonable.

Suppose you paid as much for electricity as you do for your telephone. The telephone trust has a complete monopoly. If you paid as much for electricity as you pay for your telephone, you would probably have not more than one light in each room—if that. I put a telephone in my office at home. I paid more for that telephone, even if I never picked up the receiver, than I paid for both gas and electricity in my home. I pay more for my telephone in Washington than I pay for both gas and electricity in my apartment. If it were not for these public-power systems, such as they have in Columbus, Ohio, Springfield, Ill., Lansing, Mich., and Austin, Tex., and these public-power systems that we have along these streams such as the Tennessee and the Columbia, to keep this monopoly from getting its hands on the water power of the Nation; if it were not for that you would be paying 15 to 25 cents per kilowatt-hour, and the average farmer in this country probably would not have seen electricity in his home for the next 40 years.

I have no apology to make to the gentleman from Arkansas, I have no apology to make to the Electric Bond and Share Co., and I have no apology to make to anyone else for my fight to see that the American people get the benefit of the greatest wealth in America, outside of the soil upon which we live, that is the water power in our navigable streams and their tributaries.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance of the Bonneville transmission system and of marketing electric power and energy, $5,000,000.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JENSEN: On page 220, line 9, strike out "$5,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$4,500,000."

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, in the fiscal year 1950, we allowed $4,000,000 for operation and maintenance of the Bonneville power transmission system. Dr. Raver, the Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration, appeared before the committee to justify his 1951 request of $5,250,000. While he was testifying he told the committee how well they had been able to operate and maintain the Bonneville power system with the $4,000,000 which we had appropriated last year; and he said that everyone who was hired under this item had done a wonderful job. I asked Dr. Raver, then, if he did not think the Congress should have a little credit for holding the appropriation down to $4,000,000. They had asked for considerably more, but the committee did not see fit to give it to them. Dr. Raver, in answer to my question, said: "Yes," that he thought the Congress should have some credit and that the committee should have some credit for holding this appropriation down to $4,000,000; nevertheless, he asked for $5,250,000 in this appropriation bill. The committee reduced that to $5,000,000.

The purpose of my amendment is to reduce the amount further to $4,500,000. It is true they have more responsibilities this year than last, but not to the extent of 25 percent. This will give them better than a 10-percent increase for operation and maintenance, and I think it is only fair and just that they be held down to $4,500,000, for certainly we need to save a few million here and there in a lot of places.

The amendment is very reasonable and should be adopted by all means.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I invite the Committee's attention to the fact that the original estimate submitted by the Bureau of the Budget was $5,250,000 for operation and maintenance of the Bonneville Power Administration. Our subcommittee in its judgment saw fit to cut this item by a quarter of a million dollars, leaving the total amount available for operation and maintenance $5,000,000.

I believe it is generally agreed that the Bonneville Power Administration, under the able direction of Dr. Paul Raver, is one of the more efficient, if not the most efficient, of the agencies and bureaus

81ST CONGRESS } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES { REPORT
2d Session } { No. 2021

RESOLUTION FOR WAIVING OF POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CHAPTER XI OF H. R. 7786

MAY 8, 1950.—Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H. Res. 593]

The Committee on Rules, having had under consideration House Resolution 593, report the same to the House with the recommendation that the resolution do pass.

○

House Calendar No. 198

81ST CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. RES. 593

[Report No. 2021]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MAY 8, 1950

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following resolution; which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

---

RESOLUTION

Resolved, That during the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes, all points of order against chapter XI of said bill or any provision contained therein are hereby waived and all points of order against the following amendment to such chapter are hereby waived:

On page 425, after line 13, insert:

"SEC. 1113. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 6 of the Act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 555), or the provisions of any other law, the Secretary of State may, in his absolute discretion, during the current fiscal year, ter-

minate the employment of any officer or employee of the Department of State or of the Foreign Service of the United States whenever he shall deem such termination necessary or advisable in the interests of the United States.

"Notwithstanding the provisions of section 6 of the Act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 555), or the provisions of any other law, the Secretary of Commerce may, in his absolute discretion, during the current fiscal year, terminate the employment of any officer or employee of the Department of Commerce whenever he shall deem such termination necessary or advisable in the best interests of the United States."

House Calendar No. 198

81ST CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. RES. 593

[Report No. 2021]

RESOLUTION

Providing for the waiving of points of order against chapter XI of H. R. 7786, a bill making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and providing further for the waiving of points of order against an amendment to chapter XI, and for other purposes.

By Mr. SABATH

MAY 8, 1950

Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

and War—Watchmakers Want Tariff, Not Subsidies."

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include certain quotations.

Mr. STANLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address by Hon. John S. Battle, Governor of the State of Virginia, at the dedication of the Patrick Henry School, at Martinsville, Va.

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks made on his point of order.

Mr. BURNSIDE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. CROOK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks concerning the false charge of socialism.

Mr. MURPHY (at the request of Mr. MULTER) was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter, notwithstanding the fact that it will exceed two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $246; and also to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. TAURIELLO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter from the Secretary of State.

Mr. DONOHUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a speech delivered by Beecher E. Hess entitled "Pension Plans and Public Policy."

Mr. HINSHAW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address delivered by Hon. William C. Bullitt, notwithstanding the fact that it will exceed two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $205.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD in two instances—to include in one a letter and in the other a telegram.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include an article by Mr. Frank C. Waldrop.

Mr. NORBLAD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. GAMBLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. COUDERT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter.

Mr. TOLLEFSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include in each extraneous matter.

Mr. SMITH of Kansas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include two editorials.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances—in one to include a eulogy, in another an editorial, and in the third a newspaper item.

Mr. KEARNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a statement by the soil conservation director of Wisconsin.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include certain resolutions.

Mr. McCORMACK (at the request of Mr. LESINSKI) was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOWELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a speech.

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER IN CHAPTER XI, GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1951

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 593 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 593), as follows:

Resolved, That during the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes, all points of order against chapter XI of said bill or any provision contained therein are hereby waived and all points of order against the following amendment to such chapter are hereby waived:

On page 425, after line 13, insert:

"SEC. 1113. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 555), or the provisions of any other law, the Secretary of State may, in his absolute discretion, during the current fiscal year, terminate the employment of any officer or employee of the Department of State or of the Foreign Service of the United States whenever he shall deem such termination necessary or advisable in the interests of the United States.

"Notwithstanding the provisions of section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 555), or the provisions of any other law, the Secretary of Commerce may, in his absolute discretion, during the current fiscal year, terminate the employment of any officer or employee of the Department of Commerce whenever he shall deem such termination necessary or advisable in the best interests of the United States."

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] and now yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL] in order to explain why the committee wants this rule.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, the rule which has been presented to you is made necessary for two reasons. First, chapter XI contains what might be termed language changes on an appropriation bill; and second, restore certain language in the bill that has heretofore been stricken because of points of order. For years and years we have been creating corporations, giving them power to incur indebtedness on behalf of the Government and authorizing the Treasury Department to transfer money to them. Today such authorizations have authority to create debts against the Government in a total amount of $26,000,000,000 plus. They do not have to come to the Congress. We know nothing about the current debts they are going to create. The committee is not trying to take any power away from them. We are simply trying to write into this bill the fact that they will have to file with the Bureau of the Budget and hence with the Congress in the beginning of each year the amount of indebtedness they plan to create during that year.

The idea is that the Bureau of the Budget and the Congress at the beginning of each year should have a look at the total indebtedness to be created during ensuing fiscal year by these independent corporations, so that we can weigh that with the indebtedness we create by virtue of our appropriation bills for such fiscal year. Thus, we would have a centralized and controlling look at the total expenditures of Government so that we can have those figures in connection with our total debt which now amounts to about $256,000,000,000, bearing in mind at the same time the debt ceiling, which is at the present time $275,000,000,000, and we must remember that we are going in debt at the rate of $6,000,000,000 plus per year. We are not trying to take any power away from anybody.

Another thing that has made the rule necessary is that for many years the State Department has had a provision in its appropriation bill giving them under certain conditions and circumstances authority to discharge employees without going through the red tape of the Civil Service Commission. That provision has worked well. There has been no harm done. However, it is legislation on an appropriation bill, and when that section was reached the other day a point of order was made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO], and it was stricken from the bill because of the point of order—and rightfully so. We are asking that the rule make in order these amendments in chapter XI, that will give the State Department authority that it had during the years past, and we are going to ask that the provision which we inserted in the Department of Commerce be included. The jurisdictional subcommittees recommended these provisions, and the full committee adopted the same.

There may be a divided opinion as to whether or not we should have those controls. Maybe so. Maybe you differ with me, but the rule only gives us authority to let the majority of the Members of Congress control. That is what we are asking. Vote as you may on the amendments when we offer them to the section of the bill. But permit the majority of the Congress to decide.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL] has expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman four additional minutes.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORRELL. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. As I understand the rule, it is to waive all points of order on chapter XI.

Mr. NORRELL. That is exactly right.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman has stated what a certain section of chapter XI does, but he fails to inform the House of the provisions of section 1111, which is a rewrite of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, which has no application whatsoever to what the gentleman has just stated to the House.

Mr. NORRELL. There is nothing in chapter XI in the way of language changes that does not have something to do with what is in this bill. We are here dealing with the budget of the United States for the ensuing year. The only thing this language change does is simply to make those agencies from an administrative standpoint operate on a monthly basis, and the money that we are appropriating to them we are saying, "Now you have got to spend that money on a monthly basis." Oftentimes they have been spending it during the first 8 or 9 months and then return to Congress and say, "We have got to have some more money." Our idea is that the agencies should spend this money insofar as possible in 12 equal payments, so that we will eliminate supplemental or deficiency appropriations. Authority is given to expend the money in other periods, such as seasonal, when the work of the agency necessitates such action.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORRELL. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. Can the gentleman name some of the agencies or corporations that will be affected by this review and check, as to the ultimate results on the budget?

Mr. NORRELL. I will be glad to do that. I have a list of all the corporations before me, showing their authority to create debt as of December 31, 1949. The name and amount follows: Commodity Credit Corporation, $2,176,547,533.25; Economic Credit Corporation, $268,514,911.86; Export-Import Bank of Washington, $1,583,000,000; Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, $3,000,000,000; Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, $499,008,900; Home Owners' Loan Corporation, $1,260,638,575; Housing and Home Finance Administration—slum clearance and community development and redevelopment—$25,000,000; Panama Railroad Company, $10,000,000; Public Housing Administration, $1,163,000,000; Rural Electrification Administration—electrification, $940,000,000, and telephone, $25,000,000; Secretary of Agriculture—Farmers Home Administration program—$38,000,000; Farm Housing program, $20,000,000; Secretary of the Army, $50,000,000; Virgin Islands Corporation, $8,718,000; and agencies issuing obligations only in payment of defaulted and foreclosed insured mortgages; Federal Housing Administration, $15,559,803,963.77, and United States Maritime Commission, $200,000,000; the total being, as of December 31, 1949, $26,827,231,703.88 that these corporations can make debt for, due by the United States, without saying anything to us at all now.

We are now reaching the debt ceiling. It is time to take a look and see where we are going.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORRELL. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. Will the gentleman furnish the House answers to these two questions? What effect does this legislation on this appropriation bill have on future deficiencies?

Mr. NORRELL. The entire effort is to try to discourage, if not entirely eliminate, supplementals and deficiencies.

Mr. VINSON. Will the gentleman advise the House from what source this amendment originated? Who recommended it? What department of the Government?

Mr. NORRELL. This amendment?

Mr. VINSON. Yes.

Mr. NORRELL. This amendment comes from the executive subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. VINSON. Is it not a matter of fact that not a single budget officer in any of the departments has recommended these amendments?

Mr. NORRELL. I will not answer that so far as other Members are concerned; but so far as the gentleman from Arkansas is concerned, I never asked any department of this Government if they were interested in this. I believe it is a good amendment and I am sponsoring it and voting for it, regardless of the way they believe.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman is to be congratulated on his courage; but I think the gentleman is advocating something he does not himself understand.

Mr. NORRELL. The House can be the judge of that.

Mr. VINSON. They may agree with the gentleman, but the House will not know the effect of the amendment.

Mr. NORRELL. If they can read, they can know.

Mr. VINSON. Well, sir, I will ask the gentleman to explain to the House what section 1111 does.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Arkansas has stated House Resolution 593 provides a special rule for the consideration of title XI of the pending appropriation bill. This is a nonpolitical and a nonpartisan rule in every sense of the word, and was reported unanimously by the Committee on Rules after the members of the Appropriations Committee from both sides of the aisle had requested the rule be granted, and expressed themselves as representing the honest opinion of the Appropriations Committee.

As has been explained, the first paragraph of the rules waives points of order on title XI of the bill and does give to the Appropriations Committee of the House, and through it to the entire House itself, the opportunity and power to keep a little more strict control over public spending than in the past. Under the first paragraph of this rule the committee could go a long way toward buying an end to the rather vicious habit which has developed in many Government departments or agencies of taking the appropriation given to that department or agency by the Congress for a whole year and spending it all in 6, 7, or 8 months; and then coming up and saying to the Committee on Appropriations and to the Congress: "All our money is gone; if you expect to continue this governmental service during the last part of this year you simply have to appropriate more mone." So this rule does prevent the making of points of order against that section and provides the committee and the Congress may at least require the various agencies of the Government to expend the money appropriated for their use on a fair and somewhat equitable basis so as to last throughout the year.

I would like to have the attention of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] for a moment. As was explained to our committee—and I believe you will find this to be true—there is a provision on page 422, line 14, which would permit the national defense establishment, or any other agency of the Government, to meet emergencies involving the safety of human life, protection of property, or the welfare of our citizens, to expend appropriations more rapidly, if such be necessary to take care of the emergency. In such an emergency the gentleman's legislative committee would probably move in with the subcommittee on military appropriations of the Appropriations Committee to watch any situation which might develop and to support an additional appropriation which might prove necessary.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. That would have reference to a hay lift, dropping hay for animals, and doing other things of an emergency nature that probably the Congress should continue to have some control over. What worries me is in case of a national emergency. By this amendment here you are so circumscribing the department that it cannot meet an emergency.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I do not think that is correct. This provision is broad enough, in my opinion, to take care of any emergency, either in connection with the national defense or any other emergency or catastrophe. I do not think a hay lift would be a national emergency, however.

Mr. VINSON. We all have a high respect for the distinguished gentleman from Ohio. I would like for him as a member of the Rules Committee that granted this rule to explain to the House what section 1111, which is a rewrite of section 3679, does. If the gentleman can give the House an explanation and tell us what that will do he will stop

one voice. Now, do not tell me to read it because I am asking the gentleman to read it and tell me what it does.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If the gentleman will arrange to extend my time under the rules I would be glad to go into this in detail.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman has 30 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. No, I do not have 30 minutes, and the gentleman has already used a great proportion of my time.

Mr. VINSON. Do not dodge around.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am not dodging the issue, as the gentleman well knows, for I realize I cannot compete in that particular respect with the gentleman now on the floor of this House.

Mr. VINSON. But the gentleman is a good second.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I was simply calling his attention to a section or provision which should take away any doubts which have been in his mind.

Of course, I want to remind the gentleman of something else. I have never seen him lose very many legislative combats on the floor of this House, especially in connection with national defense questions. This rule will only take away the privilege of one individual Member making a point of order and striking out of some provision of the bill. There is nothing in the world to keep the gentleman from Georgia or anyone else from amending this section of the bill as he may desire if he has a majority of the House supporting him. The gentleman is a great expert on national defense. I know of no one in America or in the world who knows more about our national defense than does the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. Please explain the amendment.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman is a great expert, nationally, and is internationally known as such. He is the greatest expert—and I say this seriously—and the greatest civilian authority we have in America today on national defense matters. I say that with every sincerity. If the gentleman feels there is any provision in this bill that needs to be amended to protect the right of our defense officials to use military appropriations in case of a great national emergency for national security purposes, or to permit his committee and other legislative committees to come to the Congress for action in an emergency, I shall support his amendment.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Will the gentleman point out just what language in this chapter would probably be subject to a point of order that he seeks to protect?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I cannot point out all of them. There are quite a number.

Mr. HARRIS. Any particular language?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Yes, if the gentleman will just permit me to continue for a moment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I might say that I will take the floor when I get a chance and I will try to satisfy the gentleman on that point.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Where can we find hearings on this proposition?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Does the gentleman mean before the Committee on Rules?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I think we are entitled to have the hearings on it.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Well, the hearings on the appropriation bill, I understand, have been printed in different sections, but there were no hearings printed of the discussion before the Committee on Rules.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, as I understood the gentleman from Arkansas, he said that the point of order which is to be waived is one of very great importance with respect to authorizations which were given to certain agencies of the Governmen to obligate the Government with respect to payments. Now, my point is this: The legislative committees have set up various governmental corporations.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Please ask your question.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Would not this restrict those corporations from obligating the Government contrary to the authorizations that were passed upon by this House before?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Certainly, it would do that.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Then we would negative every act that we passed setting up these corporations if we adopt this amendment. In other words, we would take control over every legislative committee on matters already passed on by the House, and in this appropriation bill forbid them to obligate the Government contrary to the laws of Congress.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the regular order. I yielded only for a question and not for a speech.

Now, to answer the gentleman's question quickly, if he will give attention, let me say to him that the only control the committee could have would be according to and under the law. The Committee on Appropriations could enforce the laws and the orders of Congress, and God knows someone should enforce them in behalf of economy.

The question has been asked me by the gentleman from Arkansas as to some of the other provisions that might be subject to a point of order. The members of the Committee on Appropriations can give you item for item answers as to the first portion of the bill. In addition, if you adopt this rule, section 1113 will not be subject to a point of order. That section is the old McCarran amendment which has been in each appropriation bill for the past several years and simply gives to the Department of State, of which you heard a great deal about lately, the power to discharge persons for security reasons. Now, that language has been in the original law, and in effect, for about 5 years. The provision was stricken out of the pending bill on a point of order because it was legislation on an appropriation bill. If it is included or reinstated by adoption of this rule we will simply continue the same authority to the State Department to get rid of bad security risks that it has had in the past, and God knows it is time we at least do something about these bad security-risk employees. I understand the FBI has been making a very careful check, not only of loyalty matters in the State Department, but of other persons of vicious habits who are not good security risks and who could be discharged under this provision, but under no other.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I might say that it also provides that the Secretary of Commerce shall have the same power.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That is right.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The question I raise is this. Inasmuch as there are about 4,000 of these sexual perverts holding jobs in the Federal Government, why does the committee see fit to confine it just to the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Commerce? These homosexuals are in many departments.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I cannot answer that question. If I had my way, every department of the Government would have this right. But this proposal before us is for the reinstatement of the old McCarran amendment which has been the law for many years. If we fail or refuse to reinstate such a provision, then if any of these departments do not want to get rid of any of these undesirable individuals they can merely say, "Why, the Congress took the power to discharge them away from us."

If we are foolish enough to turn down a rule like this, and an amendment like this, and leave ourselves open to the charge that we have taken away from the State Department and from the Department of Commerce, as the gentleman mentions, the power to get rid of undesirables who are bad security risks, then the responsibility will be ours and not that of the executive branch, or at least the responsibility can be shifted onto our shoulders. I do not think we are going to do that.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Has the Department of Commerce been added this year?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. No; it was in the old law.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. McCARTHY. Does the gentleman know that the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is holding hearings on the bill H. R. 4739, which is concerned with the very thing the gentleman proposes in section 1113? Is there any emergency that would require the House to act on that now?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Certainly, because if action on this rule is not taken the present law, which gives the authority I have mentioned, will expire on June 30.

Mr. McCARTHY. But we are holding hearings and Senate action on this appropriation is at best remote.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. You have held a great many hearings on many bills which have not become law. But this rule is the way to get immediate action. You can and should bring in your bill to provide a permanent law to meet this situation in every Government agency, and I hope you take some such action soon.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. I think it is pretty clear about the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Commerce, but in reading this resolution I do not get the point of what the gentleman means by fiscal controls on these independent corporations.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That will be explained in detail by the committee members, but, as I understand, we appropriate money to Government corporations, or make loans to them, and authorize them to do certain things. This simply gives the Appropriations Committee the authority to check and be sure the fiscal policies of these corporations are such that they do not spend all the money the Congress grants them in the first few months of the year and then come back and say, "We can no longer carry on because all our money is gone." Instead, they have to sort of spread their operations out over the year, and thus carry out the intent of the Congress.

Mr. CARROLL. That is contained in this resolution.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Yes.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. I take this occasion to commend the members of the Committee on Rules for granting this rule and bringing it here, because it restores to the various departments the right to get rid of these individuals concerning whom there has been so much criticism. I cannot see any reason for any type of debate on the subject. We should get rid of them. We should give that power to these departments and have the Congress behind it. I certainly want to commend the Committee on Rules openly on this floor for granting the rule.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman from Michigan. Let me reiterate that this report was a unanimous action by the Committee on Rules, supported by men of both parties. It is not a political or partisan matter at all. We approved a unanimous request of the Committee on Appropriations. I say to you with all the conviction at my command that not only should we give this authority to these departments to get rid of bad security risks and undesirables in the Government service but we should also give to the Appropriation Committee, as the only committee I know of in the House that can properly police and supervise the money we appropriate, the power to have some sort of check-rein on the expenditures made by the various agencies and departments of the Government.

If we here in the Congress simply appropriate public money and then do not pay any attention to how it is spent, we are failing in our duty.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. Am I correct in the assumption and in my understanding of the statement of the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas that what is sought to be accomplished by one provision of this rule is to give the Committee on Appropriations and the Congress the opportunity to look at the operation of these Government corporations that do not operate on direct appropriations, but which are given the authority to transfer their bonds directly to the Treasury and thus secure the money to carry on their operations without any look or supervision so far as the Congress is concerned at the expenditure of those funds?

Am I correct in the understanding?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman is correct. Of course, by doing that, these corporations do obligate us and the taxpayers of the country. The gentleman is also correct when he says that the Committee on Appropriations acts for the whole Congress. It is the only agency the Congress and the people have which can properly supervise and watch these financial transactions.

Mr. KEEFE. If this authority is given, it does not mean that the Committee on Appropriations can change any basic law or activity which has been granted to the corporation.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Or any act of the Congress, for that matter.

Mr. KEEFE. Yes, or any act of the Congress. But it will give the Committee on Appropriations the power to look into the matter and report back to the Congress so that we may be able to determine if the legislation is needed.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. Does the gentleman not think that the legislative committee which created these corporations should at least not be precluded from having a voice in the matter? Why should this additional authority be delegated to the Committee on Appropriations entirely?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. May I reply to the gentleman?

Mr. VINSON. Yes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. As I understand it, the Committee on Appropriations does have the primary control over appropriations. The various legislative committees, such as the committee of which the gentleman from Georgia is chairman, has control over legislative matters and authorizations. The Committee on Appropriations cannot change any law. It can only check on how the money appropriated by Congress is being spent. The gentleman's committee, as well as every other legislative committee, under the provisions of the Reorganization Act, does have authority to check on whether the law is being violated by agencies coming under its jurisdiction. That does give your committee the power to control the situation.

Mr. VINSON. But the law is being changed by this very amendment.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I regret I cannot agree, or take up the time of the House further. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, let the House understand the situation exactly. The Committee on Rules has reported a rule making chapter XI in order. There are a great many good things in chapter XI. Some of them may not be subject to a point of order and some may be subject to a point of order. What is the origin of it? No hearing was ever had by a single committee of the Congress, not even the Committee on Appropriations, as to what is contained in chaper XI. This is the way it came about. The distinguished gentleman of the Committee on Appropriations, which constitutes, you might say, the advisory group of the Appropriations Committee, designated as the Deficiency Subcommittee, wrote in this legislation after those committees had their hearings. I say that, in reference to these corporations which have been created by the Congress, they may be justified in doing something like that, but there are certain phases here concerning which no fiscal man in the Government knows what was in their minds. I submitted section 1111 to a qualified man in the Department of National Defense to advise me what it was. He said he did not know. I asked the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] to tell us what it does. He does not know. Let me try to tell you as much as I know about it.

There are two points in this bill against which I intend to raise a point of order. One is on page 418, section 1111, which is a revision of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes. The Revised Statutes say this:

> No department of Government shall spend in any one fiscal year any sum in excess of appropriations made by the Congress for the fiscal year, or involve the Government in any contract for the future payment of money in excess of such appropriation.

Here are about 15 pages of a rewrite of that section. I have submitted it to my staff officials who are qualified. I submitted it to the budget man in the Department of National Defense. They sent it back to me, "We do not know what it means." Now, here you are being asked to make it in order. If this is rejected, I propose to make a point of

order on that because it is legislation. I am doing it because none of us who has to deal with these matters knows what it means. No hearing was had by the Appropriations Committee.

The distinguished gentlemen here, Mr. CANNON, Mr. TABER, and these learned members of the Appropriations Committee, outstanding Members of this House—and I follow them 99 times out of 100—they wrote this in without calling on the men in the various departments to see the effect of it.

Now there is another amendment here against which I desired to raise a point of order. This is section 601:

No funds withdrawn and credited pursuant to section 601 of the act of 1930, as amended, shall be available for any period beyond that provided by the act appropriating such funds.

What is the effect of that? The effect is that funds appropriated remain available under the law today for the year they are appropriated and 2 years thereafter. The effect of this amendment is to say they must be obligated in that 1 year. If you adopt that, then you will stymie the research and development that is going on in this country, because the obligations must be made in advance.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. TABER. The reason that is in there is because department after department has been transferring funds from one fund to another for the purpose of making the funds available for a longer period than the statute allows.

Mr. VINSON. Does not the gentleman know that the law today prohibits funds being transferred from one appropriation to another? This goes even further. This is retroactive, as far as the national defense, concerning one branch of it, is concerned. Some $60,000,000 that has been obligated for research and scientific development is cut out by this amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. VINSON. The sensible thing to do is to defeat this rule, and when the sections are reached in this chapter, let us consider each one on its merits. I have grave doubt that there are any other items in this bill subject to a point of order except the two that I propose to raise.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Just for me to point out two errors that the gentleman has made in his remarks. First, I did not say that this could not be explained. I said that it would take some time, and that the gentlemen on the committee could explain it in greater detail than I. Second, the gentleman, of course, indicates that unless this rule is defeated there can be no amendments to this section. The gentleman knows that if he can convince the House, after this rule is adopted, that any portion of it should be amended, it will be amended, and the gentleman can offer any amendment he pleases.

Mr. VINSON. There are certain sections here that are good and helpful, but I am pointing out to you the importance of this section that I am calling attention to. There was no hearing before the Appropriations Committee. It was the brain child of these distinguished men, and, of course, they are proud of their handiwork. But what do you know about the handiwork? What do you know about what is going to happen? The gentleman admits there cannot be a deficiency. So they are asking you to tie your hands by adopting this rule. I ask you to vote it down. I say there will be but two points of order made to chapter XI.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has again expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I believe there is a misapprehension as to the meaning of the amendments that the Committee on Appropriations wishes to offer to the bill and that, therefore, the fears which we hear expressed are not well-founded. I have the feeling that we are not dealing quite fairly—certainly not generously—with the great Committee on Appropriations of this House in the debate that is being conducted here this morning. The committee came before the Committee on Rules and asked for this rule in order to accommodate the need of protecting the integrity of the bill. They explained patiently to the Committee on Rules that the adoption of these amendments to which reference has been made would not prevent the consideration of deficiency appropriation measures, but would only discourage the handling of funds appropriated in such manner as to create needs for deficiency appropriations. They further explained that they needed the language stricken by the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] restored in order that the heads of departments of the Government might exercise a very proper power of discharging unsatisfactory employees upon the basis of their own judgment without having to go through the proceedings now necessary. The adoption of the pending resolution would, in my opinion, be in the public interest.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to correct a typographical error in the resolution: That the figure "1950" in the third line of the resolution be changed to "1951."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the first six subsections are routine sections that have been in the Independent Offices bill for many years, and there is no change in those items. I would assume that there would be no objection there.

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

Mr. TABER. Section 1107 is a prohibition on the construction of office buildings or making loans for office buildings, which is a very proper provision.

Mr. VINSON. There is no objection to that.

Mr. TABER. The next section relates to tort claims, and I believe there is no objection to that.

Mr. VINSON. Not a bit. I ask the gentleman to proceed now to section 1110, the last proviso only.

Mr. TABER. Section 1110. That is designed all the way through to prevent the practice of governmental agencies transferring funds between bureaus in their own agency for the purpose of making funds available for more than a year when Congress intended that they should be kept within the year. If the gentleman has a constructive amendment to that, instead of objecting to the rule he should prepare that amendment and submit it. What is the gentleman's objection?

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. Let me read to the gentleman just briefly what law he is correcting:

Advance payments credited to special working funds shall remain available to the procuring agency for entering into contracts and other uses during the fiscal year or years for which the appropriation involved was made and thereafter until said appropriation lapses under the law to the surplus fund of the Treasury.

The effect of that is that under the law you could not make appropriations for 1 year plus the 2 years. With that amendment in here you would make appropriations for only 1 year.

Mr. TABER. If they do not contract for it within the year, they should not be permitted to go ahead.

Mr. VINSON. But this is retroactive and it catches $60,000,000 right today.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman may offer an amendment, if he wants to, and have that considered. That would be the way to treat it rather than to try to vote down the rule.

Section 1111 is the antideficiency statute designed to prevent expenditure by governmental agencies of funds in such a way that they create a deficiency and then come back and ask for more money. If they have some project that they should like to take up, that has not been provided for, we want to provide that they can come back to the Congress and get the money. It is a very desirable thing.

Mr. VINSON. Was there ever a hearing held by anyone and did I not state the origin of it correctly?

Mr. TABER. There was no hearing, I will admit that. On the other hand, this has been taken up at length with the Bureau of the Budget and its drafting has been gone over very carefully with the Bureau of the Budget so that any suggestions they might have on it would be thoroughly considered. The subcommittee that considered it laid it over a couple of days, over a week end, if I am not mistaken, so that the members of that subcommittee could have an opportunity to study it. For my own

part, I spent practically the whole week end studying it.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. It is a fact, is it not, and especially so with respect to appropriations for the national defense, that the Congress frequently in making appropriations puts in the provision that the funds are to remain available until expended?

Mr. TABER. That is true on some things. We are not allowed under the Constitution to make appropriations for the Army for more than 2 years.

Mr. KEEFE. And when that language is contained in the bill "for not more than 2 years" it would govern over and above the provisions of this amendment which the gentleman from Georgia objects to, would it not?

Mr. TABER. The constitutional provision would cover that.

Mr. VINSON. Let me ask you this one question, then I am through. What effect on deficiencies as written in this section will there be on the Atomic Energy Commission and atomic-energy work?

Mr. TABER. It will not have any effect.

Mr. VINSON. It has the effect of tying it up.

Mr. TABER. Oh, no. It might make them obey the law, and it might make them do things in an orderly way instead of going about it haphazardly.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. Is it not a fact that if this language with respect to the dismissal of employees had not been in previous appropriation bills it would have been impossible for Mr. Peurifoy in his campaign to get rid of undesirables in the State Department and to discharge the large number that have already been discharged?

Mr. TABER. And it would have been impossible for the Secretary of Commerce to get rid of people in his department. It is a very desirable provision.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Is it not a fact in recent years and in instance after instance that a department or agency has literally flouted the antideficiency law, thereby depriving the Congress of proper control over appropriations?

Mr. TABER. That is right. That has been done repeatedly.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. All this section aims to do is to control that proposition?

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. If that section is all right for the State Department and Commerce Department, why is it not good for all departments of the Government?

Mr. TABER. For my own part, I would be willing to have it cover all departments.

Mr. VINSON. I raise no objection to those two sections. The only one I referred to was the deficiency section, which the gentleman admits the objective is to wipe our deficiencies. You cannot run this Government without deficiencies.

Mr. TABER. I did not say that I would not have any deficiencies. I never made that statement.

Mr. VINSON. Of course, it goes to the extent where it is almost impossible to have a deficiency.

Mr. TABER. I do not want them to have the right to create deficiencies, and if anybody has any respect for the Congress of the United States he does not want the departments to run wild and create deficiencies. That is one of the reasons why the financial condition of the United States is as bad as it is, because they do not pay attention to the things that the Congress of the United States has provided.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Is not the question one of whether a deficiency should be created, and then they should come to the Congress and ask for reimbursement, or whether, seeing that the money would not last for the necessary expenditures, to come up and notify the Congress?

Mr. TABER. That is what I said, to start with, that I wanted those people, instead of creating deficiencies, to come up here in advance of their expenditures and ask the Congress for the money in the regular way.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. The gentleman will recall when I was chairman of the Armed Services Subcommittee, Army and Air Force, I had a detailed statement made of over $5,000,000,000 of expenditures for 1946 and prior years, and that of that sum some $2,000,000,000 was used, in part, to build those $74,000 houses in Alaska. We did not find out about these houses until the money was spent.

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I wish the gentleman would explain what effect this would have upon the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. TABER. It would not be able to build an office building unless it came to the Congress and got authority, and it ought not to be allowed to.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. They do not know just how much they will have to obtain, because it depends upon the size of the crop.

Mr. TABER. If they are going to have an office building they ought to come in here and get authority.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND].

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I am of the belief that this is a very, very dangerous resolution for us to adopt. I have two specific reasons for saying that. In the first place it appears that the Committee on Appropriations is usurping the prerogatives of practically every legislative committee in the House. In the second place, section 1111, the antideficiency section, is giving me a great deal of trouble.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORAND. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. When I was on the floor the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] asked me what effect this would have on the Commodity Credit Corporation, and my answer was that the only effect it would have would be to prevent them from building an office building unless they came to the Congress and got authority to do it.

Mr. FORAND. Now, coming back to section 1111, Mr. Speaker, the antideficiency section, I assure you that as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means I do not like deficiency appropriations; I do not like any kind of deficiencies, because we have had headaches trying to raise the revenue to meet the need.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORAND. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I would like to ask the gentleman from New York whether this resolution will affect the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. TABER. Not a bit.

Mr. FORAND. I am sorry I cannot yield for a colloquy.

Mr. Speaker, it is very, very important from the point of view of public assistance that this resolution be defeated and that chapter 11 be stricken from this appropriation bill, because if we fail to do that, and the restrictions of section 1111 apply to old-age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to the dependent children, we are going to be in an awful mess. Remember that under the Social Security Act the Federal Government obligates itself to reimburse the States for part of the cost of grants made to individuals who are aged, blind, and to dependent children up to a specific money ceiling set in the law and for 50 percent of the cost of administering these programs. Since it is extremely difficult to anticipate how many individuals will apply for assistance in any given period and since the Federal grant is made in the form of reimbursement for expenses already incurred on the assumption that Federal aid to the amount necessary will be made each year, it is extremely difficult to estimate what that will be.

For the past several years it has therefore been necessary for the Federal Security Administration to request a deficiency appropriation, which has always been granted without question, since it was considered to fulfill the contractual obligations of the Federal Government toward the States.

It is extremely important to the State welfare agencies and to the millions of needy aged people and other dependents upon assistance that this obligation be fulfilled without question.

The language of subsection (B) appears to give the Budget Bureau discretionary authority to exempt assistance grants from this prohibition, but there is a grave question as to whether or not it would provide reimbursement for administrative expenses, if it is impossible to get the grants for the individual needs.

Even if we get the grants for the individual needs, what assurance have we that the administrative cost will always be taken care of? Under those circumstances, I say to you that you cannot administer welfare of one type or another without administration, and administration costs money.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORAND. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I appeared before the Committee on Rules yesterday in opposition to this rule. At that time I heard the presentation of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL]. I can assure the House, and I believe I am accurate in saying this, that their testimony did not occupy over 20 minutes in asking for this rule. My testimony against it occupied only 2 or 3 minutes. At that time I was given the explanation on this point that these different departments could come before the Congress and get their deficiency appropriations just the same. I accepted that at the time, but I got to thinking it over later and studying it, and I decided that would be impossible for a department to obtain a deficiency appropriation if the Congress was not in session, during the time that that deficiency might arise. Therefore, I agree with the gentleman and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] that this is a dangerous rule to adopt. Under our form of annual budgeting we cannot foresee emergency deficits, because our budgets are prepared 18 months in advance.

Mr. FORAND. I can say to the gentleman that if there is anybody in this House that has administered welfare at one time or another he knows very well that you cannot anticipate the needs.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the argument of the last speaker I would refer him to subsection (e) on page 422 of the bill. The only part of this legislation on which his argument has any bearing at all is that portion dealing with administrative expenses of the agencies to which he refers. Not one other thing is affected by the proposed provision. He will find if he reads in that paragraph the following language: "emergencies involving the safety of human life, the protection of property, or the immediate welfare of individuals in cases where an appropriation has been made to enable the United States to make payment of, or contributions toward, sums which are required to be paid to individuals either in specific amounts fixed by law or in accordance with formulae prescribed by law."

That exemption takes care of them. Let no one drag in the kind of an argument that tells you we are not going to take care of our old people or the orphans and the children of this country. That sort of charge cannot be pinned on the Committee on Appropriations either individually or collectively and we are surprised that such a point should be raised against the committee which functions in the manner that it does and performs the work that it does as has been well exemplified during the period of weeks we have been before the House on this bill.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, the two most important questions before the country are, first, deficit spending and impending national bankruptcy; and, second, alleged Communists, pinkos, and Reds, and what-have-you in the departments of Government. We hear a great deal about economy and the necessity for economy. There is no man on the floor of the House who does not realize that we have to have some economy somewhere along the line, or we are going into national bankruptcy. Here is an opportunity to have a little economy. That is the purpose of one provision of the resolution. It gives the great Committee on Appropriations, which committee consists of some 45 Members of the House, all well-balanced, level-headed men, an opportunity to keep a check upon the situation and discourage this system of coming in after a $40,000,000,000 appropriation has been made with additional requests for additional deficiency appropriations. It does not stop this practice, but it has a tendency to discourage it.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield for a question.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Is it not a fact today, as it has been for many years, that under the antideficiency law it is a criminal offense subjecting any department head or agency head to removal from office and to a fine if he incurs a deficiency before coming before the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. COLMER. That is my understanding.

Mr. Speaker, I am afraid we are raising a strawman here today to defeat the real objective which we all want. Here is our good and learned friend, the able chairman of the Committee on Armed Services the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], the most effective man, I suspect, in the House when it comes to getting his legislation through. He has a subject in which everyone is interested. I am sure my friend knows if the national welfare of this country, from a defense standpoint, is affected he could come here with 5 minutes' notice and get whatever funds might be necessary to put his program across.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. Does the gentleman think it is a healthy way for the committee to legislate, for five men to sit behind closed doors without having any hearings and yet bring in legislation of such far-reaching importance.

Mr. COLMER. May I say to my distinguished friend, if that is the only objection he has to this resolution, it is a very, very weak one. Ordinarily he resorts to more powerful arguments. I am not interested in the method of procedure. I am interested in the results that this rule is intended to bring about and which we all hope to get.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I hope the gentleman, before his time expires, might dwell on that phase of the amendment that has to do with arming the heads of departments with certain powers.

Mr. COLMER. I thank my friend for the suggestion.

Mr. Speaker, as I said in my premise, this is a two-barreled proposition. The papers are full, the committee hearings are full, and the well of the House of Representatives is filled every day with Members getting up and charging the head of these various departments with being derelict in their duty in not getting rid of these pinkos and reds in the departments. And yet here is an opportunity to give them a weapon to clean their own house, without the Congress having to do it. Are we going to say here today that we are going to deny them that, and at the same time assail them for not doing their job?

Permit me to say to my colleagues that this House will be derelict in its duty today if it fails to take this opportunity to do something about deficit spending on the one hand and the undesirable security risks in the personnel of the Government agencies on the other.

The time to act is now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] has expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. VINSON) there were—ayes 137, noes 40.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and eighteen Members are present; a quorum.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1951

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I renew my motion that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of H. R. 7786, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate and consideration of amendments to chapter IX of the pending bill were concluded on yesterday. The Clerk will begin reading chapter X on page 345, line 1, of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Armed Forces Policy Council, the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Joint Staff, the Munitions Board, and the Research and Development Board, including personal services in the District of Columbia; purchase (not to exceed four, including one at not to exceed $3,000) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; and not to exceed $50,000 for emergency and extraordinary expenses, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of Defense for such purposes as he deems proper, and his determination thereon shall be final and conclusive; $11,000,000.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, on April 4 of this year when the Committee of the Whole began its debate upon the pending appropriations bill the very distinguished and able gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], chairman of this subcommittee, made what is probably one of the most important statements that one could make on this subject. On page 4750 of the RECORD the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] stated as follows:

Our air power, great as it is, and our Navy and our Army, great as they are, are not the things that strike terror to the heart of the enemy today and preserve the peace. These things contribute. The thing that makes America the foremost leader of all the world today is America's industrial potential, America's capacity to fight back and continue to fight back until victory has been achieved. That is what the enemy fears, and anything that enters into the body of this America and destroys the pulsing industrial heart of America is something dangerous indeed.

Mr. Chairman, no truer words could have been spoken than were stated by the gentleman from Texas at that time. It is quite true, and unfortunately so, that the Russian Government does not fear our Army, our Navy, nor our Air Force, but they do fear our great industrial potential. That, Mr. Chairman, is the reason why if a D-day ever occurs in this country, our opponents on that unhappy occasion would strike directly at the industrial potential of this country and try to lay it low on the first blow.

I have brought here a chart which is illustrative of the industrial potential of the United States in respect to the production of aircraft. This chart was prepared for me in the Pentagon Building and is not the product of idle chatter. I would like to call you attention to that chart and to show you what it takes to build from mere industrial potential into the power of production itself.

If you will notice on the chart, it is divided into years and into half years, and the vertical scale is the production of airplanes in terms of millions of pounds of airframe per month. The peak at the top of the chart represents 111,000,000 airplane pounds production per month.

If you will examine this side of the chart, which was July 1 of 1940, after war had been declared in Europe, that was the time when President Roosevelt gave the go-ahead on the so-called 50,000 plane production program. At that time the monthly production rate of aircraft was 2,400,000 pounds per month.

Now, notice how long it took to get up to this point, which is about 12,000,000 pounds per month. It took a year and a half. The production rate was a great deal lower than that previously, and if it had not been for British orders for 800 reconnaissance aircraft in 1938, the production rate would not have been 2,400,000 pounds at the end of June 1940. It started away back at a very low rate. But, you see that the production rate even with the all-out-go-ahead program took a matter of three and a half, nearly nearly 3¾ years, to reach its peak.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Can the gentleman translate into number of planes the number of pounds that he is speaking about?

Mr. HINSHAW. No; the reason being that planes come in such varying sizes, from the very small to the very large, it is not possible to translate airframe pounds into terms of number of airplanes except on an average basis under given circumstances.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. I notice on the chart there that the go-ahead sign in June of 1940 was for 50,000 planes. Can the gentleman tell us approximately when we achieved that objective?

Mr. HINSHAW. I think we achieved it and passed it before the war was over. That was the total number; not an annual rate. But, my purpose in bringing you this chart is to show you how long it takes to get started on this production program.

Here comes the 7th of December 1941, and that shows you where we were in the production program for aircraft. It was not until we got clear up to late 1943 in the production program that we began to be effective in our war against the Nazi-Goering Luftwaffe, if you please. In the ensuing year with an enormous Air Force it was possible for us to overwhelm the Nazi air power, to get at its vitals—its aircraft and fuel production potential—and destroy it. Then came VE-day, and shortly after that VJ-day, and you will notice the precipitous drop in production to about 2,000,000 pounds per month on the far end of the chart, and that is about where we are today. We are back again on the 2,000,000 pounds per month basis.

I bring this chart to you because I want to show you and demonstrate to the committee, if I can, that production potential is a great thing, but when you are attacked the next time, you are going to be attacked at home and not in Europe. You are not going to have other peoples defend you for a year and a half or 2 or 3 years waiting for your production potential to get into operation. The attack will come direct at the heart of your production potential and the effort will be made to knock it out right then and there. If that happens, then we will wish we had airplanes and not potential airplanes.

Now, I want to show you something else. Suppose that VJ-day came at this point, and that it is June 30 of this year. What would happen? Immediately you start into an attrition rate, and your attrition losses will run on a curve something like that, up to a point in here someplace, and this great area, which shows as a big blank space on this chart, is supposed to represent the aircraft that you have in storage, because without aircraft in storage you are unable to replace the attrition losses except from production which you do not have. But we have nothing but World War II aircraft in storage. So as our modern aircraft are shot down or damaged we would have to trot out the P–51's and others of that vintage to meet attrition losses. That would surely be a second-best Air Force, but slightly better than none. When you bring this attrition line in time over to meet your rising production line, then you are beginning to come on even terms with your enemy. From there on you may be able to overwhelm him if he has not already crippled your aircraft-production potential.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman is one of the country's outstanding engineers and has made a great contribution to the Congress and the Nation on these things. Is there any formula or method whereby you can maintain your production potential and still not have such a huge investment in obsolescence?

Mr. HINSHAW. Let me just talk about that briefly. I want to quote to you from the Semiannual Report of the

tee of the Whole today and include extraneous excerpts.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend the remarks he expects to make in Committee of the Whole today and include extraneous material.

Mr. CLEMENTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a resolution.

GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1951

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7786, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. Permit the Chair to make an announcement. Before rising on yesterday the Chair had recognized the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] to offer an amendment, on page 411, following line 21 of the bill.

The Clerk will now report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. THOMAS: On page 411, following line 21, insert a new chapter, as follows:

"CHAPTER X–A. GENERAL REDUCTIONS IN APPROPRIATIONS AND CONTRACT AUTHORIZATIONS

"Reductions in appropriations and contract authorizations contained in this act are hereby made in the sum of $500,000,000 [and the President is hereby authorized, with the aid and assistance of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, to make such reductions totaling $500,000,000 in appropriations and contract authorizations contained in this act, including funds for Government corporations:] *Provided,* That such reductions shall not be applied to appropriations and contract authorizations hereinbefore provided for expenditure for (1) construction and alteration of ships, new airplanes, new weapons and other equipment for the armed services, and (2) research and development conducted primarily for the benefit of the armed services: *Provided further,* That no appropriation, contract authorization, or other fund, hereinbefore provided, shall be reduced by more than 15 percent of the amount provided for such purpose in this act."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RANKIN moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. Chairman, before we take final action on this omnibus appropriations bill, I ask the indulgence of the House to make a brief observation.

For several weeks we have been laboring with this huge appropriations bill. It is huge both in text matter and in the amount of money it appropriates. It is one of the, if not the most important measure to come before us. In this bill we are determining the country's fiscal policy for next year. The distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Missouri, accurately expressed it in his opening speech when he said this is a tax-appropriation measure. What we spend by this bill must necessarily come from the taxpayers.

First of all, I wish to express sincere appreciation to those on our side of the aisle who have been here regularly on the floor, day after day, during the reading of the bill. And I think all of us appreciate the tremendous job that the entire membership of the Committee on Appropriations, from both sides of the aisle, has had in presenting this bill.

I particularly wish to commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the ranking minority member of the committee, for his tireless efforts to reduce the proposed expenditures. He, and some others with him, have pointed out innumerable places where savings could be made. But unfortunately, in those efforts our Democratic friends on the other side of the aisle have given us practically no support.

In saying this I am not unmindful that certain individual Members—all too few from the controlling majority—have sought to assist us in these economy efforts. But I think the country should know why it is, after 4 weeks of work, we now have up to this moment a bill appropriating more money than the bill as reported by the committee.

It is true that $350,000,000 have been added for defense purposes. But one would think that with these extraordinary defense demands the House would make even greater effort to make savings elsewhere in the national budget.

Mr. Chairman, the country is deeply disturbed about what has taken place these last several weeks in connection with this bill. This morning I received a letter from a young man in my district in which he says: "Congress seems to me to be nothing but a bunch of people who talk about a balanced budget and when it comes to a vote the sky is the limit."

I think he expresses the sentiment of the majority of the American people. And I also think what he says applies with great force to our Democratic friends.

During the reading of this bill 45 amendments have been offered to increase items of expenditures, and 35 of them came from the Democratic side of the aisle. And with enthusiastic support from that side of the aisle, 18 of them were adopted.

And here is an astounding fact that the country should know. Thirty-six amendments have been offered to reduce various items, and only five of such reduction amendments came from the Democratic side. In other words, 31 of the 36 amendments making cuts came from the Republican side.

But the savings realized in this bill are small indeed when compared to the substantial savings that would be realized by the 26 amendments offered from the Republican side of the aisle, which were summarily rejected. They had practically no support from our Democratic friends.

As accurately as circumstances would permit, I have observed how the House voted on the teller votes. After hearing all this fine talk about economy, I have been amazed at the lack of support received from our Democratic friends. It is understandable why the 26 reduction amendments from our side were rejected and only 5 adopted when you know that on the average, only five Democrats voted with us on teller votes for the respective reductions.

That is the record to date. We are now approaching the final vote. That will be the acid test. That is when each and every Member will be called upon to make good to his people his promises to cut Government spending. That is when the taxpayers will learn who is actually for, and who is actually against economy.

Those who vote for the astronomical sum carried in this bill will be voting to continue deficit spending and a continuation of the existing high taxes. Those who vote to reduce the amount for purposes other than our national defense will be voting to strengthen our first line of defense, which is our financial stability.

On these votes, as our names are individually called, the people we represent will at long last know exactly where each of us stand on the vital issue of economy.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my motion.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CANNON as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. THOMAS: On page 411, after line 21, insert the following:

"In apportioning funds for the fiscal year 1951, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall place in reserve not less than 5 percent of the amounts available for administrative expenses and such reserves shall not be released for expenditure unless the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall certify that maintenance of essential Government service so requires."

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment submitted by the gentleman from Missouri on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill, that it adds ad-

ditional duties to be performed by an executive officer of the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. CANNON. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] has offered a substitute amendment which has been reported. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] has made a point of order against the amendment.

The Chair has examined the amendment very carefully and is of the opinion that the amendment is in order as a substitute for the Thomas amendment. The Chair might point out that the Thomas amendment contained some legislative features. The substitute offered by the gentleman from Missouri is germane and does not, in the opinion of the Chair, add any additional legislation. The Chair, therefore, overrules the point of order.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, we are nearing the close of the consideration of a long and detailed bill. Seldom has an appropriation bill been so well processed as to pass the House with so few amendments.

The bill as reported by the committee and as passed by the House up to this point, reduces the budget estimates approximately one and a half billion dollars in cash and contract authorizations.

Due to the presentation of the annual appropriations in one bill we have this year been able to defeat proposals to increase expenditure and efforts to add unwarranted appropriations which in former years we had to accept when presented as amendments to separate bills.

But even at that, Mr. Chairman, we still desire to effect any further reduction in expenditures which may be possible at the close of the reading of the bill. And with that thought in mind we now offer in addition to the economies already effected in the bill as a substitute to the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] the motion which I send to the desk. It proposes a further 5 percent reduction in administrative expenses to be held in reserve unless the Director of the Budget finds it, or some portion of it, necessary to the maintenance of essential Government service.

The proposal submitted by the gentleman from Texas, of course, is untenable. It turns over to the President work which the Congress ought to do, it is an abdication by the legislative branch to the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman tell the committee what that 5 percent would amount to in total in administrative expenses? Has the gentleman figured that up?

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman realizes it would be difficult, if not impossible at this stage of the bill, to estimate accurately the amount involved. It has been variously estimated at a minimum of $250,000,000 and may be expected to run beyond that figure. But it is merely a matter of estimate at this time.

Mr. STEFAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. Is not the Bureau of the Budget an agency of the executive branch of our Government? Does not the amendment offered by the gentleman turn over to the executive branch the responsibilities for these cuts?

Mr. CANNON. The executive branch of the Government may impound, and does impound, appropriations at will. But by this amendment the Congress makes mandatory the sequestering of 5 percent whether the executive branch of the Government chooses to exercise its prerogative or not.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. My question is this: The proposed substitute states that there shall be placed in reserve not less than 5 percent. Would it be possible, or even probable, that 15 percent or 20 percent might be placed in reserve?

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman understands that the President may impound any percentage, and he has done that in the very recent past. But, this amendment provides that he shall impound not less than 5 percent.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. May I ask further, has not that authority been exercised by the President rather than by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget in the past?

Mr. CANNON. It has been exercised by the President and it can be exercised by the President in the future, but we provide here that sequestration shall be mandatory and that funds so impounded shall not be released or expended unless the Director of the Budget finds it necessary to the maintenance of the essential services of the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, let me address myself briefly to the contents and the purposes of my amendment. In the first place, it reduces the appropriations in this bill, which now total $29,500,000,000 by, approximately, $500,000,000. We all know that there are some untouchable items in this bill. Among the untouchable items are the fixed obligations, the debts of the Government, if you please, such as social security, amounting to about $2,000,000,000; veterans' hospitals, veterans' benefits, pensions, and so forth, amounting to approximately another $4,500,000,000; and various other items, and then on top of those untouchables we specifically say in this amendment that the armed services modernization of the Navy, new ships, guns, tanks, and weapons and research and development shall not be touched at all. When you add all of those you have out of that $29,500,000,000 about $16,000,000,000 that you can cut. So, this $500,000,000 in truth and in fact, after subtracting those nontouchable items, including national defense weapons, will figure out a little less than 3 percent. Then, as a further safeguard, we provide that no item can be reduced as it now stands in this bill more than 15 percent. In this day and time when we are all talking economy, and we all want economy, let us be perfectly frank about it, the great Committee on Ways and Means is working day and night in response to the demand from big business and little business and every consumer in this country to reduce taxes.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. Who would determine what cuts were to be made, and from what items the cuts were to come?

Mr. THOMAS. We put that directly in the hands of the President of the United States, who prepared this whole budget of $42,000,000,000. He has a staff of over 300 people, and they are the ones who sent it to us. I do not think they know quite as much about it as we do, but, let us be frank about it, they certainly know something because they prepared it in the first place.

There is a tremendous demand from everybody in this country for a little economy. If hearsay is worth anything to us, our great Committee on Ways and Means is working day and night and is about to give industry and the consumers some relief, in the neighborhood, if the newspapers are correct, of from $700,000,000 to $1,000,000,000; and I am for it. We have to help that great committee a little bit, and this is an opportunity to cut this bill $500,000,000. It makes sense.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Would the gentleman have any opposition to increasing the $500,000,000 in his amendment to $1,000,000,000, so as to really do a fairly decent job?

Mr. THOMAS. I think $500,000,000 is a good start.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman admits it is only a 3-percent cut. Certainly we can do a little better than that, and make it 6 percent.

Mr. THOMAS. Let us do 3 percent, and show the people we are trying to do something.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PRESTON. I fail to see how the gentleman's amendment would exempt agriculture. Will the gentleman explain how the agricultural appropriation bill would be affected?

Mr. THOMAS. It is good old common horse sense. We have passed some laws around here and have obligated ourselves to do certain things. If my memory serves me correctly, those obligations

are about $450,000,000. It is like social security, it is like veterans' benefits. Every time the President sends up a message he tells us that here are certain fixed obligations, and we cannot cut them. I do not want you to cut anything like that. Just cut those items that are not fixed obligations.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in order that we may try to see if we understand the true facts with respect to the bill that is now before us, did I correctly understand the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to state that the action of the committee and the action of the Committee of the Whole, as the bill now reaches its final form, have resulted in cutting this bill $1,500,000,000 under the estimates of the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. CANNON. The amount of the bill under the budget in cash is in round figures one and one-third billion dollars.

In addition sufficient contract authorization is canceled to bring the reduction $1,500,000,000 below the budget estimate.

Mr. KEEFE. I think the gentleman is in error in his estimates on this and the Members of the House should understand the situation.

Mr. CANNON. It is not a matter of opinion. It is only necessary to look at the tabulation to be found in the committee report, on page 6.

Mr. KEEFE. As I understand the situation, when the bill came to Congress from the Committee on Appropriations it suggested reductions below the budget estimate in round figures of $1,500,000,000. That is correct, is it not?

Now then, in the consideration of this bill by the House we have made additions of $485,000,000 in round figures.

I am not talking about the budget estimates; $350,000,000 of that is covered by the budget estimates for the armed services. But we have added $485,000,000. What we have actually reduced in round figures, and I have the exact figures to the penny, is $35,000,000. So that, as a matter of fact, the action of the House on this appropriation bill has added $450,000,000 to the total of the bill as it was reported to the House by the Committee on Appropriations. So that the net saving below the Bureau of the Budget estimates as submitted to the House is not $1,500,000,000, as stated by the gentleman from Missouri, but is slightly in excess of a billion dollars.

I have the exact figures, but I am stating them in round numbers rather than to take the time to read them down to the last penny. It seems to me what we have done is to evade the clear and plain responsibility which was placed upon us when we were elected as Members of the House of Representatives. We are now seeking to transfer that responsibility to the President and in effect say to him, "Mr. President, we have combed this bill from top to bottom. We cannot find any place where we can cut it, and we are now directing you, Mr. President, to cut this bill, under the Thomas amendment, $500,000,000, or under the Cannon substitute we are asking you, Mr. President, to freeze this appropriation estimate as to administrative expenses at a level which will be 5 percent under the amounts carried in the bill." That, to me, would be a shocking display of incompetence on the part of the House of Representatives.

It would appear that you have not the courage to stand here in the House and face the issue. You want to let the people of America know that you are economy-minded and yet, when a single project comes before you for consideration, the House does not have the courage to effect a reduction. You now propose to evade a plain responsibility and transfer to the President our constitutional duty to control the Nation's purse. This I refuse to do.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is a monstrous display of congressional incompetence, to say the least.

The amendment to be offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] will reassert Congressional authority and responsibility and at long last let the people of America know that their representatives have the courage to stand up and be counted and not attempt to shirk a plain duty and hide behind the President.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I am in agreement with the statement made by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE]. I cannot see how any Member of the House conscious of the separation of powers in our Government and conscious of the division of our Government into three branches, the legislative, the executive, and the judicial, could vote for the pending original amendment. Of course, the same remarks apply to the substitute amendment.

The gentleman from Texas says that there is about sixteen or seventeen billion that could be reduced. I doubt if there is going to be any reduction in the appropriation for national defense. The gentleman in his amendment exempts money for the alteration to ships and construction of new ships and research and development, but I doubt if there can be any cut in the activities of our national defense in the light of world conditions. We just put in $350,000,000, practically unanimously, because we recognized the world situation. We voted back $75,000,000 for hospital construction, which a majority of the Members felt was a good investment for human beings and human life, as contrasted with the reduction of dollars itself; and I agree with the majority. I voted with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] in his motions to increase the appropriations, a negligible amount when we consider the total appropriations, for research work for heart disease and the other diseases that affect human beings, which the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] and the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] have so ably led the fight in this House to try to bring about appropriations for research work, with the hope that it will produce results helpful to the people of our country.

The practical operation of the pending amendment will affect perhaps not more than $6,000,000,000 or $7,000,000,000. We eliminate national defense. That is, roughly speaking, $13,400,000,000. No one can reduce the interest on the national debt, which is, roughly speaking, $5,500,000,000. I doubt if anyone will affect the Veterans' Administration. That is over $6,000,000,000. That leaves only about three and one-half billion that the cut can apply to.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes, I yield to my distinguished friend.

Mr. THOMAS. Of course, the national debt interest charge of $6,000,000,000 is not in this $30,000,000,000. As far as the national defense items are concerned, the money in this present 1951 bill to cover and liquidate past contract authorizations—that is a debt that we must pay—is practically $2,000,000,000. There is $1,400,000,000 in the present bill for the purchase of new airplanes. But in all it totals only about $5,000,000,000. So out of the $14,000,000,000 for national defense, you have seven to nine billion that can be cut. You must remember there are over 250,000 civilian employees in there. That is where the reduction can be made.

Mr. McCORMACK. I understand what the gentleman says but I say that in practical operation I doubt if there will be any reductions in connection with our national defense. It is one thing to talk about the language of an amendment, but we have to consider the practical operation of the amendment if it should be adopted.

Now, what about the Post Office? Every Member knows that the reduction already made of $25,000,000 has brought about certain rather drastic actions in the Post Office Department, and the pending amendment is only going to increase that difficulty. What about the other departments? I just present these as practical considerations to practical-minded men.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to my distinguished friend from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Would the gentleman agree with me that this is a rather cowardly way of shirking our responsibility and putting it in the lap of the President? We have had the opportunity and the right to vote on reductions, and I think we should not give up an obligation which is ours and transfer it to the Executive. To pass these amendments would be to relinquish a part of our legislative responsibility and force it upon the Executive. Surely this cannot be the intent of the Members of this House.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am not going to challenge the gentleman's opinion in the use of the word "cowardly," but I do not have to go that far to make out a strong case. I think it is wrong for us to abdicate our legislative responsibility. That was the main argument made

by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE]. He is absolutely on sound ground, and I am in complete agreement with him.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the Thomas amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER to the amendment offered by Mr. THOMAS: In line 3 of the Thomas amendment strike out "$500,000,000" and insert "$600,000,000."

Strike out the rest of the paragraph and insert the following: "Not more than the following sums may be obligated by any agency or department provided for in this bill, viz: (1) For civilian personnel, not more than an amount 10 percent below the amount proposed in the President's budget estimates for fiscal year 1951, except that in the Department of Defense where no more than the amount of the President's budget estimate minus 2 percent shall be obligated. This paragraph shall not apply to nurses, doctors, or other medical personnel, including orderlies, in the Public Health Service and the Veterans' Administration.

"(2) For travel, not more than a total for all departments and agencies of $319,000,000 and not more than 5 percent less than the estimates provided for military personnel travel and not more than 20 percent less than the amount provided for civilian personnel travel, than the estimates therefor contained in the President's budget message for the fiscal year 1951.

"(3) For transportation of things, for all departments and agencies, not more than $720,000,000: *Provided further*, That in no case shall the amount obligated exceed a figure 10 percent below the estimates submitted by the President in his budget message for 1951 for each item for all agencies except the Department of Defense, and for the Department of Defense not more than 5 percent less than the estimates of the President, transmitted in said budget message.

"(4) For communications services, not more than $59,000,000 and not more for any department other than the Department of Defense than the amount of the President's budget estimates for 1951 minus 10 percent, and for the Department of Defense not more than a figure 5 percent below the President's budget estimates for 1951.

"(5) For rents and utilities, not more than $205,000,000 and for all establishments other than the Department of Defense not more than the President's budget estimates for fiscal year 1951 minus 10 percent.

"(6) For printing and reproduction, not more than $52,000,000 and not more in any case than the President's budget estimates for 1951 minus 10 percent.

"(7) For other contractual services, not more than $1,301,000,000 and for all departments other than the Department of Defense not more than the President's budget estimates for 1951 minus 10 percent.

"(8) For supplies and materials, not more than $3,888,000,000 and for all departments of the Government except the Department of Defense and the veterans' hospitals not more than the President's budget estimates for 1951 minus 10 percent.

"(9) For equipment, not more than $3,577,000,000 and for all departments other than the Department of Defense, not more than the President's budget estimates for 1951 minus 10 percent.

"(10) For lands and structures for all departments of the Government except the Department of Defense, not more than the President's budget estimates for 1951 minus 5 percent."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, recognizing that the only proper way to attempt to reduce the items in this bill, and the only opportunity we would have to do so would be by a motion of this kind at the end, I caused to be procured from the budget a table showing a complete breakdown of all expenditures of the Government for different purposes, by categories, so that I could figure this thing out and have some idea of how to proceed and be able to offer an amendment where the Congress of the United States did the job of cutting and did not delegate the authority to the President of the United States or the Bureau of the Budget. I had in mind a specific reduction in the estimates that were submitted. It is absolutely impossible to go through the bill item by item and gather them altogether at one time, but in this way I have been able to get a picture which I believe will take care of the needs of the departments—and at the same time save at least $600,000,000 to the Government.

I propose to do this by providing for civilian personnel a reduction in the estimates of the President of at least 10 percent all the way through. Some of those have been reduced to that figure now. Most of them have not been, except that in the Department of Defense I only propose reducing 2 percent and I have exempted nurses, doctors, and medical personnel, including orderlies, in the Public Health Service and the Veterans' Administration.

On the travel item where there is a total of $365,000,000 in the President's budget estimate, I figure that they can take a cut of 5 percent in the military personnel travel and 20 percent in the amount provided for civilian personnel travel. I do not believe that figure is a bit more than it should be when you come to consider all of the departments of the Government.

For transportation of things for all departments and agencies I have limited them to $720,000,000 and have provided a cut of 10 percent below the budget estimates for all agencies except the Department of Defense and for that Department I figure they can take a 5-percent cut at least.

For communication services of $59,000,000 I recommend a cut of 10 percent below the estimates and 5 percent in the Department of Defense. The total there is $59,000,000 and the saving would be $5,000,000.

For rents and utilities I have exempted the Department of Defense and have recommended a cut of 10 percent.

For printing and reproduction I have recommended a straight cut across the board of 10 percent.

For other contractual services I have recommended a cut of 10 percent for everything except the Department of Defense.

For supplies and materials, I recommend a cut of 10 percent on everything except the Department of Defense and the veterans' hospitals.

For equipment I have exempted the Department of Defense and suggested a cut of 10 percent in the budget estimates on other departments.

For land and structures I have limited the cut to 5 percent and have exempted the Department of Defense.

This is the only way I can see at this time that we can save a very substantial sum of money and meet our own obligations under the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I shall support the gentleman's amendment. I have a question for information concerning the proposed cut for land and structures of 5 percent. Is that 5 percent to be applied on a project basis?

Mr. TABER. That is my understanding, and that is what I intend. Of course, it applies to the budget estimates, and where an estimate has been reduced below the budget estimate, 5 percent would not apply.

Mr. CURTIS. In other words, regardless of what agency it is, if it has a 10-, 15-, 20-, or 33⅓-percent cut, this would not be in addition to it.

Mr. TABER. That is my understanding, and that is my intention.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ELSTON. Will the gentleman state what the total amount of money is that would be cut under his amendment?

Mr. TABER. Six hundred million dollars.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. Does the gentleman's amendment include a cut in all personnel?

Mr. TABER. Yes; a cut in all personnel.

Mr. VORYS. Of 10 percent?

Mr. TABER. Of 10 percent, with the exception of the Department of Defense, and there it is 2 percent.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I would like to ask the gentleman this question. Generally speaking, his amendment does not harm the Department of Defense in any way whatsoever, nor the Veterans' Administration, does it?

Mr. TABER. It does not. I do not think there is a single item in the Department of Defense that would be affected by this amendment but what they could take it. Two percent on their civilian personnel certainly would not

hurt them, and cutting their communications down a little bit would not hurt either.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. In other words, the gentleman's amendment places it directly in the hands of Congress to say what shall be done rather than leave it in the discretion of the President?

Mr. TABER. That is entirely correct.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. As I understand the gentleman's amendment, it involves a reduction of $600,000,000 along the same general lines as the Thomas amendment, and in addition to that certain specific provisions which would result in additional savings; am I correct in that?

Mr. TABER. Not only that, but I specify directly the items that are to be reduced and cover the whole thing completely so there is nothing left for the Bureau of the Budget to do except perform its administrative functions under the law.

Mr. KEATING. Does the gentleman have the figures as to the specific saving which would be effected over-all by the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. TABER. The only thing I can say is this: I have figured the thing out as closely as I could. I believe that there is no question but what these figures would run up to $600,000,000. They might go beyond that, but I would be practically certain that they would go to that.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Would the gentleman translate his cuts in the civilian part of the Defense and in Communications from a percentage into dollars? What would be the total amount of cuts?

Mr. TABER. On the civilian personnel in Defense?

Mr. KENNEDY. And on communications?

Mr. TABER. The cut in the Department of Defense, in the Department of the Army, would be something like $4,000,000. In the Navy it would be somewhere around $3,000,000, and in the Air Force it would be perhaps $2,000,000. There are not so many in the Air Force, because a lot of this buying of food is done by the Army.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] be permitted to proceed for five additional minutes. I wish to ask a question or two.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. If the gentleman will yield, can he tell us the extent of the cut in the Veterans' Administration which the pending amendment would cause?

Mr. TABER. I could by going through the tables, but it would take some time.

Mr. ROONEY. Can the gentleman tell us in round figures?

Mr. TABER. In round figures, the cut would apply to the personnel other than those engaged in the hospitals, and the doctors, nurses, and orderlies. The cut would apply to any items of supplies and materials other than those that would be required for the hospitals.

Mr. ROONEY. Does the gentleman's amendment also contemplate cutting the Federal Bureau of Investigation as well as research programs in heart, cancer, and mental health?

Mr. TABER. I expect those items would be cut.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman's amendment, however, does not cut any of the statutory payments or allowances to veterans in any way?

Mr. TABER. Not in the slightest degree.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I think it should be said that the gentleman at least is not trying to do away with some of the responsibilities of this body. He is at least designating where these cuts should be made if the Congress should agree to his proposal.

Mr. TABER. That is correct. I hope this amendment may be adopted. It is the only way I can see to make a general cut at the end of the bill.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I think as we come to the conclusion of this appropriation bill there are a number of things we should keep in mind. We have a national debt of $257,000,000,000, and the Department of Commerce says the total value of our physical assets in this country is only $145,000,000,000. We lack today about four to six billion dollars annually, it is estimated, of meeting operating expenses. We can continue to run a deficit only so long as we can sell bonds. How long is that? No one knows.

Our Committee on Appropriations has been conscious of these facts and these figures. I do not yield to anyone on the committee in my efforts to try to dig in and see how we can help to hold down Government expenditures. We have tried our best to do that. But I do not want to say to the House that this is an exact business that we run. Five of us on the Appropriations Subcommittee for Agriculture sat for more than 2½ months. We heard witnesses. We went into all these sundry and various programs from A to Z. But you cannot say point blank that they should have this or that amount, you just have to use your best judgment. However, there are some things we know we have to realize today.

If you have this debt, and if you are not collecting enough money to meet your obligations, you have either to raise taxes or reduce salaries or reduce services or reduce personnel.

There is no way around it. You have four alternatives, and sooner or later, and I think sooner, you are going to be faced with it. In fact, we face it now.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. In my opinion the gentleman from Mississippi is one of the most conscientious Members of the House working on the Committee on Appropriations. I want to back up what he has had to say and that is he need not go into the background whatsoever for any Member of the House, as far as his earnest desire to do something toward balancing the budget is concerned.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank my friend. We have worked together for many years in our efforts not only to provide adequately for agriculture but to try to do it as economically as the facts justify. The people of America expect economy. They expect us to show some effort toward achieving economy. The situation of our country demands economy. If I am right in that statement, however, I think we need to show judgment and discretion in our effort to bring about economy.

I am here before you today trying to point out to you the advantages of the approach in the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], chairman of our committee. Under the Thomas amendment you are turning over to the President the duty of cutting out so much money. Do you know whether he will cut it out of the Labor Department?

Do you know whether he will take it out of the Department of Agriculture? Do you know whether he will take it out of this, that, or the other department? You do not. Do you know how much he will take out of each one? You do not. If anyone wants to abdicate that authority to the President or to anyone else, that is their privilege.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. The amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] spells it out in detail.

Mr. WHITTEN. I will answer that, and I have a high regard for the gentleman from New York. It does spell it out in detail. It says where you have to cut it. When you pass that, then you have to take it. It does not make any difference what happens to a department or what happens to the armed services. If we pass that cut that is that; and we are helpless to do anything about it so far as that particular provision is concerned.

I want to point out to you just what the committee has done through its chairman. We are directing that 5 per-

cent of the administrative funds shall be withheld—5 percent. You say, "Why that much?" That is the best judgment of the Democratic members of this committee. That has been the result after we made a determined effort to hold down the appropriation by making reductions of $1,300,000,000 below the budget. It comes as the result of our awareness of what is needed in this bill to balance our budget. It comes after we have done our very best to hold down expenditures. But the need for economy is such that we want to say once again that if the future shows that further savings can be made, then that shall be done and we are directing the withholding of 5 percent of the administrative costs over and above the $1,300,000,000 we have already reduced the bill. Then we say if perchance in the Veterans' Administration or in any other of the services of the Government this 5 percent withholding works such a hardship on the service so that it cannot be carried on, then on a proper showing we can do something about it to see that the Government operates. If you can tell me any sounder basis to try to handle the finances of this country than that, then I do not know what it might be.

First, there are 2½ months of detailed study and hearings. After that you must make your best effort to hold down these expenses. We cut out $1,300,000,000. We say in addition to that 5 percent of the administrative funds be withheld. But that could be too harsh with regard to some of the veterans in the veterans hospitals and with regard to some in other services and with regard to some other departments. You cannot go through a bill which covers so many pages and millions of services to the American people and be absolutely sure of what you are doing—and I do not claim to be sure, but I say that we should make this further saving over and above the $1,300,000,000 we have already eliminated—reserving the right to reconsider individual problems that might arise.

I think the Cannon substitute is the best approach to this problem, which is a serious problem in this Nation.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Does not the gentleman believe that the Cannon substitute is not only the reasonable and sensible approach but that it is the logical approach, in view of the fact that right now the President has before the Congress 25 reorganization plans? If those reorganization plans are not disapproved, if they work out efficiently and savings are made, then that 5 percent can be applied to that. If they are not approved and these savings are not made, then the Bureau of the Budget has the discretion to release these funds in order not to cripple any of the essential business of the Government.

Mr. WHITTEN. My colleague has made a very sound argument, as he usually does. That is an additional reason as to why this is the sound approach.

But I want to say that, sitting on the Appropriations Committee, you are not in a position to say exactly. You have to back your judgment. If we can save more we want to do it. Under the Cannon amendment we will do it, but if perchance we go too far, we have not burned our house behind us or the bridge in front of us. We are where we can remedy the situation if we find it necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] has expired.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the Taber amendment, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, the objection I have to both the Thomas amendment and the Cannon amendment is simply that we are surrendering the powers which we in the House should exercise. Moreover, the Cannon amendment means a reduction of not over $250,000,000, all through the bill, as far as we can estimate. I certainly will not settle for any paltry reduction in this huge bill of only $250,000,000. On the other hand, the Thomas amendment calls for about $500,000,000 reduction. Certainly we can do better than that. If we accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and the one to be offered later on by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] we will strike at the soft spots in this bill. We have all been on Pullman cars and noticed them well filled with Government people traveling. Here is your opportunity to say to each and every agency and department of the Government: "Hold down this travel item in your division to the extent specified by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]."

You can also say to them: "The transportation of goods shall be held down according to the limitations under this amendment."

You can also say to them: "When you Government folks get a notion that you want to make a long-distance call, think twice, because this particular agency must hold its communications expenditures down to a certain point."

I think that any man or woman in this House who votes against the Taber amendment certainly cannot conscientiously claim that he or she is much interested in economy in government.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I listened to the remarks of the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], and, if I understood him correctly, he is in opposition to both the Thomas original amendment and the Cannon substitute therefor, because, as I understood him, he contends that they both involve the surrender of legislative responsibility and authority and power to the Executive.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman from Indiana is entirely correct. Just a few minutes ago we heard the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] make that approximate statement. Certainly I agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts as to what he then had to say. I was much impressed by his argument against our surrendering our legislative responsibility to the executive branch.

Mr. HALLECK. I was impressed by that argument myself, I might say. But, likewise, is it not true that of these various proposals now before us, the Taber proposal is the only one that seeks to get at the soft spots, recognizing the initial, fundamental, and primary responsibility of the House of Representatives to deal directly and affirmatively with the matter of appropriations?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman from Indiana is very sound in his statement. Mr. HALLECK has always shown that he is willing to accept the responsibility which belongs to every Congressman. It is our responsibility; and I will not admit to my people, to my farmers, that I am afraid to ask that they take a 5- or 10-percent cut along with the rest of the people, if necessary. We must cut all through this bill with the exceptions of our veterans and national defense if we ever hope to make any real saving.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to my good friend from Nebraska who has consistently supported our recommendations for savings in this bill.

Mr. CURTIS. The Cannon amendment could end up with no reduction at all. Is not that so?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman is absolutely correct. The Cannon proposal leaves the whole matter entirely to the whim of the Budget Bureau which, after all, is simply part of the President's office and absolutely under his control. There will be no saving of any consequence accomplished.

Mr. CURTIS. It seems to me that this is mere wishful thinking.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. It is mere window dressing, in my opinion. I will say to the gentleman from Nebraska that it amounts to practically nothing. The Taber and Jensen amendments would save perhaps $1,000,000,000 to the taxpayers.

Mr. CURTIS. There can be no painless reduction of expenditures.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman is correct. We must cut even on things dear to us if we hope to do anything worth while.

Mr. CURTIS. The Taber amendment is a straightforward, honest method of cutting Government expenditures. I will support it.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. In conclusion, let me point out that the Taber amendment does no harm whatsoever to national defense or to the veterans.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri who has, like the gentlemen from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] and from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], tried to cut this huge appro-

priation measure down to a workable level.

Mr. SHORT. None of us wants to surrender our congressional authority.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That is right. In my opinion, if we did so, we would do immeasurable harm to the prestige of this great body.

Mr. SHORT. The Taber amendment is not an abdication of legislative responsibility; rather, it keeps control over these expenditures in the hands of Congress where they should be.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Exactly; and that is why I cannot agree with my good friend, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], whom I complimented on the floor for his work in our Subcommittee on Appropriations. If there is cutting to be done, I think we are the ones to do it. Let us accept our responsibility and not throw this job into the President's lap. Let us adopt both the Taber and Jensen amendments.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. THORNBERRY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] proposes to reduce the general appropriation bill, which amounts to approximately thirty billion dollars, by $500,000,000. I believe that the amendment should be adopted. In my judgment and from my observation, the people of the United States want economy, not political arguments. We cannot discharge our responsibilities by telling the people of this Nation that we could not devise an amendment that would be effective in obtaining economy. It seems to me that if we are to obtain effective economy without seriously crippling some of the important functions of Government, we could very well say to the President of the United States and the Budget Director that we are directing them to save a half-billion dollars wherever it can be done without hurting the important functions of government. I have no fear of what the people of this country will say if we make a move in that direction.

You and I need to examine the huge expenditures called for in this bill in the light of the responsibilities which we have as we seek to obtain peace and decency in this world. There are four courses we can follow.

First. As we try to find elbow room in this world for democracy and freedom, we can take the great gamble of declaring war on our potential enemies. But the people of this country have never been aggressors. They seek peace; they do not want war, and you and I do not want to declare war.

Second. There is that ugly choice, the wholly unrealistic choice, the selfish choice of again becoming isolationists, withdrawing to our own shores and allowing freedom to perish in other lands. If we chose that course, our folly would some day return to haunt us, just as our isolation of the 1930's haunted us throughout the early days of World War II.

Third. We can continue as we have in the past by voting for all of the programs which we find desirable regardless of the cost. But many of these programs are luxuries which do not contribute to the strength of our national defense and which we can very easily do without. If we continue this course, it will lead us to disaster and chaos. There is but one choice.

That is our fourth choice, the choice, given us by the Thomas amendment, of providing for this Nation a strong program of national defense which will enable us to speak out for peace and decency in this world, of providing assistance to those neighbors of ours who want democracy and who desire to join us in resisting the communistic dictator, and of doing without those luxuries which we can defer to a future date when we can afford them. As we pledge ourselves to that course, we shall also recognize that there are many things we would like to have but we will have to postpone them to another day. It would be fine if we had unlimited resources to do all of these things, but we do not have unlimited resources. We must conserve our national resources as cautiously as possible in order that we do not fall victim of national bankruptcy.

As I read the Thomas amendment, it follows the fourth course. It does not cripple our national defenses; it does not weaken our fight on communism. It merely postpones many luxuries—some of which are desirable, some of which I would like to see us have, but luxuries which we must do without if we are to achieve a strong, sound national fiscal policy.

Mr. Chairman, I believe very firmly that the people of the United States are willing to make every sacrifice necessary to achieve peace and decency in this world. For that reason, I shall vote for the Thomas amendment, which reduces this appropriation by $500,000,000. I believe its adoption will assist in securing the economy so necessary if this great Nation is to endure.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Taber amendment.

Mr. Chairman, for many, many years I have held this body, the House of Representatives, in great respect. As one of its Members I have been jealous with respect to the power that it should exercise as contemplated under the Constitution of the United States. From time to time I have regretted steps which have been taken in the direction of increasing the executive power beyond those limits originally contemplated in the Constitution.

Today we are faced with a situation which I think calls upon the House of Representatives, acting within its sphere, to make a decision and not leave it to any other power. In my judgment, the so-called Taber amendment gives us that opportunity, for it provides just how these reductions shall be made. When they are made, if they are made, they are the result of the judgment of the House of Representatives.

We face a difficult situation with respect to the fiscal condition of the Government. You know it as well as I do. You know in your hearts it is a serious situation and is becoming more so as days go by. We cannot go on with this deficit financing for much longer without endangering the whole economy of the country.

I would not for one moment propose that the services of the Government of the United States be reduced to such a point as to destroy the Government's effectiveness. The Taber amendment does not do that. What I would propose, and I do so in all earnestness, is that the time has come for the Government to display a little austerity.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Cannon amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to no one in this House in my desire to obtain the greatest economy that we can possibly achieve. I realize that our present fiscal condition requires that we use extreme means. But let me say to you that the most effective way to accomplish economy is within the departments and it is for that reason that the subcommittee of which I have the privilege of being chairman, has taken the action it has. I do not take credit for it. It was the work of the committee as a whole, and a large part of the credit should go to the former chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD]. What we did in our committee was to suggest that the Treasury Department make a thorough study to see how it could cut its expenditures.

As a result of that study the Secretary of the Treasury, who has cooperated with our subcommittee, reported to us this year that the Department has saved, by reason of improved management and machinery, 1,000,000 man-hours per annum. That is a real accomplishment toward economy.

Now, let us consider the Post Office Department. Our committee took the people of this Nation at their word, in their demand for economy, and reduced the appropriations for the Post Office Department. A subcommittee in the other body on yesterday voted 9 to 0 to rescind the order of the Postmaster General which would put into effect certain economies in an effort to reduce the expenditures of his Department.

The objection I have to the Taber amendment is that, when the cuts are made under that amendment, the same cuts will be applied to the Treasury and Post Office Departments, where a very strict economy program has already been adopted, as will be applied to the other departments of Government. In the Thomas amendment we refuse to discharge our duty to cut the appropriations and direct the President of the United States to do something that we do not have the courage to do ourselves. In the Cannon amendment we direct that 5 percent of the funds be held in reserve unless and until the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall certify that maintenance of essential Government services requires their expenditure. It seems to me that is a more sensible way to approach the problem.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. The percentages that I used were directed at the President's budget estimate and not at the amount in the bill, and therefore a cut below what the committee has recommended would not be affected except as the committee has failed to make a 10-percent cut.

Mr. GARY. But it does apply to all departments alike.

Mr. TABER. It does.

Mr. GARY. The point I am making is that the savings that we have made in the Treasury Department are not all reflected in the cuts made by the committee this year, but some of them are reflected in the requests that appeared in the President's budget, because many of the changes to which I referred were made before the budget requests were submitted and the requests were smaller because of the changes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman mean to say or infer that the curtailment of delivery service of the Post Office Department was the only way that the Postmaster General could effect economies?

Mr. GARY. I specifically stated on the floor when I presented the report of our subcommittee that, in my judgment, it was not the only way, but it is only fair to say that the Postmaster General stated in his order that it was issued in response to a demand from our committee that he reduce expenditures and I, for one, do not intend to attempt to operate the Post Office Department. That is the duty of the Postmaster General.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 1 hour and 15 minutes, the last 10 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I suppose the attitude of this House can probably best be described as a desire to keep each of the individual items in the appropriation bill at their present amount, or even to increase them, but to cut down the total amount appropriated in the bill. That certainly seems to me to be what has happened during the last 4 weeks. The House refused to cut any items, and, in fact, was often prone to increase them, but always Members expressed the hope and desire that after action was completed the total spending would be less.

Mr. Chairman, we are faced with three definite proposals to effect reductions in the total of this bill. I certainly will support the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. It is the most responsible type of action we can take at this point in the consideration of this legislation. I want to say, however, that should the Taber amendment be rejected I will support the Thomas amendment.

I share with some of my colleagues the sentiment that has been expressed that the Thomas amendment is really an irresponsible way to appropriate funds or effect savings. By it we abdicate to the President the power to do the appropriating for us. I will admit that. I think probably the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] himself would admit that it is not a very responsible way to appropriate funds. However, it is certainly less irresponsible than to pass the bill with the total of spending that is contained in it at the present time.

I am interested not so much in the procedure, Mr. Chairman, as I am in seeing to it that some savings are made.

At the present time the Committee on Ways and Means, of which I am a member, is considering the matter of excise taxes and excise-tax reductions. You individual Members from all over the country know that the pressure is on you and you, in turn, are trying to put the pressure on the committee to reduce or eliminate many of these taxes. How, pray tell, can you vote, on the one hand, for expenditures which will create a deficit of anywhere between six and eight billion dollars and then, on the other hand, vote for reduction of any kind of tax? I think we must come to the realization that unsound spending means unsound taxes. I will be the first to admit that in the excise-tax field there are many inequities and injustices which must be corrected. But let us come to this realization right now: As long as you continue unreasonable spending, you are going to have to continue unreasonable taxes.

Let me make my position clear. I cannot support Government spending in the amount contained in this bill. I cannot support tax reductions as long as that spending continues. I am not going to vote to load our spending on my children.

Mr. Chairman, no matter how the proposal is made or by what method, I am going to vote to reduce the total amount of these appropriations. My record to date is clear. I have voted against all efforts to increase the individual items in the bill. I have voted for all responsible efforts to reduce the individual items in the bill, and I intend to continue that record.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Does the gentleman not feel that even without any directive as suggested by the Thomas amendment, the Executive as the head of the Government and of all the executive agencies has some responsibility to direct his appointees to reduce expenditures wherever possible?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. He certainly has. I think that is one of the most unfortunate things that has faced this Congress in the last few years. We have control only over the total amount of money which will be given to the individual departments, but we have little or no control over how the departments spend the money once it is given to them. It is the responsibility of the President to see to it that the money is not wasted. I think all too often that responsibility which is the responsibility of the executive department has not been carried out.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. I think the gentleman will realize that neither the Congress nor the executive department can balance a budget without cooperation between the two. The gentleman has been aware during his service in the Congress of many instances pointed out by subcommittees on appropriations where real economies have been effected in departments and the service increased and the morale of the departments improved by cutting out the driftwood and the shrubbery which they did not need. Savings do not mean crippling in every instance; often they are the medium for real progress. The danger is that, in the blindness of opposing any reduction, persons of responsibility in the executive department will issue untrue and misleading judgments as to the effect of any given reduction.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. That is true. I want to say one thing more before I conclude, Mr. Chairman, and that is that I think the Congress very often shirks or forgets its responsibility when it authorizes the expenditure of funds. I think too often the Congress places upon the members of the Committee on Appropriations an impossible job when it authorizes spending programs without giving consideration to the amount of money which is going to have to be appropriated to carry out the particular program involved.

I think it is time that we looked into our procedures for authorizing expenditures of funds and see if some corrections cannot be made in that field so that the House will be conscious when it authorizes a new program or a new activity of the cost that is involved. The real time to economize is when the legislation authorizing new and expanded program is before the Congress.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. When the House adopted the 21-day rule it did away with the only brake that we had, and that was the Committee on Rules in stopping some of these authorizations.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. That may be true but I would point out that each Member of the House also has an individual responsibility to put on the

brakes. In fact, it is time we put on the emergency brakes.

(Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, because of the cases of addiction to narcotics which have come to my attention in my district and the arrest by the Bureau of Narcotics of some 50 dope peddlers in Philadelphia within the last few days, I have made an investigation of the national narcotic situation. I find that since the end of the war smuggling and trafficking in heroin have increased sharply. There has been a serious upsurge in addiction, particularly among teen-agers and those in their early twenties. I find this to be true in my district and am advised that similar situations exist in other cities, particularly New York City, Chicago, St. Louis and East St. Louis, Los Angeles, Detroit, New Orleans, and, to a lesser degree, in many other cities and towns.

Unless drastic measures are taken, dope peddling and addiction will continue to spread rapidly. The Bureau of Narcotics, with a small force of 180 agents, has done an admirable job but with the increase in smuggled drugs, it cannot effectively control the situation unless its force of agents is materially increased. Before the war the Bureau of Narcotics had a field force of 240 agents. With this number of agents the dope traffic was kept under control. Wartime restrictions on international travel and shipping added to the hazards of drug smuggling and helped curtail the flow of illicit narcotics into this country. Consequently, the field force of the Bureau was gradually reduced to its present strength of 180 men. Even though this represents only 2 percent of the Federal law enforcement agents, the Bureau of Narcotics is responsible for the imprisonment of 10 percent of the inmates of Federal penal institutions.

Narcotic drug distributing syndicates are growing and, unless drastic measures are taken, will become firmly entrenched. The Bureau of Narcotics made 2,900 arrests in the first 6 months of the current fiscal year. This is more arrests than were made for the whole of each of the fiscal years 1941 through 1947. This certainly is indicative of the increasing dope traffic. However, the increased activity in the first 6 months of the current fiscal year depleted the Bureau's current appropriation to the extent that it has been compelled to cut back its enforcement activities sharply for the remainder of the fiscal year. Its funds for travel and purchase of narcotics are now so limited that it cannot make many investigations which should receive immediate attention.

For the fiscal year 1951 the Treasury Department requested for the Bureau of Narcotics the sum of $1,933,000. The Appropriations Committee reduced this to $1,750,000, a cut of $183,000. It is true that $1,750,000 represents an increase of $140,000 over the Bureau's appropriation of $1,610,000 for the fiscal year 1950. However, after this $140,000 is reduced by the salary increases under the Pay Act passed a few months ago, by the statutory increase in the per diem rate, and by necessary in-grade promotions, the net increase with which to combat the growing narcotic traffic is only about $25,000. This is negligible when it is considered that this small agency must combat the well organized criminal syndicates, which have millions of dollars at their command because of their unlawful activities. The amount requested would permit the employment of 12 new agents only and would allow the Bureau of Narcotics to operate at full speed during the next fiscal year. If the spread of addiction is to be curtailed, we must at least increase the Bureau's appropriation to the amount requested, $1,933,000.

Narcotic arrests reported by fiscal years

Year:	*Number*
1940	3,584
1941	2,819
1942	2,867
1943	2,571
1944	2,629
1945	2,047
1946	2,620
1947	2,855
1948	3,180
1949	4,803

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Utah [Mrs. BOSONE] is recognized.

Mrs. BOSONE. Mr. Chairman, I am nonplused at hearing the three amendments this afternoon. Certainly the Appropriations Committee is on the spot. After we have deliberated for some 3 weeks—and I have heard most of the discussion on this tremendous bill—then to hear the members of the Appropriations Committee come in with amendments to cut, it seems to me that, if we should have cut this bill, it should have been cut at the beginning; and we should have known those cuts 3 weeks ago or 2 weeks ago, instead of at this late hour. I would not have been surprised if members of other committees had come in with these amendments, but I am surprised at the Appropriations Committee offering them. Of course, the members of the committee have a tremendous responsibility and they have assumed that responsibility. The rest of us, who are members of other committees, still believe what our committees report. The Appropriations Committee has conducted all the hearings and heard all the programs that have come before this Congress. The details have been explained. The Appropriations Committee has had the right to interrogate witnesses, and I understand they have worked hard and long and diligently. Who knows why the Appropriations Committee does not know? I am still naive. I believe people. I have believed what I have heard on the floor of this House for over 3 weeks. With the exception of one afternoon, I have been in attendance each day, and I have listened, because I realize this has been a tremendous bill. I came here feeling that I wanted to vote for cuts, because I was honestly economy-conscious—not suddenly, however. I just did not get that feeling lately. I have had it a long time, because I am one of those who does live within her means. I came here expecting to vote for cuts, but as I have heard the arguments and the programs explained and the expenditures that were required, each debate weighed heavily upon me, and, except in a few instances, I voted not to cut, because I realize that false economy can certainly be painful extravagance.

I realize, too, that government is not an exact science and it does not operate as such. We do not know what is going to face us or what the future has in store. I do believe if there is any group in this House that should know what finances are required to run this government, it is the Appropriations Committee.

Now, after we have deliberated on the bill for 3 weeks or more, the committee offers three amendments to cut the bill. If a department should have been cut, the Appropriations Committee ought to know where to cut, and it should not be for those of us who have been on other committees to come in here, after hearing the explanation for only a few minutes, and have this burden placed upon our shoulders. If the Appropriations Committee does not know what it is doing, then let us recommit the bill and let them agree, and let us have this economy consciousness and at least be honest about it. Let us not have it as something sudden.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOSONE. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. Does not the gentlewoman realize that these cuts are being offered by members of the Appropriations Committee? I, too, have been sitting here, as the gentlewoman has, for 3 weeks listening to this debate. They have had no opportunity to look over the whole bill, because each of them were on subcommittees, which did not give them an opportunity to get a bird's-eye view of the entire bill.

Mrs. BOSONE. The funny part of it is that the cuts are coming from both sides of the aisle and from members of the Appropriations Committee. Where in the world does that leave the rest of us?

Mr. VORYS. That is the significance of it. They are coming from both sides.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKETT] is recognized.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, the Appropriations Committee reported to us a bill that reduced the budgetary estimates of the administration by one and one-third billion dollars. The members of the Committee on Appropriations and its staff are to be sincerely congratulated not only by the membership of this Congress but also by the entire Nation. I take the position in this discussion that where these members had 3 months' time with limited personnel and facilities to find a sum total of $1,300,000,000 by which they could reduce the administration's budget, there certainly must be many other places where cuts could be made. The Government agencies commenced preparing their requests in the summer of 1949; from that time until January 1950 hundreds of administrative employees working on the budget had a decided advantage over the Appropriations Committee and other Members of Congress. In view of that fact and in view of the efforts that have been made on the floor of the House to reduce

certain items in the discussion that has taken place in the past 3 weeks, I candidly state to the House now that I expect to support the Thomas amendment, since most of those efforts failed, unless it is amended by another proposal. I expect to support any other proposal that is reasonably sound to effect an economical appropriation bill as it passes this House. I want to vote, and shall vote, for the best proposal to effect the greatest practical economy the pending parliamentary situation will permit.

All of us recognize, of course, that national defense from enemies without and within the borders of this Nation is of prime importance at all times and particularly under circumstances confronting us today. One of the major props upon which we must rest national defense is a sound domestic economy. In order to have a sound domestic economy we must make substantial progress toward a balanced budget.

I am not persuaded, Mr. Chairman, with the force of the statement made to the effect that should the Thomas amendment be adopted we would be delegating our authority to the Chief Executive; I would say that the House has failed to exercise its authority during the last 3 weeks and cut this appropriation bill at proper points as we have discussed it. Having failed to do that up to this point it is now our bounden duty, if we are economy-minded, and I certainly am, to exercise our authority today and tell the executive head of the Government that we instruct him to reduce expenditures in keeping with the terms of the Thomas amendment.

I should like to ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] a question, if I may. As I understand his amendment, there is no reduction in the amount of the bill as it now stands for the essential national defense items by way of stockpiling and military equipment and personnel. Is that correct?

Mr. TABER. There is not.

Mr. PICKETT. I should like to ask the gentleman from New York this further question: What reduction is there on such items as the civil functions of the Corps of Engineers?

Mr. TABER. There would be very little. It could apply only to those items where civilian personnel is involved.

Mr. PICKETT. There are other questions of similar nature regarding veterans and agriculture I would like to ask but my time has expired. I shall make inquiry concerning them of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] privately.

One concluding remark: Even before coming to Congress it has been my position we should operate the Federal Government under a balanced budget when possible. To do so we should eliminate the unnecessary in expenditures, reduce the desirable as low as possible, and scrutinize the essential most carefully before passing appropriations bills. I have done my best to follow that policy since my service in Congress began.

(Mr. PICKETT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

(Mr. HARRIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, we have now come to perhaps the most important amendment from a policy standpoint which has been offered during the several weeks this omnibus appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1951 has been under consideration.

This amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], is important because it will effectuate an expression of this House toward a measure of economy and a step toward getting our House in order on a sound business program. It provides an over-all reduction of approximately $600,000,000.

With this total appropriation of more than $29,000,000,000, this is a small percentage reduction. As has been stated, the committee reduced the budget request by approximately $1,500,000,000 and in the consideration of the various chapters providing funds for the agencies and departments of the Government for the next fiscal year, some $450,000,000 has been added. This means a net reduction of the committee action of approximately $1,000,000,000 and this amendment would be a further step toward economy of another $600,000,000.

I recognize the difficulty that exists in trying to bring about economy and efficiency in Government. I join others, however, who have expressed grave concern over the fiscal affairs of the Nation.

There is indication that the deficit this year will be from six to seven billion dollars. As I have said on many occasions, deficit spending is indefensible only in a crisis or national emergency.

A few days ago in consideration of the civil-functions chapter of this appropriation bill on flood control, I was somewhat critical of the approximately 25-percent reduction of the budget estimate without any comparable reduction on the other agencies and departments of the Government.

I said then, Mr. Chairman, if the same percentage reduction or anything like similar reductions were made, I would have no complaint with the action of the committee.

This amendment and the Thomas amendment would bring about this further reduction in these agencies of Government except the national defense establishments. This would not adversely affect our national-defense program, nor our national security, stockpile of strategic materials, and so forth. Neither would it affect as I understand its purpoes, the veterans, to whom we are obligated and committed to provide for their needs.

Furthermore, there is every reason to expect that the Ways and Means Committee will report a tax bill in the very near future. I went before the committee and urged the repeal and revision of war-excise taxes. I think it is nothing but right to remove this burden from the taxpayers of this country as it was never intended to remain after the war emergency had ended.

I therefore repeat, Mr. Chairman, that the war-excise taxes should be repealed and from the reports committee action thus far indicates there will be something like a $1,000,000,000 reduction in revenues from this source.

If this is true, the adoption of this amendment is even more important.

I do not consider this a partisan matter, though there are charges of spending and more spending. I consider this as an effort to bring our Federal budget in line with revenues.

I know it is easy to follow the course of providing more and more funds that will benefit more and more people. I am as interested in providing the actual needs and assuming a responsibility of public service that is needed and justifiable as anyone in this House, but I also know, Mr. Chairman, that we cannot continue to remain a strong, powerful, and leading nation of the world without continuing to be strong economically.

I know with world conditions so unsettled and the necessity of tremendous funds included in this bill for our national defense, that it is difficult to readjust funds available for this purpose.

I realize our commitments to foreign programs, appropriations which are yet to come, make it even more difficult to bring within our revenues these appropriations for our governmental service on the domestic front. I can understand how easy it is to make contentions that if we can spend money on foreign programs, we can invest more and more on these programs at home.

I feel any sound-thinking person, however, must understand that our commitments and appropriations on these foreign programs, economic assistance to needy countries, is for the preservation of peace in the world and to prevent another bloody war that could very well destroy our economy or freedom of enterprise, our American system, as well as taking the lives of untold numbers of our youth as we experienced in this recent and unfortunate destructive war. As I have said heretofore, if by the expenditures of funds during these few years we can prevent another war, saving the lives of our own men, the calculated risk would be thoroughly justified. It is a long-range program, of peace, one to prevent another tragic war and a program to prevent unholy aggression by tyrants that would enslave free people.

Our economy at home must be strong. We have many worthy programs underway, some of which will require years to accomplish. These must be approached on a sound financial basis, that will return dividends and make our economy stronger.

The only way we can bring about this accomplishment is to face a realization. The only way we can reach the objective is to determine our full responsibilities and commitments and pare on other programs to the extent of living within our revenues and insisting that these departments serve our public in a manner that will provide the actual needs but yet recognizing an economic stability, that a sound financial program in your Federal Government means as much to-

ward the future as it does in any private undertaking.

It is the duty and responsibility of this Congress to take the steps that will bring us to the goal of living within our revenues and yet, start doing something about the enormous and tremendous debt that was brought on by the war.

We all say we are for economy and here, Mr. Chairman, is the opportunity of showing that we mean what we say.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CHRISTOPHER].

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, like the gentlewoman from Utah, I still have a little confidence and faith in people. It may be that if I stay in Washington long enough I shall get so that I will not, but I hope not; and I still have it at the present time.

One of the great committees of this House, the Committee on Appropriations, began shortly after the first of January to consider this bill that we have now had under consideration here in this House for almost a month. They held hearings on this bill; the different departments of Government testified at those hearings; many others testified. They studied the bill for a period of practically 3 months. For almost a month we have had it on the floor of this House. It has been read by the Clerk line by line, paragraph by paragraph, figure by figure; we have had amendment after amendment offered on the floor of this House, and whether the amendment has been accepted or rejected it has always been by majority vote of the membership. Now, are we ready to say to our folks back home: The great Appropriations Committee of the House is unreliable? Shall we say they are incompetent?

Will we say: "They considered an appropriation bill for 3 months, then brought it to the floor of this House wrong"? Will we say: "This House considered and amended the bill for a month and it is still wrong"? Are we willing to admit that? As far as I am concerned I am not willing to admit it. I have been on the floor of this House every day that the bill has been under consideration. I voted for the cuts I thought were justified and voted against those I thought were not justified.

The great Committee on Appropriations took a billion and a half dollars off of appropriations and contract authorizations as allowed by the Bureau of the Budget. Then, because of a war scare, justified or unjustified as the case may be, we added about three hundred to three hundred and fifty million dollars to the bill for national defense, mostly for airplanes. I do not know whether that was justified or not, but I would rather vote for that military increase if it is not justified than to vote against it and find later that it is justified. So I voted for those military increases.

I still have confidence in people; I still think there are people in the United States who know more than I do, believe it or not. I am in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and I am opposed to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas and the substitute offered by the gentleman from New York. If this bill needs further cuts they should have been made by this House in regular order as we considered the measure. Shall we now say to our President: "We, of this House, did not have the courage to do our duty. We did not have guts enough to accept our responsibilities. Now, please, Mr. President, discharge our responsibilities for us"?

I still have the courage of my convictions. More than 50 years of observation has convinced me that 1 ounce of backbone is worth more than all the wishbone in the world.

(Mr. CHRISTOPHER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

(Mr. REES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] to reduce the appropriations bill in the amount of approximately $800,000,000, $600,000,000 being direct reduction, and approximately $200,000,000 indirectly. It should be carefully observed that this reduction does not affect the appropriation for the defense of the country or for veterans benefits of all kinds or for stockpiling or for other items that are absolutely needed.

I call your attention to the fact that after deducting appropriations for defense and for the veterans' benefits, including hospitals and other necessities, that the deduction is less than 6 percent of the remaining portions of the appropriations bill.

This cut is a very mild one. I think the reduction should and could be as much as $1,000,000,000 without injury to any department of Government.

This bill has been under consideration for a period of 4 weeks. I am disappointed that amendments to reduce appropriations in various departments of our Government have met with so little support. I have voted for every reduction that I thought was fair and reasonable and have also offered amendments to reduce some of these items, even though they were defeated.

Mr. Chairman, every expense item in this bill should have been "cut to the bone." Of course, there are a good many projects and proposals included in the bill that contain certain benefits to particular regions or areas. All items in this bill should be considered on the question as to whether they are really needed, and not because certain individuals or groups want them.

Here we are today about to complete legislation that will charge the citizens of this country with a bill amounting to almost $30,000,000,000. This is almost $1,000 for every taxpaying family in this country. The responsibility of appropriating funds to carry on the activities of our Government is the responsibility of the Members of Congress. We should assume that responsibility with a view of appropriating only such funds as are absolutely required, and should be further considered in the light of the fact that our country is already in debt to the extent of $260,000,000,000, and that we will have a deficit at the end of this year of more than $6,000,000,000. That is good reason why this Congress and this country should "tighten its belt."

The responsibility for the expenditure of these funds is with the administration and the administrative agencies. This Congress ought to insist that those who are charged in handling such expenditures should see to it that every dollar appropriated under this bill is wisely and carefully expended. Every department of Government should be required to account in detail as to how and why and where these funds are expended.

Many times I have complained and criticized departments of Government with regard to the use of funds without serious consideration and realization that they are spending the money of the taxpayers of this country. On too many occasions those responsible for expenditures have been extravagant and careless, and in too many cases wasteful. From now on let us have full and complete accounting.

Furthermore, if any agency has unexpended funds on hand at the end of the year, see that such funds are returned to the Treasury instead of insisting on spending them just because they have the funds on hand.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks on the various amendments as they are introduced in the Committee at that point in the RECORD where the various amendments are considered.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE].

(Mr. LYLE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

ECONOMY AND EFFICIENCY

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, I am constrained to explain briefly my support of various amendments to cut down the over-all appropriations provided for by this bill.

To begin with, I look with great disfavor upon the practice inaugurated by this bill of bringing to the House a so-called one-package appropriation bill. This bill appropriates almost $30,000,000,000. It embodies provisions for departmental and agency appropriations heretofore included in 11 or 12 separate appropriation bills.

In my opinion—I venture to express it despite the high regard I have for the ability, integrity, and patriotism of the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee and his fellow members—it is absolutely impossible, from a human, intellectual, and logical standpoint, efficiently and adequately for the House to study and consider the complex, multitudinous, and voluminous matters embraced in this bill in one single measure and at one virtually uninterrupted

time. The human mind simply cannot adequately apprehend or absorb, let alone act intelligently, upon such a large number of intricate statistical matters involving the determination of vital social and economic policies without more mature deliberation and more detailed discussion. And if it were not for the serious legislative problem posed by the defeat of this measure I should almost be willing to recommit it and have its various provisions reported back to the House for action in separate categories, as has been formerly the practice. However, such a course seems to me impractical, and I am therefore compelled to vote along lines which I deem wise and salutary in order to curtail and reduce some of the huge sums appropriated by the bill.

I am not willing, in the light of present world conditions, to assume responsibility for cutting down further the appropriations for national defense. And I cannot subscribe to cutting the Veterans' Administration or funds for adequate postal service or funds necessary to insure essential and vital services and activities of the Government. But we must move toward a balanced budget and the end of deficit spending and the adjustment of the huge national debt. I think there are many ways available to Government agencies to slice the fat from current expenditures without harm or impairment to the essential functions of Government. The basic objectives of the Hoover report are undeniably in the interest of national economy, governmental efficiency, and departmental accountability. The Congress must answer the plea of the people for sound administration of Federal affairs and the lightening of tax burdens as soon as possible. A sound, healthy economy will be our best guaranty against national weakness in this critical period of history in which our free way of life is in peril.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the pending amendment is to reduce the over-all expenditures of the Government as provided for in the pending appropriation bill. I have and will continue to give my support to the pending amendment and any other that seeks to accomplish this purpose. It is imperative that there shall be reduction in the expense of conducting our Federal Government.

There is no more important question before the Congress today than that of bringing our fiscal affairs into balance. At the present time we are spending beyond our means. The result has been a deficit each year, with the exception of the 2 years when the Republicans had control of Congress in the Eightieth session. Prior to that time and since that time we have had a deficit each year. From present indications the deficit for this year will run upward of $6,000,000,000. In the coming fiscal year there is an indication that it may run as high as $8,000,000,000 if we spend at the rate fixed in the pending appropriation bill. We should not close our eyes to the harmful consequences that will result from the continuation of a policy of deficit spending. No individual can do this in his personal affairs, nor can any business do it, without reaping results that will be disastrous. Nor can our Government do it.

The situation becomes worse when we consider that in addition to the present appropriation bill, now before us dealing only with our domestic affairs, there will shortly come before us bills appropriating huge sums of money to carry out our economic and military aid to foreign nations. The amount we are spending for such purposes is becoming alarming. And, from present reports it seems that now we must assume obligations for the expenditure of funds in the countries of southeastern Asia. All of this is adding up to tremendous sums of money. How long are we going to be able to carry these burdensome expenditures? Every deficit adds to our national debt. Increasing expenditures makes necessary additional taxes. We should be thinking and acting in terms of reduced expenditures and thereby make possible reduced taxation.

There are some, who by their remarks, seem to think that the budget cannot be balanced. I do not agree with that viewpoint. I believe we can balance the budget by reducing expenditures, thereby we can reduce taxes and pay off something on the national debt. I do not hesitate to say this can be done when there is a will to do it. The Republicans in the Eightieth Congress did reduce expenditures, did balance the budget, did pay off a substantial sum of our national debt, did reduce taxes, and left a surplus in the Treasury. What has been done can be done again. It must be done if we are to maintain the strength and security of our Nation. This is a matter of prime importance. We do not know what the future holds in store for us. We, therefore, must make every effort to maintain our financial structure in a sound condition. If we do not do so, but permit it to grow continually weaker, then we are endangering our future national security. This we must not do.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in support of the Taber amendment. It cuts approximately six hundred million from the appropriations.

We are faced in fiscal 1951 with an operating deficit of over $6,000,000,000. How long can we continue deficit financing on such a large scale with a national debt of over $258,000,000,000?

I hope the Taber amendment will be accepted.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Chairman, this is a refreshing day for the American people, refreshing in that we are now engaged in a discussion as to whose amendment we shall adopt to save them money. It is refreshing—and not bewildering, as has been previously stated.

Let us be frank. The bewildering part of this entire procedure is the appropriations bill itself, and the method of its presentation. It utterly fails to provide the average Member of this body sufficient information by which to make an intelligent decision. I do not mean to infer that this is the fault of the distinguished Members who labor so diligently on the committee. They do the best job possible with poor machinery. It is the fault of our method of consideration. Therefore, I think, it is inappropriate and inaccurate to say that the method offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] for reduotion of the appropriations bill is not an intelligent one.

Members of this House must of necessity appropriate in a general way. That I may be fully understood, let me ask how many of you know how much money has been appropriated for telephone calls for the Department of Labor or the Department of Commerce, or for the purchase of gasoline or railroad or airplane tickets? How many of you know how much has been appropriated for salaries in the various agencies and their millions of employees? How many of you know how much has been appropriated for construction, for administration, for travel, for entertainment? Frankly, I do not believe that 1 percent of the Members of this House can cast an intelligent vote other than a general one. No Member of this House could conceivably spend enough hours in a day to attack the problem in such detail.

To carry the point further, the applications for funds do not come out of Congress, but from the administrative branch, through the Bureau of the Budget, which, incidentally, is an arm of the executive branch and not of the Congress. Their report is such that it is most difficult to comprehend, as all of the Members of this body know from experience. It is twice as thick as a Sears, Roebuck catalog, and not half so interesting. I have attempted, every year that I have been a Member of this House, to understand it, but it is put together in such a way, and probably of necessity, that I have great difficulty in doing so, and I am sure that the same is true of all of the Members of this body.

I have the greatest respect for the ability and intelligence of the members of the Appropriations Committee, and for the Members of the House of Representatives. I know how laboriously they work, and I know that they do not enjoy spending the money of the American people. The system that is available to them and to us, however, in the preparation and study of an appropriations bill, permits only a general appraisal.

There are some who are qualified to analyze and judge the needs of some of the departments. I venture there is none of us who is sufficiently familiar with the operation of all Government departments to be in position to correctly point out where money is being squandered and where it is being wisely spent.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, it seems very appropriate, when we attempt to cut the appropriations, that we do so generally, as has been suggested in the amendment of my distinguished colleague, Mr. THOMAS, of Texas. That is the only way that makes sense. Let us say to the Bureau of the Budget and to the Government departments, "This is what our Government can afford to spend. Use it to the best possible advantage." They and they alone are in position to determine where curtailments can be made with the least loss of service to the people.

In my judgment, the gentleman from Texas is rendering a distinct service to

the American people and to this body in offering such an amendment. We must strengthen our fiscal position, and this, in my judgment, is the only way in which it can and will be done. And, as you know, this amendment in no way curtails our national defense.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Instead of having a new method, we had better go back to the old method of reporting appropriations so that we can understand them. This is the worst I ever heard of.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield.

Mr. SCRIVNER. This is a new method, and that is one reason we do not have these details.

Mr. LYLE. We have never had them in the 6 years I have been here. I have been constantly endeavoring to understand what we are doing with the people's money. Therefore, I think the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], and the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], are both intelligent approaches.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I will say the only way we are ever going to get economy in Government is to have a Congress that is going to vote economy, or you are not going to get it. That does not apply to the gentleman now speaking, because I do not know his record, but I know that the only way we are going to have economy here is to vote economy.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Chairman, many of us from time to time are economy-minded, so we think, but when it comes down to the voting we soon find that we are not economy-minded, but economy-mouthed. I trust that we shall not be so today. It is estimated that this amendment will save $500,000,000. That is not a saving to the rich alone, but a saving to every American. It is a step that should strengthen our economy. It is a step that should strengthen America. It is a step that should inspire the executive departments to weed out the useless and unnecessary functions that most naturally and surely must be a part of each of them. If they do not have the money, they will not spend it unnecessarily. I shall support both the Thomas and the Taber amendments, for I believe them to be in the interest my country.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT].

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, very definitely the need for some economy has been established by these weeks of debate and by events throughout the country. Yesterday we were told of information which could not be made public, which seemed to point to the conclusion that we are in danger of going to war. Obviously, if there was any justification for those statements being made, and any justification for increasing the amounts for the military, then, regardless of our previous attitude, our legislative sins, or our waste, the time has come when we simply must get into financial condition to sustain a war effort. Secondly, the people of this country are demanding excise tax cuts in order that business may be encouraged; and, thirdly, the American people are getting mighty worried about the value of their savings and insurance and bonds. So, it becomes incumbent upon this House and this Congress to reduce the total cost of Government.

Now then, in this particular situation where we have three possibilities before us, I can see no reason why we cannot support the Taber amendment, and in the event it fails, support the Thomas amendment. I have listened here today to some very eloquent arguments about the Congress surrendering its power to the executive. Let me say this to you that historically the importance of legislative control of the purse had to do with moneys appropriated. That power was designed to prevent the king or the administrator from extracting money from the people without the consent of the people's representatives. Now then, the Thomas amendment is built upon a situation where each specific item has been outlined, the specific amounts fixed, the total amount fixed, and then it simply carries the final statement that the executive must spend some percent less than we have previously agreed to. Now, that is not surrendering our power. It is a further order to the executive that the total amount must be reduced this much. Certainly, if it were a matter of surrendering legislative power it would have been possible for the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] to have gone back and suggested a cut of so much in each item. But, as a realistic thing, to get the cost down, and to provide further for some flexibility with a change of circumstances, he has proposed, and I believe wisely, that the executive be instructed to cut the budget; not given the privilege of cutting it, but instructed to cut it. Now, that is not a surrender of power. The only thing I see the matter with the Thomas amendment is that it is not sufficiently high in the amount ordered cut.

[Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT.]

(Mr. COUDERT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, up to the hour of 1:40 on this day of grace the United States is still whirling down the road to ruin. This House will in a few minutes have an opportunity either to lend added impetus to that wild flight to disaster or to put on the brakes and turn the ship of state back upon a sound course, to sound fiscal policy, to a course that will save the value of the American dollar and the savings of the American people.

In my humble judgment, what we do this afternoon may well be a fateful decision, because if we accept this bill in its present form we will have pretty well committed ourselves to an indefinite continuance of unlimited, reckless, disastrous, inflationary deficit spending.

I am in favor of the Taber amendment because it is the obvious sound and constitutional way of meeting this problem.

It is the way the House should meet that major responsibility which is its responsibility first and foremost. If the Taber amendment should fail, I expect to support the Thomas amendment. It is not as effective and it is not the direct approach, but if the majority party is unwilling to support a sound and effective approach as offered by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], then I for one do not intend to allow partisan considerations to affect my judgment on a matter of the utmost importance to the Nation, to wit, a beginning of national economy in budgetary matters.

The distinguished gentlewoman from Utah had some very pertinent remarks to make about this bill and about the failure of the members of the Committee on Appropriations to understand what they are doing. Mr. Chairman, let me say to my fellow Members that the responsibility for that curious situation is largely that of the majority members of the Committee on Appropriations who forced upon the committee this monstrosity which we call the one-package bill. This entire bill came before the full committee with its $29,000 000,000 of authorizations and appropriations and in about 2 hours it was whipped through the full committee. No Member had an opportunity to get a bird's-eye view or to find out what was in any part of the bill except that of his own little subcommittee. In my humble judgment what has happened up to this time has demonstrated the utter failure of the one-package approach.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON].

(Mr. PRESTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, this has been a very interesting discussion today and as I sat here listening to the various comments pro and con and listening to those who are pleading for this approach to fix our fiscal policy for 1951, I wondered where all those Members were during the 3 months that the members of the Committee on Appropriations crept each morning at 10 o'clock down into the catacombs of the Capitol and stayed there until 6 o'clock in the evening sweating over this bill.

I wonder why these people who want to settle this fiscal matter in one fell swoop in this manner today did not come before our subcommittee and tell us then that the people of America are disturbed? Not a single Member of the House appeared before the subcommittee on which I served and asked us to reduce any item in any specific amount. I daresay that if the subcommittee chairmen here today were to take the

well and comment on this phase of the matter, they, too, would say that no Member of the Congress came before their subcommittees and pled for the reduction of a single item. No, my friends—you know where they were then. The Members of the House of Representatives were appearing before the legislative committees, asking for authorizations for expenditures. That is where they were. They were asking for projects in their own States and their own districts and it is only about 60 days before the primaries that they wake up to the fact that the people are becoming economy-conscious in the country. They did not think about it at the time the Committee on Appropriations were working on this bill doing its best to bring a sensible bill to the floor of the House.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Will the gentleman from Georgia please tell the Members of the House just what committee the Member from the Fourth District of Ohio appeared before during this session of the Congress, or during any other session of the Congress to ask for an appropriation either directly or indirectly for his district in Ohio?

Mr. PRESTON. May I say to the gentleman that the gentleman from Georgia has been so busy these days that he has not tried to keep up with the activities of the Member from the Fourth District of Ohio.

Mr. McCULLOCH. I would like to advise the gentleman from Georgia as well as other members of the committee that the Member from the Fourth Ohio District has not appeared before any committee or any subcommittee requesting authorizations or increased authorizations for his district in Ohio. And he does not intend to do so. I might further refer the gentleman from Georgia to that well-written editorial in the Saturday Evening Post which tells the story of how the Fourth District of Ohio solved their own problem of flood control in the great Ohio Valley.

Mr. PRESTON. I yielded for a question, not for an oration. I will ask the gentleman from the Fourth District of Ohio if he appeared before any committee asking for any economy.

Mr. McCULLOCH. I did not appear before your committee asking for economy. That was the duty of the members of your committee to effect economies.

Mr. PRESTON. I thank the gentleman. If this Thomas amendment is adopted, I hope the first place the President applies the cut will be the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, and cuts the salaries and money that we spend so freely.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, this morning we heard the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] talk about being practical. We also heard the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi talk about using common sense. We heard the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], talk about economy, "but."

Mr. Chairman, the President is going around the country in a special train telling the farmers how bad off they are. It reminds me very much of the fellow crying the blues with a ham under each arm.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. Yes, I yield.

Mr. RICH. Suppose the President finds out the engineer on this train is on strike and will not be able to get him back. Choo, choo, choo, woo, woo, woo. Train stop. The President ought to tell the people of this country that they will have to do one of three things. He will either have to spend less, tax more, or we go bust. Choo, choo, choo, woo, woo, woo. Cannot we get some economy in Government?

Mr. GAVIN. I thank the gentleman for that contribution.

I want to say that at the present time we have between four billion to $4,750,000,000 tied up in surplus foods; right on down the line, wheat, corn, cotton, down to soybeans. A couple of weeks ago we voted another $2,000,000,000 for the Commodity Credit Corporation to buy more surplus food products. Then the following week we had ECA, and we set up a billion dollars, which is a thousand million dollars, to buy more foodstuffs in the open market. Instead of taking this $1,000,000,000 that we appropriated to buy food in the open markets and set it up to purchase armaments, we are going to buy more foodstuffs when we cannot even now find places to store the food that we have already purchased.

This means that from the appropriations established, that they will be in a position to purchase $3,000,000,000 more of foodstuffs. Certainly that is not being practical. Certainly that is not common sense, when we have already tied up over $4,000,000,000 in foodstuffs and we are getting ready to buy up to $3,000,000,000 more. It is regrettable that the billion dollars set up in the ECA appropriation is not going into our national defense program for armaments, and that the four billion or more of stockpile foodstuffs that we now have, be used for distribution to those countries that need it, rather than spending another billion dollars in the open market to purchase foodstuffs. Here would have been a chance to save a billion dollars. We could have cut a billion dollars off of the ECA, because we already have the foodstuffs stockpiled that could be used to meet the demands to take care of any situation that might arise anywhere in the world. That would have been practical and common sense.

As my good friend from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] says, "Why, sure. We are for economy, but."

Let us not kid ourselves. Subsidy payments are great vote getters. We should be looking after the best interests of our country and economizing to build up our national defense to meet the needs and demands that may be made upon us if we suddenly find ourselves in an emergency.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

(Mr. GAVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is recognized.

(Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to speak on these amendments, but I felt impelled to do so for a rather special reason at this time. We are discussing whether or not we shall vote an amendment which may cut $600,000,000, or one which will cut $500,000,000, or one which will cut somewhere between $60,000,000 and $250,000,000. But one thing that has been completely overlooked is that should we cut to the extent of any one of these amounts the deficit will still remain at six to seven billion dollars. Therefore, there must be something we are not dealing with when after 3 weeks of debate and months of consideration by the Committee on Appropriations we are still in that position, and I take these few minutes to call to the attention of the House two things that we should be thinking about at a time when the shoe is pinching, and it is pinching right now.

First, in our thinking we forget about what has been happening in the 3 weeks we have had this bill under consideration, how we have been passing legislation which establishes fundamental policy that costs the United States hundreds of millions of dollars. It is not just a question of what we might cut this afternoon, but it is a question such as the high-fixed farm price parity is concerned which is holding up food prices as far as city consumers are concerned, costing vast sums of money and at the same time imperiling farmers because it is just stretching the rubber band much too far.

Second, we are not thinking enough about what America makes. It is not alone what America spends; it is what America makes that is so important. I hazard the hope that when the time comes the House will pay as serious attention as it is paying here now, to the proposals for small business, the proposals to stabilize our own economy in respect of employment, the proposals to expand our program of giving technical aid abroad and thus enormously increasing world-trade markets; the proposals for facilitating world trade, proposals for taking care of displacement which may be caused by what is going to be essential for the United States, a new import outlook. I hope that at least in those days we will remember this time today and remember that it is just as important to decide on how to help what America makes as it is to decide on how to cut what America spends.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. It is time we looked after American business in this country but suppose that at that same time we are looking after all the people of this world,

how can we look after our own when we let them come in and take the American market from our manufacturers? How can we cure unemployment that way? It cannot be done.

Mr. JAVITS. The gentleman from Pennsylvania and I have talked that out before. It is only by expanding the markets of the world that America will be able to sell more of her own goods and increase her own employment.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. I wish to join with my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] in complimenting the gentleman from New York on his fine statement.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. REES. The gentleman has indicated that one of the factors of high cost of living is farm prices. Does the gentleman realize that in a 15-cent loaf of bread only 2 cents represents what the farmer in the Middle West gets for the wheat in that loaf of bread? Does the gentleman realize that the farmer gets only 22 cents a dozen for eggs for which the gentleman from New York pays 70 cents?

Mr. JAVITS. I have found no fault with the farmer, but only with policy which must be reviewed—including this very spread to which the gentleman refers. I believe in the stabilization of farm prices but it must have a relation to the realities the city dweller faces.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

(Mr. STEFAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

PEOPLE DEMAND ECONOMY

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. This amendment would save the taxpayers of the Nation more than $600,000,000. I wish we could make a larger saving. We are confronted at this point in the bill with three amendments. The first by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], whose amendment would perhaps make a saving of about $500,000,000. This amendment, however, leaves the authority to the Chief Executive. The other amendment is that of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] which he indicates would make a saving of about $50,000,000. The Taber amendment, however, is the only one of the three that actually is mandatory and definitely makes a real and definite decrease. That is the amendment I hope the House will vote for.

I am proud of my membership on the committee which brought this huge appropriation bill to this House with a cut of $1,500,000,000 below the President's budget figure. I am also proud of my membership on the subcommittee which decreased the President's budget figures by nearly $100,000,000 in our bill.

Members of this House will recall that when we first presented this huge appropriation bill I took the floor and stated that although we made initial cuts in the committee that there is room for more reductions. The people in my district want economy if we can make same without serious injury to the necessary functions of Government. Here is our opportunity to do this. I am familiar with the items in the Taber amendment and I feel certain that this decrease will not apply to the necessary defense items nor to the veteran portions of the bill. There is still room to cut out a large amount of personnel, travel, administration and other items in Government without seriously injuring any of the necessary functions.

Mr. Chairman, we must make reductions in unnecessary expenditures and this is the place to do this. With a public debt of more than $260,000,000,000 and an annual interest charge on that public debt of $6,000,000,000 and an annual cost of $50,000,000 to administer the debt is one real reason why something must be done now. We know that we are faced with a deficit of about $7,000,000,000 a year. Financial ruin is staring us in the face. We know we must make expenditures for our national defense. We can cut very little or nothing in that item. So we must make the savings in other sections of the bill. Even with this saving of more than half a billion dollars in the Taber amendment we will not be able to balance the budget but we will make a start in that direction. We did a good job in this regards in the Eightieth Congress when we balanced the budget, paid on the public debt, showed a little surplus, and even cut taxes. Necessary Government functions were not injured. This is an example we must follow in this Eighty-first Congress.

THE FARM PROBLEM

Regarding another matter—that which was referred to by the previous speaker, the gentleman from New York—that is the question of the farmer. I wish to state that the farmers in my district are in favor of economy and want the budget balanced eventually. In reply to his intimation that the farmer is so well off, I may state that the facts do not bear out this belief. By such statements you would think that the farmers get everything the consumers pay for what they eat. This is far from the truth.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I want to say just a few words to correct somewhat the impression left by the gentleman from New York as to the cost of our farm price supports. I wonder if he realizes that the entire price-support program has not exceeded a total of $1,140,000,000 since 1939. This is based on the testimony of Mr. Brannan given to our subcommittee last January 12. I think the gentleman will agree upon those statistics and that $100,000,000 a year is a small cost when we consider the great good a prosperous agriculture does for our entire economy.

Mr. STEFAN. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for his statement in behalf of the farmers. Were the farmers to give away everything they produced the people in the East would still be paying at least 75 percent for many agriculture products.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That is correct.

Mr. STEFAN. That is an argument in favor of price supports for the farmers which the gentleman helped so much in bringing about during his service in Congress.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman from Nebraska has also fought for years for this program. Will the gentleman further agree that were it not for the fact we have held farm prices to that level we call parity the industrial sections of our Nation would certainly suffer from a lot of unemployment?

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman from Minnesota is right. The people of the East ought to realize the farmer should get at least the cost of production plus a reasonable profit.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I thank the gentleman. He has always been one of the best friends the farmers have in Congress and the State of Nebraska has a right to be proud of him.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I want to compliment the gentleman on his last statement. The farmer is entitled to cost of production plus a reasonable profit.

Mr. STEFAN. He has not been getting it for a long, long time. The farmer today is the man who suffers first from a decrease in food prices and always pays high prices for things he buys. Certainly the gentleman will agree with me that if the transportation and the distribution problems were solved we would solve a whole lot of our economic ills so far as the farmer is concerned. I have introduced a transportation bill with hopes that it will help solve this problem. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. CARL H. ANDERSEN] and other great friends of the American farmer favor this approach to solve our transportation and distribution problem. In the meantime we must keep fighting for full support on farm prices; otherwise the farmer will suffer and the laboring, business, and professional men will suffer with him.

(Mr. GROSS and Mr. WILLIAMS asked and were given permission to extend their remarks at this point.)

[Mr. GROSS addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

[Mr. WILLIAMS addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. IRVING].

(Mr. IRVING asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. IRVING. Mr. Chairman, I doubt if I can contribute too much in the short time available to me, but I would like to say a few words here regarding this bill. First, I want to refer to the statement made by the whip of the party on the left that only a few Democrats had voted for economy, that the Republicans were outvoted, and so forth. He complimented his Members for being on the floor. Where were they? The gentleman knows they were not too many of them here and that at any time they could have done right well if they had been.

I recall being on the floor practically every day before the Easter vacation and every day since. I recall the very noticeable absence of Members on the floor during all of this time while we were reading and during the discussion of the $29,000,000,000 appropriation bill which we have before us. Further than that, I want to say that several comments were made by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] about the diligence of the Democratic whip in being able to round up a few more votes every time so that the Republicans could not make their votes for economy count. I think if their whip and their party had been as diligent about getting on the floor and staying on the floor practically any day they could have outvoted the Democrats on this proposition because the Democrats did not stay on the floor either. There were times when there were only 40 or 50 Members on the floor and sometimes less than that. I have been somewhat skeptical about this siuation and the earnestness and sincerity of people who are attempting to make a political issue out of economy. Perhaps they do not really want real economy as bad as they want it for an issue which they need badly.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IRVING. No. The gentleman wastes too much of the taxpayers' money every time he gets down here in the well of the House hollering about economy and does not practice it himself.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman does not believe in economy, he does not vote for economy, and he knows his statement is not the truth.

Mr. IRVING. I did not yield to the gentleman. He does not know what he is talking about. In fact his statements are utterly unfounded and perhaps accidentally false. If he will check the RECORD he will find that I have voted for economy. He will also find that I practice it in the conduct of my office and in many other ways that I shall be glad to tell him about. Of course, I think he knows very well how money is wasted in many ways.

I refuse to yield further. The gentleman wastes the time of the House every day singing the same song over and over again. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and the Appendix are filled with all kinds of useless, needless, and ineffective statements and so forth that costs the taxpayers money. He has cried wolf and whined so many times that it has gotten to be a joke.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IRVING. I refuse to yield.

Mr. Chairman, I think it would be a good idea if the Congress would practice a little economy itself. I think that maybe the various branches and departments of this Government would be a little more inclined to practice economy themselves if there was a fairly economical Congress here showing that they also believed in economy and would be willing to take the same medicine they prescribe so freely for others, thereby pointing a way and setting an example for them. I do not know but what they may get a little disgusted being preached at for economy all the time, and they may well say, "Well, here is a Congress wasting money right and left. They do not practice economy themselves, so why should we?" I have always been told if you want somebody to do something, set that kind of an example for them, and I think it probably would be a good idea for the Congressmen themselves to get down to business and practice economy in the running of their own affairs.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IRVING. No; I refuse to yield.

Mr. ARENDS. The gentleman referred to me. Will he yield?

Mr. IRVING. I referred in no manner that was critical. I hope that he can get all of his Members out here to vote for economy, because I surely think they could have outvoted the Democrats every time in favor of economy if they had really wanted to. I would like to see them actually do so.

Mr. ARENDS. With a 92 Democratic majority we cannot.

Mr. IRVING. There has never been a 92-percent majority on the floor in all the weeks we have been considering this bill, and it looked to me just like the Republicans were counting out their Members to have just a few less each time than the Democrats so that they could say that they could not vote these economy measures. Now the Democrats are for real economy, not false economy that in the end costs the taxpayers more. How about 1947–48? The Internal Revenue Bureau was cut so that the Government lost hundreds of millions of dollars. This certainly is not sound economy—save a few dollars and lose millions. That is why we need to make separate and individual cuts or reductions where they can be made without losing efficiency. Why did not we do so while we were working on this bill the last several weeks instead of trying to pass the buck to the President? We are dodging our responsibility and giving away duties if we do that.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. O'SULLIVAN].

(Mr. O'SULLIVAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, we have heard a great deal of very caustic and severe criticism from the Republican side of this House of Representatives concerning this omnibus appropriation bill. The various appropriations contained in the budget and reflected in this bill have been called by some previous Republican speakers some very bad and unseemly things—some terrible names—and the impression has gone forth to the public generally that this bill is a sort of haphazard affair; that no one had any real concern about the money appropriated or the purposes of the appropriation except these self-crowned saviors of the Republic who are but a small segment of the Congress. Their concern, however, started to be manifested only when this bill began to be discussed before the Committee of the Whole. They never testified themselves before any appropriations subcommittee.

The word seems to have gone out from the Republican strategy committee to use to the full the present appropriations bill for its nefarious political purposes in an effort to persuade the people through the reactionary press of the Nation that the present appropriations could be cut so as to balance the budget. In some instances they have succeeded in so fooling the people. The only daily newspaper in Omaha has been such a paid tool for this unholy lobby and for days has ran articles and editorials on its front page, and as a consequence I have received 59 letters from my district to the effect that the budget should be balanced and that President Truman ought to be stopped in his efforts to foist such a budget upon the people. Heretofore I never thought that it would be humanly possible for reactionary republicanism to so deceive the people. There seems to be a concentrated effort to give out false information to the people through the kept press of the Nation and vie with nazism, fascism, and Stalinism to repeat the lies so often that the people would put full credence in them. I shall take my remaining time to call the attention of this House and the readers of the CONGRESIONAL RECORD to certain undeniable truths concerning budget balancing and the way this budget, as contained in this omnibus appropriations bill, was made up.

First of all, this budget cannot be balanced at this time. It is humanly impossible. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and every other truthful Republican and Democratic Congressman will tell you that. There are $14,000,000,000 of fixed charges which cannot be cut. This leaves a balance of about $15,000,000,000 to run the Government and pay for all other items of expense. If it were not for the cold war, the budget could be balanced and something could be paid on the national debt. Other speakers have and will explain this in greater detail.

Now, is this budget in its present form as reflected by the omnibus appropriations bill made up by the President? The undeniable answer is "No." It is made up in the following fashion: Prior to the beginning of each fiscal year—before July 1—each of the departments of Government requests each of its various subdivisions to make up estimates as to the amount of money necessary to run each of same. Experts in each subdivision furnish the heads of the departments with this carefully pre-

pared, itemized data. Then the heads of the departments go carefully through these items and eliminate all unnecessary costs. Then the heads of each of the departments of Government transmit their corrected and trimmed budgets to the Bureau of the Budget, which is composed of many highly trained and capable experts, who examine carefully these financial demands of the heads of the departments of Government, and in turn eliminate all discovered duplications and unnecessary expenses, and finally makes up the budgetary demands and transmits them to the President, who in turn has his experts examine examine and check these items, and then sends them to the Congress. They are then sent to the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives, because all appropriations must originate, under the United States Constitution, in the House of Representatives. The Committee on Appropriations is composed of 45 able men, comprised of Democrats and Republicans.

The membership of the present Appropriations Committee is as follows:

Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Eighty-first Congress: CLARENCE CANNON, Missouri, Chairman; JOHN H. KERR, North Carolina; GEORGE H. MAHON, Texas; HARRY R. SHEPPARD, California; ALBERT THOMAS, Texas; MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, Ohio; W. F. NORRELL, Arkansas; ALBERT GORE, Tennessee; JAMIE L. WHITTEN, Mississippi; GEORGE W. ANDREWS, Alabama; JOHN J. ROONEY, New York; J. VAUGHAN GARY, Virginia; JOE B. BATES, Kentucky; JOHN E. FOGARTY, Rhode Island; HENRY M. JACKSON, Washington; ROBERT L. F. SIKES, Florida; ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ, New Mexico; WILLIAM G. STIGLER, Oklahoma; E. H. HEDRICK, West Virginia; PRINCE H. PRESTON, JR., Georgia; OTTO E. PASSMAN, Louisiana; LOUIS C. RABAUT, Michigan; DANIEL J. FLOOD, Pennsylvania; CHRISTOPHER C. MCGRATH, New York; SIDNEY R. YATES, Illinois; FOSTER FURCOLO, Massachusetts; EDWARD H. KRUSE, JR., Indiana; JOHN TABER, New York; RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH, Massachusetts; CHARLES A. PLUMLEY, Vermont; ALBERT J. ENGEL, Michigan; KARL STEFAN, Nebraska; FRANCIS CASE, South Dakota; FRANK B. KEEFE, Wisconsin; BEN F. JENSEN, Iowa; H. CARL ANDERSEN, Minnesota; WALT HORAN, Washington; GORDON CANFIELD, New Jersey; IVOR D. FENTON, Pennsylvania; LOWELL STOCKMAN, Oregon; JOHN PHILLIPS, California; ERRETT P. SCRIVNER, Kansas; FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR., New York; CLIFF CLEVENGER, Ohio; EARL WILSON, Indiana.

This full Committee on Appropriations is divided into the following subcommittees:

District of Columbia—subcommittee: JOE B. BATES, Kentucky, Chairman; SIDNEY R. YATES, Illinois; FOSTER FURCOLO, Massachusetts; RALPH E. CHURCH, Illinois; LOWELL STOCKMAN, Oregon.

House of Representatives, Architect of the Capitol, Botanic Gardens, Library of Congress, Government Printing Office—Subcommittee: CHRISTOPHER C. MCGRATH, New York, chairman; MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, Ohio; GEORGE W. ANDREWS, Alabama; ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ, New Mexico (temporarily assigned); GORDON CANFIELD, New Jersey; ERRETT P. SCRIVNER, Kansas.

Department of State, Department of Justice, Department of Commerce, the Judiciary—Subcommittee: JOHN J. ROONEY, New York, chairman; DANIEL J. FLOOD, Pennsylvania; PRINCE H. PRESTON, Georgia; KARL STEFAN, Nebraska; CLIFF CLEVENGER, Ohio.

Treasury Department, Post Office Department, Export-Import Bank of Washington, Reconstruction Finance Corporation—Subcommittee: J. VAUGHAN GARY, Virginia, chairman; ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ, New Mexico; OTTO E. PASSMAN, Louisiana; GORDON CANFIELD, New Jersey; FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR., New York.

Department of Labor, Federal Security Agency, National Labor Relations Board, National Mediation Board, Railroad Retirement Board, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service—Subcommittee: JOHN E. FOGARTY, Rhode Island, chairman; E. H. HEDRICK, West Virginia; CHRISTOPHER C. MCGRATH, New York; FRANK B. KEEFE, Wisconsin; ERRETT P. SCRIVNER, Kansas.

Department of Agriculture—Subcommittee: JAMIE L. WHITTEN, Mississippi, chairman; WILLIAM G. STIGLER, Oklahoma; EDWARD H. KRUSE, JR., Indiana; H. CARL ANDERSEN, Minnesota; WALT HORAN, Washington.

Department of the Interior—Subcommittee: MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, Ohio, chairman; W. F. NORRELL, Arkansas; HENRY M. JACKSON, Washington; BEN F. JENSEN, Iowa; IVOR D. FENTON, Pennsylvania.

Executive office of the President, sundry independent offices and agencies, General Services Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Inland Waterways Corporation, Tennessee Valley Authority—subcommittee: ALBERT THOMAS, Texas, chairman; ALBERT GORE, Tennessee; GEORGE W. ANDREWS, Alabama; FRANCIS CASE, South Dakota; JOHN PHILLIPS, California.

Civil functions, Department of the Army—subcommittee: JOHN H. KERR, North Carolina, chairman; CLARENCE CANNON, Missouri; LOUIS C. RABAUT, Michigan; JOHN TABER, New York; RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH, Massachusetts.

Department of Defense—subcommittee: GEORGE H. MAHON, Texas, chairman; HARRY R. SHEPPARD, California; ROBERT L. F. SIKES, Florida; ALBERT J. ENGEL, Michigan; CHARLES A. PLUMLEY, Vermont.

Since the adoption this year of the one-package appropriation bill called the Omnibus Appropriation bill, another final screening committee has been set up called the Central Subcommittee and it is as follows:

Central Subcommittee: LOUIS C. RABAUT, Michigan, chairman; W. F. NORRELL, Arkansas; ALBERT GORE, Tennessee, E. H. HEDRICK, West Virginia; OTTO E. PASSMAN, Louisiana; JOHN TABER, New York; RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH, Massachusetts; KARL STEFAN, Nebraska. Alternates: HENRY M. JACKSON, Washington; WILLIAM G. STIGLER, Oklahoma; SIDNEY R. YATES, Illinois; ALBERT J. ENGEL, Michigan; FRANK B. KEEFE, Wisconsin.

All of the aforementioned 10 committees have held hearings for a long period of time and have done painstaking and diligent work and when they had gone over the budget proposals made by the President, and checked every matter thoroughly and made reductions where they deemed they should be made, their finished product was reviewed and rechecked by the central subcommittee, which also made reductions, and then the present bill was drafted reducing the estimates in the President's proposal by a very sizable sum.

Is there anyone who is wild and reckless enough to say that the making up of this budget was not a careful and painstaking effort?

Who is there who would be so ignoble and unjust as to find fault with the splendid service rendered by this Appropriations Committee to the rest of the Congress and to the Nation and its people? Why should I believe my reactionary home-town newspaper, and its 59 letter writers, and turn down the skilled and mature judgment of the subcommittees on appropriations and the central committee on appropriations and the full committee on appropriations? It just does not make sense to me and I shall stand back of these fine patriotic Democrats and Republicans who worked so hard and well to do a splendid job on this one-package budget, because they had all the facts at their disposal, and my other advisers had no facts at all—just a pack of lies.

When this bill is completed before the House it will then go to the Senate for rechecking, rescreening before its appropriation subcommittees and committee. It will be debated and voted upon in the Senate. If the Senate disagrees with the House, conferees of both bodies will be appointed, and all differences will be resolved and when both bodies agree it will go to the President, who can either sign the bill or veto it. If it is vetoed by the President it can be passed over his veto, if the proper majority is obtained.

No, my friends, this is not a haphazard, loosely thrown together, damnable, or outrageous budget bill at all, careless praters to the contrary notwithstanding. It is a splendidly considered bill and will end up, I am sure, as a splendid law which everyone of us, except the chronic or soreheads and bellyachers, can support.

I am sorry to take up so much time in detailing the foregoing matters but I believe it was worth the effort.

True our national debt is high because of past wars and their aftermath. The debt is now about $257,000,000,000. I ask the complainers which they would prefer, an unbombed Nation with a large debt, or a bombed Nation with an inconsequential debt? We had to pay a high price to win these wars but do you not think it was worth it? We should make every effort to economize, but not walk backward in trying to do it, but forward. We must carry on this cold war to try to avert world war III. We must be prepared and if my vote will do it we shall be prepared.

Our Nation is not bankrupt, nor any way near bankruptcy. Our physical assets are well worth over $684,000,000,000. Our national income is $225,000,000,000 plus. We are heavily in debt now, but when peace finally comes it will be as a drop in the bucket if we can still keep the enemies from our shores and splatter theirs with bombs.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

(Mr. PHILLIPS of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, the more I listen to the discussion and the nearer we approach the end of the time we have for the discussion of this amendment the more convinced I am that the discussion has gone deeper than whether we shall cut a certain amount of money from the bill before us. We have gone to a basic prin-

ciple in the form of government under which the United States operates.

If you will read history as it refers to other nations that have gone through the same experience and also the papers and the records of the discussions of the men who set up our kind of government more than 170 years ago, you will realize why it is that the form of government we have has existed for some 170 years, while every other government in the world that was in existence at that time has changed its government in that period.

What happened in this new country was that we took the records and the experiences of the other nations of the world up to that time and, in the hands of men like Jefferson, Madison, and Hamilton, and others, we took the weaknesses of those governments and the strengths and out of them created a government that had the simple principles embodied in our Constitution. For that reason we have existed as a free government when other nations of the world have lost their freedoms.

One of the essential features of our form of government has been the control of the purse, the control of the power of appropriation and of taxation, in the hands of the representatives of the people. The moment we give that up, even by the process of saying to the executive branch, "You take our work, which we have been unable to finish, and you work on it," the minute we do that we have surrendered one of the strengths in our Government.

As a practical matter, then, what would happen? Do you, Mr. Chairman, or do any of the people here, want to put into the hands of any one man of either party in the executive arm of the Government the right to determine where cuts shall be made in the budget, without consideration or representation or discussion among the representatives of the people who would be affected?

So I rise to remark that we have come today to another milestone in the history of the United States, that we shall stand up today and be counted on whether we are still for the republic, for free government, and for government in the hands of the people's representatives, or whether we shall move one step farther toward centralization of government, which inevitably in the history of the world has led to dictatorship.

Today, therefore, Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], but I shall not vote for any amendment or any substitute which takes power and protection away from representative government.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, this is the kind of day when Members of Congress like to stand up and be counted. Some have spoken apologetically about economy, professing their desire for the practice of economy and yet not appearing to realize that the House has already effected some very real and substantial reductions in the pending bill. Perhaps without exception, every Member has supported some substantial reductions in the pending measure. Let us not delude ourselves. Yesterday we passed the military portion of this bill. Even in the military portion of the measure, by reason of our desire for economy, we reduced the military requests of the President and of the Secretaries of Army, Navy, and the Air Force $190,000,000. We even reduced the funds for the Air Force, an establishment which is so popular with the country and the Congress and so essential to our defense, in an earnest effort to promote economy. We do not have to apologize and say that just today we have decided for the first time to become economy minded. Already in the mill we have made an earnest effort and some real progress in the direction of reduced spending. I have supported those efforts to effect economies and I join with others in the desire to achieve additional savings.

Our savings, as a result of the language and figures in this bill thus far, amount to $1 500,000,000. I do not apologize for the measure which has been presented to you.

When a war is on does anyone say that we should balance the budget and thereby perhaps lose the war? I think not. We bend every effort to the winning of the war, despite an unbalanced budget. Everyone knows that a certain type of war is in progress right now and that peace has not been achieved or declared. The cold war is a reality. The cold war brings about expenditures in some ways comparable to a shooting war. So we are now in the midst, if not in the critical stage, of the cold war. When one is asked why the Congress does not balance the budget, the answer is not hard to find. Thoughtful Americans are aware that we are spending at the rate of $20,000,000,000 a year in an effort to strengthen our national defense and win the cold war. We are bending every effort toward preventing world war No. 3. By reason of those efforts the budget is out of balance but peace is worth all we are doing to achieve it. If you take out the $13,000,000,000 for the Army, Navy, and Air Force, the ECA funds and the atomic energy and other funds amounting to a grand total of about $20,000,000,000 in the President's budget, if you eliminate the cold war, then you have a balanced budget and we can make a substantial payment on the public debt. That is the reason why we have not balanced the budget and that is why the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], does not himself advocate reductions adequate to balance the budget. The gentleman from New York merely says, in effect, in his amendment, "Let us reduce the budget by an additional $600,000,000 which would be added to the $1,500,000,000 reduction already made." That action would not, of course, balance the budget, as much as we all desire to see the budget balanced. Moreover, the so-called Taber amendment would give the executive branch a blank check, so to speak, to cut appropriations without specific congressional authorization. The amendment means that Congress would surrender its power and authority to the executive. For my part, I do not believe that Congress should surrender its power of representative government. Congress canot properly shift its responsibility for economy in government to the executive. Congress should make the necessary reductions, specifying exactly where they are to apply. There is no other proper procedure.

Under the Taber amendment we would assign to the Executive the authority to make the reductions. The Congress would not make the reductions as required by the American system of democracy. In what department the reductions would be made, no man can tell. How severe the reductions would be, no one can tell. Mr. Chairman, Congress should accept its responsibility.

I dare say that not 10 percent of the Members have had an opportunity to read the amendment of the gentleman from New York. It is printed in the RECORD, but I doubt if anyone upon careful reading of the RECORD can understand or interpret it.

The amendment says, "For equipment not more than $3,577,000,000 may be expended." A reduction is proposed, and I would not oppose a needed reduction. But where will the reduction be made? No one can say, because the Congress is abdicating its authority to make appropriations. This I refuse to do. We should not surrender our prerogatives as legislators.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman would yield, this hits every single item, separately, that the President sent up here.

Mr. MAHON. It takes equipment in all agencies of Government, amounting to $3,577,000,000. There is no way of telling what agency would be reduced and to what extent.

Mr. TABER. Not in the defense set-up.

Mr. MAHON. The defense set-up is exempted, but there is no possible way of knowing where the changes in the bill would take place in the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York. Therefore, it is abdication of our responsibility to legislate, whether or not we admit it. We turn over to the Executive the power of legislation.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman would read my amendment he would know that it would be on specific items.

Mr. MAHON. It would be made in what agency? No word is said as to where or how or when, except during the fiscal year 1951. That is the situation even though certain broad categories are mentioned in the amendment. The committee, and the House, in their desire to achieve economy, have already reduced the budget by $1,500,000,000, as has been previously explained. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, in a desire to go even further, has offered an amendment which anybody can understand, and which does not abdicate congressional powers. I am supporting the Cannon amendment in an effort to further promote savings.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Texas.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. The Cannon amendment simply provides that the Bureau of the Budget, in apportioning the funds to the various departments, shall withhold 5 percent of the administrative funds from each department. That money could not be released unless it should be necessary for the essential purposes of the Government. This procedure should achieve a substantial reduction in civilian personnel.

The Members understand that when we appropriate money for a department, the actual money is not sent to the department. Every agency of the Government goes to the Bureau of the Budget and in effect says, "We have an appropriation of a certain amount for the fiscal year. Our schedule of expenditures for the first quarter, second quarter, third quarter, and fourth quarter is so much." That program is laid out, quarter by quarter, and the money is released for each quarter by the Bureau of the Budget to the agency. In other words, the funds are released and channeled through the Bureau of the Budget to the agency.

The committee amendment simply says that 5 percent of the administrative funds for the agencies shall be held by the budget, in order to effect further economies. The sum held in reserve could not be released unless such expenditures should be absolutely essential for carrying on the necessary operations of the Government. So that is where we stand.

Except for the cold war, we would easily balance the budget. We are doing our best to achieve savings and we do not have to apologize for a critical international situation which has thus far kept the budget out of balance. The amendment of the gentleman from New York is not the answer to the unbalanced budget. A more stable world situation is required. So long as our airplanes are being shot down and our way of life is threatened, it is not unwise to spend a few billion dollars in the cause of peace and national security.

All Members wish to take every safe step in the direction of economy. Legislation is a matter of compromise and the Cannon amendment seems to afford the best approach to our problem at the moment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] is recognized to close debate on the pending amendment.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield my time to the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL], the ranking member of the executive committee.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, did not the gentleman announce that he would oppose any such consent request?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is not advised what the gentleman may have announced yesterday. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL].

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I believe we all understand now what is going on. Shortly after we convened the subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations started work on the budget for the next fiscal year. These subcommittees of our Appropriation Committee have heard thousands of witnesses. They heard the testimony, considered all matters before them, and made the cuts that the committee has made in this bill. When these subcommittees had finished their hearings the chairman of the full committee appointed an executive subcommittee whose duty it was to try to consolidate and assemble the recommendations of the several subcommittees and write one bill containing the entire budget of the United States for the fiscal year 1951.

The gentleman from Michigan was chairman of that committee; I was the next on the Democratic side. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] was the ranking minority member. We invited the chairman and ranking minority member of each of our subcommittees to appear before the executive subcommittee for a general discussion of their committee work, and with but one exception these distinguished chairmen and ranking minority members indicated that all possible cuts had been made. The subexecutive committee then wrote the bill. Actually all we could do was to receive the several recommended reports and bills from the jurisdictional subcommittee. This is what we did. Each chapter of this bill was entirely prepared by the jurisdictional subcommittee. I think the actions of the various subcommittees were unanimous with very few exceptions. Only one exception was indicated to our subexecutive committee. The total savings made under total budget estimates amount to about one and half billion dollars.

The flaw in the statement of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] is that he charges us with increases in the bill but does not give us credit for increased budget estimates. The bill has actually been reduced about a billion and a half dollars when you add to the original budget estimates the supplemental budget estimates; and I am sure he will agree with me on that.

We have read this bill line by line, word by word, figure by figure. There is not a man in this House who has not had an opportunity to reduce the bill or at least to offer an amendment on any word or figure in the entire bill. We have been considering this bill in excess of a month and the net result has been that many of the cuts made by the Appropriation Committee have been restored. That, of course, was your privilege. The fact is that the bill has not been reduced as it should have been, but you have canceled out several cuts that your Committee on Appropriations recommended. I have voted for cuts in subcommittees and in the full committee and on the floor of the House during the consideration of this bill.

I am going to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] in the hope—I am not kidding myself and I do not want you to think I am—that it may mean that a strong suggestion by us will result in the Director of the Budget Bureau agreeing to cut out something; yet I am under the impression that since he has approved the items we already have in the bill to begin with he probably will not do anything.

If the Cannon amendment should not be adopted, then we may have to support the only amendment remaining in order to make substantial reductions in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion the other body may accomplish more than we have. At least I hope so.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired on the pending amendments.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment to the amendment be again read.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Taber amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Permit the Chair to state the existing situation. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], has offered an amendment. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], offered a substitute for the Thomas amendment. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], offered an amendment to the Thomas amendment. The vote will first come on the Taber amendment to the Thomas amendment, then the vote will be on the Cannon substitute for the Thomas amendment, and then the vote on the Thomas amendment.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided; and there were—ayes 159, noes 141.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. RABAUT and Mr. TABER.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 183, noes 147.

So the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RABAUT) there were—ayes 123, noes 181.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. RABAUT and Mr. TABER.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 141, noes 194.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] as amended by the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. RABAUT and Mr. THOMAS.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 213, noes 115.

So the amendment as amended was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 1101. Unless otherwise specifically provided, the maximum amount allowable during the current fiscal year, in accordance with section 16 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 78), for the purchase of any passenger motor vehicles (exclusive of busses, ambulances, and station wagons), is hereby fixed at $1,400.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, on May 5 the committee adopted the Case amendment. The Case amendment cut the administration fund of the Public Housing Administration $2,950,000. This means that the low-cost rental-housing program which we adopted earlier this year will be cut one-third in its administrative appropriation.

This is like taking the gasoline away from the automobile. You build the automobile and then you refuse to let the automobile have the gasoline necessary for its propulsion.

The President submitted a budget of $13,000,000 for the first full year's operation of this 6-year program. The House Appropriations Committee cut $1,300,000 of this, and then the Case amendment cut $2,950,000 more. This made a total cut of $4,250,000 on a $13,000,000 appropriation.

The result of that cut will be that general orders will have to be issued in the Public Housing Administration freezing all personnel employment. They will not be able to hire the people to administer the program which we passed in this House earlier this year.

It is interesting to note that during the presentation of this amendment by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], the subcommittee chairman, spoke against the amendment. However, the Case amendment was carried notwithstanding the opposition of the chairman of the subcommittee. When the committee rises and we are in the House, I hope some member of the Committee on Appropriations will ask for a separate vote on this particular amendment. If not, I shall ask for a separate vote on it.

I emphasize the fact that the total cut of the Committee on Appropriations and the Case amendment is $4,250,000 on a $13,000,000 budget. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], in his presentation, made several mistakes in his argument. He stated this would result in a 25-percent cut. As I have shown you it is a 33⅓-percent cut. He also stated it was twice as much as the Public Housing Administration uses during the current year. I point out that the supplemental appropriation during the current year was for an eight-and-a-half-month operation.

In other words, instead of a $4,250,000 cut, it amounts to a $6,600,000 cut on an annual basis in relation to the current budget. I shall ask for a separate vote on this amendment.

I hope those who are interested in the middle-income-housing groups and in making effective the middle-income-housing problem, so that people in the middle-income bracket will have houses to live in, and houses to rent, built by local authorities with private funds.

A vote for the Case amendment is a vote against the people in the middle- and low-income brackets who need housing. It will hamstring the PHA in its administrative services.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. My understanding is that this will also seriously affect the low-cost-housing program which was passed by the Congress only a short while ago.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is correct. The cut in this fund by one-third, as I said, is equivalent to taking the gasoline out of the automobile of low-cost housing.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I hope the gentleman is successful in obtaining a roll-call vote on this proposition.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I shall ask for a separate vote and hope the House will support the striking out of the Case amendment.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman from Missouri that we should confine the discussion to the matters before us, but since there would be no opportunity to speak on this, and since the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is absent at the moment on important business, and since he had no reason to think we would return today to an amendment previously adopted, it is necessary for me to put upon the record certain facts which the House should know, particularly if on tomorrow or at any other time a motion would be made to ask for a roll-call vote upon that particular amendment.

It is necessary for the House to know that in the discussion before the subcommittee on independent offices which considered that matter it was generally felt—and while I speak only for myself, I say it was certainly a matter that appeared in the evidence before us—that this particular agency of Government could well stand a greater cut in its administrative expenses than had been given. The gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], my colleague and my good friend, said that it is like providing an automobile but not providing gasoline. His simile is not quite correct. It is a case in which an automobile needs 3 gallons of gasoline to get to a certain place, so he proposes to give it 10 gallons of gasoline for that particular distance.

Last year and in the preceding years, this agency of Government came before us and used the breaks, to speak in the vernacular. It used the little profit that it made on the difference between the amount it charged in interest and the amount that was charged it for money furnished from another agency. This year we gave it a different set-up in a legislative bill which passed the Congress, in which we gave it the right to come before the House and ask for a certain amount of money for administrative expenses. It was very noticeable that the amount immediately increased over the amount used in the preceding year, and the reduction desired by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is apparently less than the difference asked for. So I hope that the amendment of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] will be sustained, with the very firm feeling that the administrative costs of this agency could be reduced without damaging its effectiveness. I do hope that, if a roll-call vote is asked for on tomorrow, the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] will be sustained.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JAVITS: On page 412, after line 8, insert the following new section 1102, and renumber the succeeding sections accordingly:

"SEC. 1102. No part of any appropriation contained in this act for education, research, and training shall be expended subsequent to the effective date of this act for tuition fees, grants, or other charges to any institution of higher learning, other than a religious or denominational institution, selecting its students exclusively or primarily from the members of such religion or denomination, on that basis, which excludes, limits, or otherwise discriminates against any person or persons seeking admission as students or faculty in such institution because of race, religion, creed, color, or national origin, or segregates such person or persons after admission."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. RABAUT. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment for two reasons: First, because the bill contains something in the neighborhood of $3,000,000,000 for payment to institutions of higher education and payments to those who attend such institutions, the largest figure about $2,500,000,000 being the figure for veterans. I have patterned this amendment closely after the law which we have in the State of New York prohibiting discrimination against those who seek admission into colleges and universities, which law has worked very effectively in New York, and I think it ought to be clear that this is no vain idea, no abstract belief. In New York we are actually making a law like this work, and it has been found useful to all of our people.

I do not think it should take much argument to convince the House that I am not talking about sectional views or the pressures which exist in different

parts of the country—that is something which we know only too well and one would not be adult who proposed an amendment like this and did not understand what was incipient in the way the amendment would be voted on. But I am appealing to the great bulk of the Members of the Committee of the Whole and of the House who are not affected by such a particular local situation who have to look at these questions only as Americans and only as representatives of all the American people. I ask those gentlemen to ask their own consciences, regardless of how they feel on any piece of antidiscrimination legislation, whether there is any justification for paying out vast sums of money of the United States to any institution of higher learning which discriminates against those who seek admission either as teachers or as students on such grounds of color, race, or creed.

I think, too, that no discussion of this general subject at this time can be complete unless we understand, and understand clearly, just what is happening in the world with respect to what is called race relations in the United States. It is the biggest single piece of propaganda which we give the Communist propagandists anywhere. I feel in the most sincere good conscience that it behooves every American who is really militant in this cold war against the Communist forces we are fighting, to fight and to fight constantly on this particular issue. In the eyes of the world, it will demonstrate that we practice what we preach and that we just do not preach freedom and civil rights for other people.

Let me emphasize that the great bulk of the peoples of the world are yellow, black, or brown people, not white people. We cannot afford to deal with this problem on a purely national or on a local basis, but it must be projected on an international and on a world basis; and it becomes directly and materially a part of the foreign policy of the United States to seek to do what we can about this situation in our own country.

We should be most actively concerned in respect of discrimination and segregation on this front of education where the Government is spending huge sums of money with institutions which may discriminate and which may segregate. This issue is directly connected with the question of causing those institutions to drop those practices. I cannot possibly see how we can condone it, and yet be fighting for liberty with the full power and full conscience we ought to.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. PACE. If the gentleman's State Legislature in New York has given you what you want up there why do you not let other State legislatures give the people of their States what they want? Why do you want to impose the will of the Legislature of New York on the entire Nation?

Mr. JAVITS. I think the gentleman has put his finger on the main point. The Federal Government is paying $3,000,000,000 out of the Federal Treasury to institutions some of which may engage in these practices, and this is the only place in which that correction can be made. I am here at the place where I ought to be to endeavor to make the correction.

Mr. PACE. That would be all very well if the State of New York were putting up $3,000,000,000.

Mr. JAVITS. The State of New York puts up money for its own universities and its people put up a great share of the Federal revenues. The Federal Government here is putting up money for universities all over the country and any guilty of these practices should not get that money.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. We people in Pennsylvania want to see that the money goes to educational purposes regardless of race, creed, or color; and I am speaking for a city that pays a billion dollars a year in taxes.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment for the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MARCANTONIO as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. JAVITS: On page 412, line 8, after the period in line 8 insert a new section:

"SEC. 1101. (a) No part of the funds appropriated in this bill shall be paid to any institution, firm, partnership, corporation, or person who denies equality in education or employment because of race, color, or creed."

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is a meritorious one; however, it does not go far enough. A similar amendment was offered by me when we were dealing with that chapter in the bill that provided for aid and grants to States for educational and job-training purposes. This is the third time I have offered civil-rights amendments to this bill. The other occasion was when I offered an amendment to the District of Columbia chapter of the bill to prohibit discrimination and segregation in the District of Columbia. Both times the amendments were defeated.

Now we are considering the general provisions of this bill and therefore my amendment deals with the entire bill. Here we are appropriating $29,000,000,000. What does this amendment provide? It provides that in the expenditure of these funds not one penny shall be paid to any firm, corporation, institution, or individual who denies equality in employment and that not one penny shall be paid to any educational institution which denies equality in educational facilities because of race, color, or creed. We are applying here the principles of FEPC. That issue is undergoing another sham debate in the other body, and we might as well be frank about the situation that stares us in the face. Here we are about to adjourn soon. This Congress has about two more months to go, yet not a single piece of civil-rights legislation has been enacted.

It is my considered judgment that the fight in the other body, like the fight here on civil rights, is a phony fight, it is a fixed fight, the fight has been thrown before it started. So here we have an opportunity again to make a real fight and insure against the expenditure of $29,000,000,000 of Federal funds under conditions of segregation and discrimination and guarantee that they be spent under conditions of equality.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. Under the gentleman's amendment just what executive or administrative agency or tribunal would make the decision that an individual or a corporation or a school or a college were in fact practicing discrimination so as to make applicable the amendment which the gentleman has offered?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The department which would have jurisdiction in the payment of the grant would have the power to make that determination. Further, this amendment deals with payments made directly by departments. The departments could not make payments to firms that deny equality in employment. The departments themselves would be prohibited by my amendment from practicing discrimination that the departments are practicing in many, many sections of the Government.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. Then the gentleman's amendment gives the chance to Congress to vote on the matter that is involved in FEPC, where there is no compulsion but merely directs the money in proper channels so in no case will there be any discrimination by any agency against any child because of race, creed, or color?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. None of these funds will be paid to anybody who is guilty of discriminatory practices and nobody can benefit from the funds of the people of the United States who practices discrimination.

That is the amendment. It is very simple. It reduces itself down to a very simple proposition. You either believe in civil rights or you do not. Now, a lot of people profess to believe in it. This Congress certainly has no good record on that score despite the professions of the majority for civil rights. We have not passed any civil rights legislation. As a matter of fact, this House has gone backward. A week ago Monday we passed a bill here which had the support of the House Democratic Party leadership—we might as well record it—which stripped away from Negro employees in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing certain rights which they had obtained by Civil Service examination, and this House went so far as to make that bill retroactive so as to wipe out the benefits these Negro Government employees had earned by this examination. Yes, we have gone backward on the matter of civil rights.

Now the President, I understand, is going to make a speech at a civil rights

meeting. I just wonder what he is going to say about this Democratic Congress. Perhaps he is going to repeat his speeches of 1948; the blame is going to be placed by him on the so-called Dixie Democrats and Republicans.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MARCANTONIO moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill H. R. 7786 to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken from the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman from New York opposed to the bill?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I am, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman qualifies.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I do oppose this bill. This bill is the budget. Budget represents policy; it implements policy. This bill implements the policy of a cold war which is not in the interests of the American people. The bill demonstrates conclusively the cold-war policy of sacrificing the people's needs for the benefit of those big trusts which profit from the cold war which unless terminated by the people will force the world into a war that nobody will win and which will destroy civilization itself. This bill represents the program of guns instead of butter; of Jim Crow instead of civil rights; of unemployment instead of jobs; of slums instead of housing; of a Taft-Hartley repression of labor instead of genuine collective bargaining; of tyranny and fear instead of freedom and our Bill of Rights. A study of this bill, as I have sat here every day during its consideration, reveals that veterans are subjected to a false economy, public housing has been deprived of adequate funds and the health program has been cut down to nothing. Even our postal service has been cut in almost half. On the other hand we have in this bill over $14,000,000,000 for the war program. Soon we will appropriate more billions for the Marshall plan and other similar cold-war devices. This bill sacrifices the veterans, the farmer, labor, the tenement dwellers, the old people, the orphans, the widows and the sick to the cold-war economy. When I think of the refusal of this House to make appropriations for heart disease and for cancer and think of the willingness with which we have increased the appropriations for the Wall Street war program I cannot in good conscience vote for this bill which says no to the needs of the American people for the profit of the big monopolies which are the only beneficiaries of this cold-war economy.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I just wanted to be sure that we have the effect of these two amendments clear. My amendment applied to colleges and universities and the Federal moneys devoted to that purpose. The gentleman's amendment covered all the money in the bill.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. That is right. The gentleman's amendment is a very limited civil-rights amendment. The gentleman is very limited in his approach to civil rights and my approach is sweeping. I want full civil rights. I admit the difference, and I think our records in this House will bear out that difference.

As I was saying, Mr. Chairman, the President may tell the country at the civil-rights meeting that the fault for the failure of this Congress to enact civil rights legislation rests with the so-called Dixie Democrats. Well, it is a matter of arithmetic. They are in the minority, and they oppose this legislation, and they are here when this legislation comes up; they have been here to vote against it, on every single occasion on which these amendments have been offered by me or by others. What the President must explain is where have his Democrats been on these occasions. I mean those Democrats who like Truman profess to be for the civil rights. I have always noticed the conspicuous absence of many of these so-called leading civil-rights spokesmen. They deliver wonderful speeches all over the country and over the radio and on the public platforms, but when it comes to a fight of this kind in the House, where are they? Where have they been? Certainly not here. Now, we have a good number of them here. Unfortunately we cannot get a record vote unless this amendment is adopted. But, I call upon them to square themselves with their consciences in this matter. I am calling upon those who campaigned on the civil-rights platform, on those who said that if elected they were going to vote and fight for civil rights, not dodge the civil-rights issue, not hide behind the procedure of anonymous voting that exists in the Committee of the Whole, but to stand up and be counted and vote and fight. I call upon them to live up to the obligations which they incurred when they were elected on the basis of the promises that they made to the people in their party platform. This issue of white supremacy has go to be fought out. How long do you think you are going to fool 14,000,000 American people by dodging and by using every single parliamentary device to avoid a position on this issue? How long do you think the President or anybody else can go around the country and say, "Well, it is the Dixie Democrats that stopped us"? The issue rests here with the northern Democrats, as well as Republicans. You constitute a majority here in this Congress. You have the votes. What are you going to do about it? Up to now you have killed every piece of civil-rights legislation. Up to now you have been going backward instead of forward on this issue. Up to now the fights on this issue have been fights that have been thrown, that have been fixed right from the very beginning.

Now, with my amendment, you have another chance to keep faith with the people. I know it is annoying to you when I offer these amendments. I know a lot of people are annoyed and disgusted that MARCANTONIO should be repeatedly offering these civil-rights amendments, but I am going to keep on offering them as long as I am here and until we win this fight, because I conscientiously believe, and it has been my guiding political philosophy, that no white man is free in America as long as the Negro is subjected to discrimination and Jim Crow and segregation. There can be no freedom and no democracy in any land where men and women are deprived of equality because of the color of their skins or their national origin or their place of birth or the church in which they worship.

I know that this principle is a challenge to white supremacy, but white supremacy has to be challenged and it has to be beaten, otherwise our democracy can never live. It is a mere mockery, it is a sham, it is a fraud.

Sure, you can wave the flag all you want and you can Red-bait all you want and you can raise the Red bogie all you want, but as long as men are deprived of equality and of these God-given rights by means of Jim Crow and white supremacy, so long we will not have any genuine, real freedom, real equality, real democracy in these United States. Now is the chance to strike a blow against white supremacy by adopting my amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my preferential motion.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] for the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. MARCANTONIO and Mr. RABAUT.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 95, noes 119.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JAVITS) there were—ayes 48, noes 109.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 1109. No part of any appropriation contained in this or any other act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation included in this or any other act, shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of the United States, is not a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the

United States, or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further,* That any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation or fund contained in this or any other act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further,* That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law: *Provided further,* That, as applicable to the Departments of Agriculture and Interior, nothing in this section shall be construed to require an affidavit from any person employed for less than 60 days for sudden emergency work involving the loss of human life or destruction of property, and the payment of salary or wages may be made to such persons from applicable appropriations for services rendered in such emergency without execution of the affidavit contemplated by this section.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JAVITS: On page 417, after line 14, insert a new section 1110, and appropriately renumber succeeding sections. The new section to read as follows:

"SEC. 1110. No part of any appropriation contained in this act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation included in this act, shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who advocates, or practices the denial to any citizen of the United States of the right to apply for, hold or be promoted in any Government position or office on the grounds of race, color, religion, or national origin."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it goes beyond the scope of the bill.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I point out that the provision which I have suggested as an amendment will result in retrenchment because it may result in withholding wages or salaries from employees of the United States. That is all that this refers to. It would affect the appropriations made under this act and therefore comes within the rules of propriety as an amendment to an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. COOPER). The Chair is prepared to rule. The gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] has offered an amendment which has been reported. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] makes a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it goes beyond the scope of the pending bill.

The Chair has examined the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York, and is of the opinion that it does go beyond the scope of the pending bill. The Chair invites attention to the fact that it seeks to affect funds of corporations not necessarily appropriated for in this bill.

The Chair therefore sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

(2) Any appropriation available to an agency which is required to be apportioned under subsection (c) of this section shall be apportioned or reapportioned in writing by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. The head of each agency to which any such appropriation is available shall submit to the Bureau of the Budget information, in such form and manner and at such time or times as the Director may prescribe, as may be required for the apportionment of such appropriation. Such information shall be submitted not later than 40 days before the beginning of any fiscal year for which the appropriation is available, or not more than 15 days after approval of the act by which such appropriation is made available, whichever is later. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall apportion each such appropriation and shall notify the agency concerned of his action not later than 20 days before the beginning of the fiscal year for which the appropriation is available, or not more than 30 days after the approval of the act by which such appropriation is made available, whichever is later. When used in this section the term "agency" means any executive department, agency, commission, authority, administration, board, or other independent establishment in the executive branch of the Government, including any corporation wholly or partly owned by the United States which is an instrumentality of the United States.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. NORRELL: On page 422, line 5, after the period insert the following:

"The provisions of this section shall not apply to any corporation which obtains funds for making loans, other than paid-in capital funds, without legal liability on the part of the United States."

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, the only thing we are trying to do is to stop the debt-making activities of corporations. This has to do with the corporations that do not create any debt against the Government. This amendment is offered by request. We have no objection; I think it is a good amendment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORRELL. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I did not know anything about the amendment in advance; I did not know it was to be offered.

Mr. NORRELL. This has absolutely nothing to do with any Government corporation that creates debts against the United States Government.

Mr. TABER. What is the objective of the amendment?

Mr. NORRELL. We on this side were requested to offer the amendment if we did not intend to include such corporations. We indicated we did not include them and we have no objection to the amendment. I think the amendment is all right.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORRELL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. Will the gentleman explain what corporations are intended to be left out and what effect it has on limiting the funds under this bill then?

Mr. NORRELL. The corporations that we did not intend to include would be such as the intermediate credit bank and other similar corporations that do business, but have no power to obligate the Government in any way and cannot borrow money from the Treasury. We are not trying to include those corporations in this part of the bill.

Mr. FULTON. What is the effect of the amendment on the bill, because I do not understand exactly what it is?

Mr. TABER. It is a modification, as I understand it, of a provision in section 1111 of the bill, a limitation against it, which would permit Government created corporations to borrow money where the United States is not liable. That is what I understand it is aimed at. I have been advised that the two corporations that would be affected are the intermediate banks for cooperatives, and one other corporation.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORRELL. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. The intermediate credit bank issues debentures. In other words, they lend money to farmers, then they take the farmers' notes as security and issue debentures which on the face of them say that they are not obligations of the Federal Government. In our effort to control Federal corporations which operate on Federal capital and which issue obligations of the Federal Government, we wanted to show we did not want to include corporations which issue their own negotiable paper and which says that they are not obligations of the Government.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe I have any objection to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlemen from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTEN. On page 422, line 5, after the period, insert "Nothing in this subsection shall be so construed as to interfere with initiation, operation, and administration of agricultural price support programs."

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. May I say to the committee that the members of the subcommittee on this side of the aisle who have had occasion to go into this matter believe the original intent of the committee was not to give such authority to the Director as this amendment would prohibit; so I am authorized to say to the Members on this side of the aisle that we have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank the gentleman. I have discussed this with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN], members

of the Subcommittee for Agricultural Appropriations. In the general provisions of this bill we are trying to prevent deficiencies, and in doing that the general provisions provide that the funds for the various operations of the Government shall be set up on a quarterly basis and have to be cleared with the Bureau of the Budget.

Now the Commodity Credit Corporation was set up as a corporation for the reason that we intended for them to have some freedom and latitude in handling their operations. This amendment leaves it where they have to make the same reports of their operations and all that, but it does mean that the Bureau of the Budget cannot interfere with the proper operation of the price-support program. In other words, they cannot delay the initiation or proper administration of the price-support programs. This leaves it where the Commodity Credit Corporation can follow the basic law and carry out the purposes set out in their charter and under the law authorizing its creation. There is some question whether the CCC would be included in the absence of this amendment, but this clarifies the provisions where there can be no question.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. The same Corporation which is in charge of administering the price support program is likewise engaged in other activities, such as carrying out the International Wheat Agreement, acquiring supplies for the ECA, likewise acquiring beef in connection with the foot and mouth program in Mexico, and also in acquiring supplies for foreign cash customers. I think in all of those operations and transactions the Corporation acts as agent. It is not the purpose, as I understand, of this bill, to subject those transactions to budgetary scrutiny.

Mr. WHITTEN. Insofar as the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation are concerned, I think that the gentleman is eminently correct. In so far as the other agencies are concerned, I do not know.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. Do I understand that the amendment is for the purpose of keeping out interference by the Bureau of the Budget with the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation? If the Bureau of the Budget thinks something ought to be done for efficiency, this will block them.

Mr. WHITTEN. No; this does not enter into that. Under the general provisions the Corporation must make certain reports. In the absence of this amendment they would have to set up in advance, on a yearly basis or on a quarterly basis, their operations and you cannot do that with the Commodity Credit Corporation where you do not know in advance what your demand for outlays will be to support the price of crops.

Mr. FULTON. If the Bureau of the Budget feels that it is wise that there be these advance quarterly reports made by the Commodity Credit Corporation, why should we in the act by the amendment cut them out of that right?

Mr. WHITTEN. They make the same reports, but we say that the Bureau of the Budget cannot make such demands as will interfere with the proper discharge of the obligations of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Short of interfering with the proper discharge of such obligations, they have full rights, but if the Bureau of the Budget sets out to block the price support program which was authorized by law and which the Commodity Credit Corporation had an obligation and a duty to perform, this merely says in that case the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be permitted to go ahead.

Mr. FULTON. I do not see why, if the law says one thing, the Bureau of the Budget can block the Commodity Credit Corporation without this amendment.

Mr. WHITTEN. It is hard to understand, but we wish to be sure it does happen.

Mr. COOLEY. The Bureau of the Budget could not block them except for the provisions in the present bill.

Mr. WHITTEN. That is right, but it might be held by the Bureau of the Budget to give them that right, and we wanted to make it clear.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. I do not understand the gentleman's amendment in this respect: The gentleman has made a statement with respect to the Commodity Credit Corporation insofar as the antideficiency provisions of the act are concerned. Should not that same exception be made, for instance, with respect to the social welfare program about which the gentleman from Rhode Island spoke yesterday, inasmuch as we will not know beforehand, for instance, just what the charges against that will be, and the Bureau of the Budget might very well interfere with that?

Mr. WHITTEN. I am not going to argue with the gentleman about that because I am not thoroughly familiar with it. I do feel that I am qualified to speak to the present question. As to the other, the gentleman may be clearly right. I just do not know.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I think the gentleman from Mississippi has already answered the question of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, but I thought perhaps the gentleman from Pennsylvania had not differentiated between the Bureau of the Budget and the General Accounting Office as to its subsequent check and its right to establish the procedures. That is not the right of the Bureau of the Budget.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

(2) In the case of a violation of subsection (a), (b), or (h) of this section by an officer or employee of an agency, or of the District of Columbia, the head of the agency concerned or the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, shall immediately report to the President, through the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and to the Congress all pertinent facts together with a statement of the action taken thereon.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, this concludes section 1111. I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point a section-by-section analysis of the amendment we have made to the Antideficiency Act, showing the changes in this section.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF AMENDMENT OF ANTIDEFICIENCY ACT, AS AMENDED BY SECTION 1111 OF H. R. 7786

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, subsection (a) would prohibit the making or authorizing of expenditures in excess of the amount available in any appropriation or fund, and also the creating or authorizing of an obligation against any appropriation or fund in excess of the amount available therein. The second clause of this subsection would prohibit involving the Government in any contract or other obligation for the payment of money in advance of appropriations unless such contract or obligation were authorized by law. Certain items are authorized by law to be contracted for in excess of appropriations made therefor. See, for example, United States Code 41, page 11; United States Code 25, page 99; United States Code 31, page 667; United States Code 31, page 668. The language of this clause follows the present law, and would make no change in these authorizations.

Subsection (b) is substantially a reenactment of existing prohibitions against acceptance of voluntary services or employment of personal services in excess of those authorized by law.

Paragraph (1) of subsection (c) would provide that all appropriations or funds available for obligation for a definite period of time (barring those which may be exempted by administrative action under later provisions of the amended section) be so apportioned as to prevent obligation thereof in a manner which would indicate a necessity for deficiency or supplemental appropriations for such period. This is designed to insure that appropriations which are available for a fiscal year, or for other time periods—usually related to fiscal years—will not be obligated at a rate which would exhaust the appropriation prior to the end of the period for which the appropriation was made, and thus result in a need for a deficiency or supplemental appropriation, or an increase in the authorization for administrative expenses of a corporation, or in drastic curtailment of the activity for which the appropriation or authorization was made.

Paragraph (1) of this subsection would provide also that all appropriations or funds not limited to a definite period of time, and all authorizations to create obligations by contract in advance of appropriations—commonly referred to as contract authorizations—be so apportioned as to achieve the most effective

and economical use thereof. The first part of this provision relates to the so-called no-year appropriations and to funds, such as funds used by corporations for purposes other than administrative expenses, which are available indefinitely and without relation to any particular fiscal year. The second part relates to contract authorizations which may or may not be required by law to be executed with reference to any particular fiscal year.

The appropriations and funds referred to—except certain types of corporate funds—are now under the apportionment system, but the authority for their inclusion in that system stems from Executive Order 8512, dated August 13, 1940, rather than from the present Antideficiency Act, which relates only to fiscal year appropriations. It is necessary that no-year appropriations and funds (including all funds of corporations, whether for administrative expenses or for other purposes) and contract authorizations be included in the apportionment system and be controlled to the extent necessary to insure efficiency and economy in carrying out the purpose for which such appropriations and authorizations are granted by the Congress. The last sentence of this paragraph would provide that as used thereafter in the amended section, the term "appropriation" means appropriations, funds, and authorizations to create obligations by contract in advance of appropriations.

Paragraph (2) of subsection (c) would authorize the officer making apportionments to establish reserves "to provide for contingencies, or to effect savings whenever savings are made possible by or through changes in requirements, greater efficiency of operations, or other developments" subsequent to the date on which the appropriation, fund, or contract authorization was made available. The further provisions of paragraph (2) of subsection (c) contemplate that the Congress will be requested to rescind any amount reserved in the apportionment process when it is found that such amount will not be required to carry out the purposes of the appropriation, fund, or contract authorization concerned.

Paragraph (3) of subsection (c) would provide for apportionments by "months, calendar quarters, operating seasons, or other time periods, or by activities, functions, projects, or objects, or by a combination thereof." The present Antideficiency Act provides for apportionments "by monthly or other allotments." The operations of many agencies do not fit into a system of calendar quarters but are best gaged by operating seasons or other time periods.

Paragraph (4) of subsection (c) would provide that apportionments be reviewed at least four times each year, and contemplates that upon such review such reapportionments will be made or such reserves established, modified, or released as may be necessary to further the effective use of the appropriation, fund, or contract authorization concerned in accordance with the purposes stated in paragraph (1) of this subsection.

Subsection (d) of the proposed amendment designates the officers who shall make apportionments and reapportionments. This subsection is divided into two paragraphs, of which the first relates to appropriations, funds, and contract authorizations available to the legislative branch, the judiciary, and the District of Columbia. In this connection it may be noted that the present antideficiency law covers all appropriations—except certain types which are specifically exempted—without distinguishing between appropriations for the legislative branch, the judiciary, or the executive branch, except that contingent appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives are specifically exempt from the apportionment provisions. Thus, the appropriations available to the legislative branch and those available to the judiciary, except the contingent appropriations mentioned, inadvertently have been made subject to apportionment by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget in Executive Order 6166 of June 10, 1933. To correct this, paragraph (1) of this subsection makes separate provision for apportioning appropriations available to the legislative branch, the judiciary, or the District of Columbia, and designates the officer or officers having administrative control of each such appropriation to make the apportionment thereof. A time limit is provided within which the apportionment should be made.

Paragraph (2) of subsection (d) provides that appropriations for the agencies, required to be apportioned under the provisions of subsection (c), shall be apportioned or reapportioned in writing by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and that the agencies shall submit information necessary therefor in such form and manner as the Director may prescribe. Definite time limits for submitting such information and for making apportionments are provided, the net result of which is to require that apportionments in all cases be made not later than 20 days before the beginning of the fiscal year for which the appropriation is available or not more than 30 days after the approval of the act by which such appropriation is made available, whichever is later. These provisions are aimed at preventing delays which have occurred in some cases in the past in the submission of proposed apportionments by the agencies, and in the making of apportionments by the Bureau of the Budget. They will cure a defect in the present law which does not recognize that appropriations may not be made prior to the beginning of the fiscal year.

Paragraph (2) also defines the term "agency," when used in the amended section, as meaning "any executive department, agency, commission, authority, administration, board or other independent establishment in the executive branch of the Government, including any corporation wholly or partly owned by the United States which is an instrumentality of the United States."

Subsection (e) of section 1 would provide that no apportionment or reapportionment which, in the judgment of the officer making such apportionment or reapportionment, would indicate a necessity for a deficiency or supplemental estimate, should be made except upon a determination by such officer that such action is required because of (A) any laws enacted subsequent to the transmission to the Congress of the estimates for an appropriation which requires expenditures beyond administrative control; or (B) emergencies involving the safety of human life, the protection of property, or the immediate welfare of individuals in cases where an appropriation has been made to enable the United States to make payment of, or contributions toward, sums which are required to be paid to individuals either in specific amounts fixed by law or in accordance with formulae prescribed by law.

Many new laws enacted subsequent to the submission to the Congress of estimates of appropriations result in increasing the rate of obligations in the fiscal year in progress. In some cases such laws are approved after the passage of the appropriation act, and in other cases shortly before the appropriation is made. Technically, in the latter type of case there may be an opportunity to seek additional appropriations to carry out the functions imposed by the new laws, but as a practical matter the legislative process seldom permits the passage of newly conceived appropriation legislation in the last few days, or even weeks, of a legislative session. It is for this reason that provision is made in clause (A), above, for apportionments on a basis indicating a necessity for a deficiency or supplemental estimate in cases where new laws resulting in increased costs are enacted "subsequent to the transmission to the Congress of the estimates" for an appropriation, rather than subsequent to the enactment of an appropriation act. This procedure is in line with that now etsablished under section 203 of the Budget and Accounting Act (31 U. S. C. 14) which provides that the President may from time to time transmit to Congress supplemental or deficiency estimates "necessary on account of laws enacted after the transmission of the budget."

It is not clear what is meant in that part of the present law which authorizes waiver or modification of an apportionment "upon the happening of some extraordinary emergency or unusual circumstance which could not be anticipated at the time of making such apportionment." The present law is equally vague in excepting from the apportionment system those appropriations made "for objects required or authorized by law without reference to the amounts annually appropriated therefor." Under present law the executive branch heretofore has considered that appropriations for certain activities of the Government must be apportioned on a basis leading to a deficiency or supplemental estimate in some circumstances in order to insure that obligations of the Government will be met in accordance with the apparent intent of the basic legislation and the appropriations made pursuant thereto. Notable among these appropriations are those for grants to States for public

assistance programs and for payment of benefits to veterans.

It is necessary that programs of this type be carried on without delay or curtailment, even in the event changed circumstances indicate that appropriations therefore are inadequate. Accordingly, the bill would authorize the apportionment of any particular appropriation on a basis which would indicate a necessity for a deficiency or supplemental estimate when required in emergencies involving the immediate welfare of individuals who are dependent upon appropriations of this type, as well as in emergencies involving the safety of human life or the protection of property.

The provision of paragraph (2) of subsection (e) for an immediate report to the Congress whenever an appropriation is apportioned on a basis which would indicate a necessity for a deficiency or supplemental appropriation would give the Committees on Appropriations an opportunity to question immediately any apportionment which they believed to be not in accord with the will of the Congress.

Subsection (f) would permit exemptions from the apportionment system of certain appropriations and funds, such as appropriations for payment of claims and judgments, where apportionment would serve no useful purpose, and of appropriations for contingent expenses of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, and of items determined by the President to be of a confidential nature. Funds of Goverment corporations would be included in the apportionment system, but receipts from industrial and power operations available under law could be exempted by the apportioning authority.

Subsection (g) would provide for administrative regulations to keep obligations within apportionments, and to fix responsibility for the creation of obligations in excess of apportionments. In the executive branch and the government of the District of Columbia, such regulations would be subject to the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget in order to insure a certain amount of uniformity therein, but without depriving any agency of the opportunity to develop such a system as might be required to fit its particular needs.

Subsection (h) would prohibit any officer or employee of the United States from authorizing or creating any obligation in excess of an apportionment or reapportionment, or in excess of the amount permitted by regulations prescribed pursuant to subsection (g). This is designed to insure that the officers and employees who actually obligate the appropriations will be responsible for keeping them within the apportionments.

Subsection (i) would provide specific penalties for violation of the amended section. Paragraph (1) of this subsection provides penalties for any officer or employee of the United States who violates subsections (a), (b) or (h). Such penalties comprise appropriate administrative discipline including, when circumstances warrant, suspension from duty without pay or removal from office; and, upon conviction of a knowing and willful violation, a fine of not more than $5,000 or imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or both. This paragraph would improve the present law by specifying the acts which are to be considered subject to penalty, and by providing for more practicable penalties, which can be gaged with reference to the seriousness of the offense.

Paragraph (2) of subsection (i) would require immediate reports of all pertinent facts together with a statement of the action taken thereon, in each case of a violation of subsection (a), (b), or (h) by an officer or employee of an agency. Such reports would be made to the President, through the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and to the Congress.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JAVITS: On page 425, after line 8, insert a new section 1112 and renumber the succeeding section, the new section to read as follows:

"SEC. 1112. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who advocates or practices the denial to any citizen of the United States of the right to apply for, hold, or be promoted in any Government position or office on the grounds of race, color, religion, or national origin."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I have taken this time to point out to the House that there is an Executive Order No. 9980 entitled "Regulations Governing Fair Employment Practices Within the Federal Establishment."

This Executive order has many provisions but does not seem to me to have provisions which have power. My amendment is designed to try to implement it.

The strongest term of this Executive order is that the head of each department "shall take the necessary corrective or disciplinary action in consultation with or on the basis of delegated authority from the head of the department." That is as far as it goes.

My amendment is designed to give the Executive order teeth as it relates to nondiscrimination in the Federal Establishment. It applies to those who have something to do with personnel in the Federal Establishment, the hiring of people. It seeks to penalize them in the effective way in which they can be penalized, by denying them compensation if they do not comply with the Executive order. That is the whole purpose of the amendment.

I feel it is only fair in a $29,000,000,000 appropriation bill, in view of the expressed policy of the President of the United States on this subject, to try to carry it through in some effective way by legislative enactment.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, a few moments ago I was appointed as a teller to count the votes in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

I want the House to know that I voted with the gentleman from New York on his amendment to prevent discrimination. The position I have taken here today objecting to amendments falls to my lot because of the position I hold in the Committee on Appropriations, responsible for carrying this legislation through the House, and not because of any principle involved.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 1112. No part of the funds of, or available for expenditure by any corporation or agency included in this act shall be available to pay for annual leave accumulated by any officer or employee during the calendar year 1950 and unused at the close of business on December 31, 1950.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RABAUT: On page 425, line 13, before the period, insert ": *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to officers and employees whose post of duty is outside the continental United States."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is self-explanatory. It prevents the accumulation of annual leave during the current fiscal year by prohibiting the use of 1951 appropriation funds to pay for leave which is earned during the calendar year 1950, but not used prior to the close of business on December 31, 1950. The amendment simply provides that this section shall not apply to officers and employees whose post of duty is outside the continental United States.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Will that include the employees of the Central Intelligence Agency who are employed outside the continental United States?

Mr. RABAUT. If they are outside of the United States, yes.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Why does the gentleman feel that this should be the law? What argument does he put up in favor of this amendment?

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, in some parts of the world the place of the post of duty may be very unhealthy and from time to time under doctor's orders people have been advised to accumulate enough leave so that they may have the opportunity to restore or preserve their health by having the advantage of a longer period of leave. That is true in the Panama Canal section particularly and in many other places in the world.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. SADLAK. Does the gentleman feel that the weather in Washington sometimes is most unhealthy?

Mr. RABAUT. Well, they can take a trip out of Washington any time they desire.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROONEY: On page 425, after line 13, insert:

"SEC. 1113. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 555), or the provisions of any other law, the Secretary of State may, in his absolute discretion, during the current fiscal year, terminate the employment of any officer or employee of the Department of State or of the Foreign Service of the United States whenever he shall deem such termination necessary or advisable in the interests of the United States.

"Notwithstanding the provisions of section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 555), or the provisions of any other law, the Secretary of Commerce may, in his absolute discretion, during the current fiscal year, terminate the employment of any officer or employee of the Department of Commerce whenever he shall deem such termination necessary or advisable in the best interests of the United States."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, the two paragraphs which constitute new section 1113 were originally in the bill when the chapter pertaining to the Departments of State and Commerce was considered in Committee of the Whole a week or so ago. Those two paragraphs contained in the bill at that time were stricken out of the bill on a point of order raised by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO]. The language of this pending amendment is in order as a result of the adoption of the rule on the pending bill.

The reason for the insertion of this language must be apparent to all of us. It is necessary in order to enable the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Commerce to immediately discharge and get rid of any subversives or security risks who may be employed in either one of those two important departments of government, which are vitally connected with our national defense.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. My information, from discussing this amendment with Members on this side, is that we are very much in favor of the amendment and there is no objection on this side. I wish to ask the gentleman how he feels about applying this amendment to some other sections of the bill. The Atomic Energy Commission is protected, is it not?

Mr. ROONEY. They are protected as well as the Federal Bureau of Investigation. I am particularly concerned with these two vital departments, the Department of State and the Department of Commerce. I feel they should have this right so that the Secretaries of both Departments may immediately get rid of any subversives or security risks. That is not the situation today in the Department of Commerce.

Mr. STEFAN. I say there is no objection to the amendment on this side of the aisle.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. Would the gentleman accept an amendment to his amendment, putting in the Department of Defense? I had a bill, which has already been filed, that is similar to your amendment, but it also includes the Department of Defense as well as these two departments.

Mr. ROONEY. I am informed they already have authority to do exactly what the proposed language would do in the Departments of State and Commerce.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. I suggest to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] that his amendment would be subject to a point of order.

Mr. ROONEY. That is a fact. Anything in addition to the language which is now proposed in the pending amendment would be subject to a point of order since it would be legislation on an appropriation bill.

I ask for a favorable vote on the pending amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JENSEN: On page 425, after line 13, add a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 1113. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or position under the United States Government which may become vacant during the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1950:

"*Provided*, That this inhibition shall not apply—

"(a) to not to exceed 10 percent of all such vacancies in any agency caused by separation from such agency;

"(b) to positions filled from within the agency;

"(c) to offices or positions required by law to be filled by appointment of the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;

"(d) to scientific and technical positions in the Atomic Energy Commission and the armed services;

"(e) to nurses, doctors, or other medical personnel, including orderlies, in the Public Health Service and the Veterans' Administration;

"(f) to law-enforcement officers;

"(g) to temporary, emergency, seasonal, or cooperative positions;

"(h) to commissioned, commissioned warrant, warrant, and enlisted personnel, and cadets of the Coast Guard, and the undergraduates of the United States Military and Naval Academies; or

"(i) to any agency in the legislative or judicial branches of the Government or the municipal government of the District of Columbia."

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, in order to have sufficient time to explain this amendment, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I shall not, will the gentleman yield to me to submit a consent request?

Mr. JENSEN. I shall be pleased to.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment end in 15 minutes, 10 minutes for the gentleman from Iowa and 5 minutes for the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] is recognized.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I can assure the Members of the House that a great deal of hard work and many, many hours and days of study and research have been exerted in order to bring this amendment to as near perfection as is humanly possible in order that it be made fair, proper, and understandable, so as to do the thing I am quite sure the majority of the Members of this House wish done, and to meet the wishes of the American people which is to reduce the present number of Federal employees and hence their tax load. As of March 1 of this year, the latest figure, shows total civilian Federal personnel was 2,091,895 costing the taxpayers the enormous sum of almost $7,000,000,000 each year.

The average turnover in Federal employment is approximately 2 percent a month, which means that we have a turnover on an average annually of about 24 percent. That turnover is caused by deaths, reesignations, and separations of all sorts. There are a great many folks working for the Government today who might be hard put to find gainful employment elsewhere if they were taken off the Federal payroll at a time when unemployment rolls are mounting as has been the case during 1949 and 1950. This method of reducing the number of employees was used in many States and cities during the depression and it was very satisfactory and effective. It is the painless way of reducing Federal employment over a period of years to the point which the American people can afford to pay.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I will yield later if time will permit. After I explain the amendment. My time is short, only 10 minutes. I wish I did have the time, for there is no man whose judgment I respect more than the able gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. Chairman, I want to explain this amendment as best in the time I have so that all may understand we are not hurting the proper functioning of Government by this amendment. I shall explain the amendment section by section. I may say before I begin analyzing it that even though the amendment of the gentleman from New York was adopted by the House and should it become law, which I hope it does, each department, commission, bureau, and agency of the Government numbering around 1,000 will have a certain amount of money made available to them on July 1 next to spend during the fiscal year 1951.

This amendment if adopted and made law would start operating after July 1, 1950, and would not in itself have the effect of taking anyone off the payroll. So it has in effect no connection with the amendment the gentleman from New York offered and which the committee has adopted today. Naturally, it would

reduce the employees of the Government to the degree that it provides, as time goes on and vacancies occur.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. May I ask the gentleman, will he tell the committee what his amendment does and whom it affects?

Mr. JENSEN. I will be glad to explain if the gentleman will permit me to do so.

The language, "No part of any appropriation contained in this act," limits the prohibition on expenditures to the funds made available by H. R. 7786, and would restrict the filling of vacancies by departments or agencies included in the said act only to the extent of the funds appropriated thereby, and would have no effect upon the expenditure of funds available to such departments or agencies from any other source.

The provision, "any incumbent appointed to any civil office or position under the United States Government which may become vacant during the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1950" covers any person appointed to fill a vacancy in a civil position in any department or agency of the Federal Government, not included within the exceptions provided, when such vacancy came into being during the fiscal year covered by the said H. R. 7786. It would not restrict the filling of any vacancies which exist on July 1, 1950. Such provision would not apply to any person appointed by an agency or department not included within the appropriation provisions of the said act, and would not include members of the armed forces.

Exception (a) would permit the filling of 10 percent of all vacancies occurring during the fiscal year by reason of separations from the service for all causes, including deaths, resignations, retirement, and transfers to other agencies. Vacancies occurring through promotion or reassignment within the agency would not enter into the computation of the 10 percent.

Exception (b) would permit the filling of any vacancy wholly within the agency, thereby affording the head of an agency greater latitude in utilizing the personnel available to him than would be the case under an absolute prohibition on the filling of vacancies and, at the same time, necessarily would result in an overall reduction of personnel equal in number to at least 90 percent of the total number of employees separated during the year.

Exception (c) was included so that there could be no question but that the funds appropriated by the act would be available in any event to pay the compensation of persons whose appointments are required by law to be made by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Exceptions (d), (e) and (f) specifically exempt scientific and technical positions in the Atomic Energy Commission and the armed services; nurses and doctors and orderlies in the Public Health Service and in the Veterans' Administration; and all law enforcement officers. These exceptions are necessary because of the technical qualifications required of such personnel and because it is vital to the public interest that the number of qualified employees in such positions be not further reduced.

Exception (g) would permit the unrestricted filling of vacancies in any temporary, emergency, seasonal, or cooperative positions in any of the departments. That exception contemplates those positions not required to be filled at all times during the year, and those made necessary by emergency conditions, seasonal requirements, and so forth. If such positions were made subject to the provisions of the proposed amendment it might have the effect of seriously curtailing or abolishing necessary activities, such as forest fire-fighting service, agricultural cooperative work, census enumerating, and so forth.

Exception (h) specifically would permit the filling of certain vacancies occurring in the Coast Guard. That exception is necessary because the Coast Guard is a quasi branch of the armed services, yet, being under the Treasury Department in times of peace, actually is a part of the civilian service of that Department.

Exception (i) exempts any agency in the legislative or judicial branches of the Government and the municipal government of the District of Columbia from the prohibitions contained in the said section. This exception includes such agencies as the Library of Congress, the Government Printing Office, Architect of the Capitol, General Accounting Office, and the Administrative Office of the United States Courts.

The proviso for impounding the appropriations or parts thereof unexpended because of the operation of this new section will prevent the use of such funds for any other purpose and the savings effected must be returned to the Treasury.

Estimated saving resulting from amendment

[Estimate based upon latest available total employment figures, separations, and average annual salary per employee as compiled by the Civil Service Commission]

Total separations (all causes) per year (estimated from figures released for December 1949)		324,000
Adjusted to exclude—		
1. Those who were on extended LWOP	18,000	
2. Those reappointed in all agencies by transfers	19,800	
		37,800
Total separations, all agencies		286,200
Estimated 2½ percent representing employees in agencies excepted from amendment		71,550
		214,650
10 percent authorized to be filled by appointments from outside the agency		21,465
Estimated net vacancies which will not be filled under provisions of the amendment		193,185
Average annual salary per employee		$3,550
Total average annual salary represented by unfilled vacancies		$685,806,750
Total saving resulting from amendment (estimated upon the basis that one-twelfth of the total vacancies will occur each month during the year)		$371,442,562

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would save approximately $371,000,000 in the fiscal year 1951. I have secured all my facts and figures from top officials of departments of Government who know quite accurately or as accurately as is humanly possible the amount which would be saved if my amendment becomes law.

I sincerely hope it will be adopted by this House today.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, in looking at this amendment, I want to admit that I do not understand it. I do not know anyone here who understands it, and I have been here quite a long number of years, and I have never seen this term before "cooperative position." Does anybody know what that is?

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. If the gentleman can explain "cooperative position" to me, I will yield him a minute of my time.

Mr. JENSEN. I will be glad to explain it. The Soil Conservation Service and the PMA cooperate in working together on soil conservation practices. In fact, the committee headed by the gentleman from Mississippi provided 5 percent in fiscal 1950 for the PMA to use to hire technicians for the Soil Conservation Service. There is a good example.

Mr. RABAUT. All right.

Mr. JENSEN. Are there any other questions?

Mr. RABAUT. No.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JENSEN) there were—ayes 93, noes 117.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. RABAUT and Mr. JENSEN.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 141, noes 136.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

This act may be cited as the "General Appropriation Act, 1951."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending bill and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes, 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word

Mr. Chairman, it is quite obvious from some of the things that have been happening here today that at long last the Members of the House of Representatives, being the representatives of the people back home, are understanding that there is a real demand and an insistent demand in the country for economy in governmental expenditure here in Washington.

We have made some progress today in that direction and I am happy for it, because I know that the people back home, in overwhelming majority, are going to applaud that action.

Today two amendments have been adopted that make real and substantial savings. I assume that they will come on for a vote as we go back into the House. The decisive majority by which the Thomas-Taber amendment was adopted clearly indicates that there will be no retreat from that amendment. However, because the time was so limited on the so-called Jensen amendment, I want to just say a word further about that.

If there is one thing that I have found from talking to my people in Indiana, if there is one thing that my mail demonstrates to me, it is the conviction on the part of the people that in too many places in Government we have too many employees. We have seen the numbers grow by the hundreds of thousands, so there has come this insistent demand that we cut down the number of employees. That is what the Jensen amendment seeks to do. As the gentleman from Iowa so well said, the amendment seeks to do it in a painless way, not to bring about a reckless separation of persons from the payroll, but simply up to 10 percent to see to it that places becoming vacant shall not be filled.

There are contained in his amendment, as he explained here so far as he was permitted by the time limit to go, exemptions and exceptions that have been carefully worked out to the end that no essential function or operation of Government will be interfered with if this amendment goes into operation. On the other hand, however, it does provide a real, practical, effective, decent way to cut down on the Federal payroll and to get off the Federal payroll employees whom we can do without; and what better place could we start to economize than in this direction? I say here to my friends who really want to bring about economy in Government without interfering with any essential function of Government, stand by the Jensen amendment. We will then see that it will work out effectively; it will not unduly prejudice anyone; it will not unduly prejudice the Federal service.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. It should be said again that this amendment does not affect the armed forces; it does not affect the Justice Department, or the FBI; it does not affect doctors and nurses and medical specialists or even orderlies in the veterans' hospitals; it does not affect the Coast Guard or the military or naval academies; in fact, this amendment has been worked out so carefully that it all makes sense and will not affect any agency of the Government or any person who is actually needed in the working of this Government.

Mr. HALLECK. Why, of course. The gentleman is absolutely correct; and when the roll is called on that amendment anyone who votes against it will put himself definitely on the side of those who are not willing to go even to the extent of 10 percent in cutting the Federal payroll in certain places. This amendment is designed to bring about a reduction in the number of people on the Federal payroll. If you want to take the responsibility for defeating that, O. K. by me. But, as far as I am concerned, I am going to respond to the demand that I know is in the country and act in a way that I know will not adversely affect the real interests of the government at all.

Mr. IRVING. Mr. Chairman, I realize that the few minutes that I have is not sufficient time to say what I want to say to the Members of this House in regard to this very important subject, the $29,000,000,000 omnibus appropriation bill. We are about to vote on the few remaining amendments and then on the final passage this afternoon of a bill of tremendous importance to all of us as well as every citizen and taxpayer of this great Nation. I would like to express my appreciation to various chairmen and members of the subcommittees as well as the full committee and its distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] for their months of arduous work and tireless efforts to do a conscientious job in bringing to the House a bill that would be adequate for all needs of the Government and yet save money for the taxpayers. Perhaps they are not entirely satisfied and perhaps many of the other Members are not convinced that they have been able to do both satisfactorily. However, I think everyone will agree that with the great number of indeterminates and uncertainties involved in the past, present, and future of our far-flung foreign problems resulting from both hot and cold wars that have created grave responsibilities which no doubt have weighed heavily upon them in their considerations as will the many difficult and complex domestic situations arising in this postwar period.

So, this, together with the terrific burden of a vast and fast mounting public debt, it has no doubt been a very serious problem for them to proceed either in the direction of strict economy requiring retrenchments of such a nature that they would be unhealthy for our national defense or our domestic economy which requires as near full employment as possible with a corresponding high national income. Likewise it would have been unsound and unwise for this committee to proceed in an entirely opposite direction with no effort being made to consider all the possible avenues of reduction. It is presumed that they have tried to follow a course that would not take them too far in either direction. Making a saving and yet providing ample resources for any emergency; thereby avoiding the critical and almost fatal mistakes causing the condition of utter unpreparedness that we found ourselves in just before the beginning of the last war and even after we were attacked.

In conclusion I would like to say that I am certainly disappointed that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] did not include the legislative branch of the Government in his amendment instead of making it one of the exceptions to be exempted from any form of economy. It seems to me that it might have shown a little better faith on his part with those he is subjecting to reductions and little more sincerity on his part and those of his colleagues in this matter of economy that they have been talking so loudly about lately. I referred to this matter earlier in the debate today and so far it has been completely ignored, although not even the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], who has just spoken, will deny that many millions of dollars could be saved for the taxpayers if the many economies that they ask the other branches and departments of Government to effect were practiced by this branch itself, and I cannot see how it could possibly effect its efficiency to any noticeable degree. In fact it might increase it. I surely expected my Republican friends on the left would, after my calling to their attention this opportunity to effect really worth-while savings for the country, would jump on it immediately and include it in one of their amendments. No doubt it never has occurred to them, as it is often said that we often fail to see the things nearest to us because of straining to see those farther away. Then again it is better to preach than to practice. And so far this and other reasons that have been advanced here about these amendments I must say that they are not, in my opinion, the best way to effect economies nor reach the objectives that I seek, which are more efficiency, less waste, and real economy and not false economy. However, Mr. Chairman, until we can do better I shall vote for them.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] is recognized.

(Mr. RABAUT asked and was given permission to yield his time to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].)

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, it was very interesting to listen to the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana, but the fact remains that the Taber amendment and the Jensen amendment are inconsistent with each other. The Taber amendment accomplishes one thing; the Jensen amendment is partially and from a marked angle inconsistent with it. We are asked to pass a bill containing two amendments, one inconsistent with the other.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCORMACK. In just a minute, if the gentleman will let me complete my observation.

Both amendments should be defeated. The Taber amendment is going to result in a greater cut to the Post Office Depart-

ment, as an illustration; it is going to result in a cut to the Veterans' Administration; it is going to result in a cut over and above those already made by the Commitee on Appropriations to all other agencies of the Government.

It is one thing for the gentleman from Indiana to talk today; it is another thing to interpret this action tomorrow and to know what actually has happened. So we want the record to be clear. I hope there will be roll calls so that it will be known who brought about the further reduction which in turn will bring about the serious repercussions that are bound to occur as a result of both these amendments.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. There is nothing inconsistent in these two amendments. They dovetail into each other.

Mr. McCORMACK. Both amendments are clearly inconsistent with each other. The amendment offered by the gentleman from New York cuts the appropriations. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] said his amendment will not result in certain employees being discharged. In that respect there is a very marked inconsistency. The fact remains that the Taber amendment will bring about further reductions in every agency of the Government over and above those already made by the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts, the distinguished majority leader, permit me to make an observation with regard to the reaction of the American public to the handiwork today of these gentlemen on the other side of the aisle. These same Republican gentlemen have voted billions upon billions of dollars for the Marshall plan and foreign aid and today they are denying the American public Government services to which they have been accustomed and entitled, such as those of the Veterans' Administration, the Post Office Department, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and research programs in heart, cancer, and mental health, just to mention a few. Yes; you cut the FBI this afternoon.

Mr. McCORMACK. The fact remains that if both of these amendments are retained they are inconsistent with each other. The amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], reduces the appropriation for every agency. My only purpose in rising at this time is so that the record will be clear to show just what has happened and where the responsibility lies.

Mr. ROONEY. May I ask the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts to call attention to the fact that the transcript of today's proceedings in typewritten form now on the table in front of the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] shows conclusively, in answer to a question I put to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] that the FBI is cut under the provisions of his amendment.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I say also it is going to be interesting to find out how many Republican Members offered amendments to increase the bill. That will be very interesting.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I want to ask the gentleman this question: In the list of people who are excluded from this particular amendment, it does not exclude vital help in veterans' hospitals, such as cooks. If the cooks quit, you cannot hire them again. How are you going to feed the people in the Veterans' Administration hospitals?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Will the gentleman take these two amendments and show the Members of the House just where the two amendments are inconsistent? I am sure the gentleman can do that. He has given us generalities but he has not given us any facts. Will the gentleman take them please and get down to cases?

Mr. McCORMACK. The amendment of the gentleman from New York among other things reduces the appropriation $600,000,000. That is what, among other things, it provides. That means that there has got to be a cut in every agency of Government over and above the reduction made by the committee. That includes the Post Office Department, that includes the Veterans' Administration, that includes all other agencies of the Government. I personally hope there is a roll call on that amendment.

(Mr. DONOHUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point.)

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, in the complicated social, and economic structure of the present day, national and international, the number, size and complexities contained in the preparation of this appropriation bill almost staggers the imagination. We all appreciate, I am sure, the committee members studied tirelessly, scrutinized diligently, and worked endlessly, with conscientious sense, over a long period of time to present this bill. On the whole they did, most of us will agree, a remarkable job and deserve our sympathetic commendation for their personal sacrifices, of time and effort, in a trying task. Nevertheless I deeply feel the American people are entitled to a practical demonstration of economy-mindedness in this body and I fully believe the over-all objective of the reduction which will result from the Thomas-Taber amendments should be adopted.

I am sure nobody here wants to interfere with Federal Government participation in the administration of social-security and unemployment compensation programs, or seriously cripple the efficiency of our postal service. I am certain you would not want to deny to our veterans, especially those disabled for life in our country's service, the aids and benefits to which they are legally, justly, and morally entitled. It would be a bold prophet indeed who would advocate the diminishment of our national defenses in these threatening, challenging hours. Unbiased authorities advise us the vast foreign commitments to which we are pledged must be sensibly maintained in peril of extinction of freedom here and throughout the democratic world. I do not stand to urge suppression of any of these vital activities. I would be the last to favor any move to paralyze essential Government functions and inflict needless injury and hardship upon individual citizens.

Yet I do want to see every energy exercised to answer, as much as humanly possible, the desperate cry of our taxpayers for some relief from their overpowering burdens. We are, as a Government, spending more money than is collected; we are in debt to the extent of a quarter of a trillion dollars; we are taxed every time we put out our hand. Under these circumstances I want to show our own people, our own citizens, by definite gesture, that we know the great personal sacrifices they have unselfishly been shouldering and that we want to ease their load as much as we can. The reduction proposed seems sensible to me; it will be an honest step toward trying to balance the budget. It may well be accomplished by careful administration and provide a morale lift to the taxpayer, which is why I favor it.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, within a very few minutes the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union will rise and report this omnibus appropriation bill back to the House. The House of Representatives, Mr. Chairman, always appreciates a job well done, and when that job happens to be a difficult and a tedious and a tiring job, the measure of appreciation is all the greater.

I take the floor at the close of this debate to express a very sincere appreciation for the magnificent job done by my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] in presiding over this bill in Committee.

I am sure that my sentiments in this respect are shared by every Member of this House on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I want to join, in behalf of the Republican Members of this House, in this commendation of our very able Chairman who has conducted himself with great dignity and fairness. We, on this side, appreciate him as we always have.

Mr. PRIEST. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. We are all proud of JERE COOPER, not only as a Member of the House, but for the outstanding and the fine manner in which he always has presided over any bill that he has been designated as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House. I have served with my friend for many years. The people of his district and of his State can well be proud of their JERE COOPER.

Mr. PRIEST. I thank the majority leader.

Mr. Chairman, for more than a month this bill has been before the House. Day after day since about April 3 the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee has demonstrated every hour of every day those qualities of patience and fairness and justice that mark him as a great presiding officer.

In addition to his arduous duties of presiding during consideration of this bill, he has carried his part of the load during all of that time as the ranking majority member of the Committee on Ways and Means as it seeks to write a new tax bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair appreciates the very kind references.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the Canfield amendment, at page 109, line 1; the Gore amendment, at page 136, line 20; and the Boggs of Louisiana amendment, at page 305, line 14.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment?

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the Taber amendment to chapter I, page 2, line 3.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the Thomas amendment, page 411, after line 21.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Is that the Thomas amendment as amended by the Taber amendment?

Mr. ROONEY. That is correct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the Case of South Dakota amendment, page 290, line 2, which cuts the appropriation for the administration of the Public Housing Administration.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the Jensen amendment at page 425, after line 13. This is the last amendment that was adopted.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TABER. Will the Chair advise the House in what order the separate votes will be taken?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The amendments upon which a separate vote has been demanded will be considered by the House in the order in which they appear in the bill, that is, in the following order:

First, the Taber amendment, page 2, line 3, on which a separate vote was demanded by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BATES].

Second, the Canfield amendment, on page 109, line 1, on which a separate vote was demanded by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Third, the Gore amendment, page 136, line 20, on which a separate vote was demanded by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Fourth, the Case of South Dakota amendment, page 290, line 2, on which a separate vote was demanded by the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Fifth, the Boggs of Louisiana amendment, page 305, line 14, on which a separate vote was demanded by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Sixth, the Thomas amendment, page 411, after line 21, on which a separate vote was demanded by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Seventh, the Jensen amendment, page 425, after line 13, on which a separate vote was demanded by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER].

Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the first amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 2, line 3, strike out "$11,000,000" and insert "$9,800,000."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 179, noes 104.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CANFIELD:

On page 109, line 1, strike out "$135,000,000" and insert "$136,000,000."

And on line 4, after "attrition", insert ": *Provided further*, That not to exceed $1,000,000 shall be available for expenses of reserve training, including pay and allowances of Regular and Reserve personnel on active duty engaged primarily in administration of Reserve training program, and including drill pay at a rate not to exceed those prescribed by or pursuant to law for the Naval Reserve."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CANFIELD and Mr. GREEN) there were—ayes 143, noes 131.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska and Mr. CANNON asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote is demanded, the Gore amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GORE: On page 136, line 20, strike out "$75,000,000" and insert "$150,000,000."

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BIEMILLER) there were—ayes 152, noes 111.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 258, nays 131, not voting 41, as follows:

[Roll No. 158]

YEAS—258

Addonizio	Doyle	Kelley, Pa.
Albert	Durham	Kelly, N. Y.
Allen, La.	Eberharter	Keogh
Andrews	Elliott	Kerr
Angell	Engel, Mich.	Kilday
Aspinall	Evins	King
Barden	Fallon	Kirwan
Baring	Feighan	Klein
Barrett, Pa.	Fenton	Kruse
Bates, Ky.	Fernandez	Lane
Bates, Mass.	Flood	Lanham
Battle	Fogarty	Larcade
Beall	Forand	Lemke
Beckworth	Frazier	Lesinski
Bennett, Fla.	Fugate	Lichtenwalter
Bennett, Mich.	Fulton	Linehan
Bentsen	Furcolo	Lovre
Biemiller	Gary	Lynch
Blackney	Golden	McCarthy
Blatnik	Gordon	McCormack
Bolling	Gore	McDonough
Bonner	Gorski	McGrath
Bosone	Granahan	McGuire
Breen	Grant	McKinnon
Brown, Ga.	Green	McSweeney
Bryson	Gregory	Mack, Ill.
Buchanan	Gross	Mack, Wash.
Buckley, Ill.	Hagen	Madden
Buckley, N. Y.	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Magee
Burdick	Hand	Marcantonio
Burke	Harden	Marsalis
Burnside	Hardy	Marshall
Burton	Harris	Merrow
Byrne, N. Y.	Hart	Miles
Camp	Havenner	Mitchell
Canfield	Hays, Ohio	Monroney
Carroll	Hedrick	Morris
Case, N. J.	Heffernan	Moulder
Celler	Heller	Multer
Chatham	Herlong	Murdock
Chelf	Heselton	Murphy
Chesney	Hill	Murray, Tenn.
Christopher	Hinshaw	Murray, Wis.
Chudoff	Hobbs	Nelson
Clemente	Holifield	Nicholson
Colmer	Holmes	Noland
Combs	Howell	Norton
Cooley	Huber	O'Brien, Ill.
Cooper	Hull	O'Brien, Mich.
Corbett	Irving	O'Hara, Ill.
Crawford	Jackson, Wash.	O'Hara, Minn.
Crook	Jacobs	O'Konski
Crosser	Javits	O'Neill
Cunningham	Jennings	O'Sullivan
Davis, Ga.	Jonas	O'Toole
Davis, Tenn.	Jones, Ala.	Pace
Dawson	Jones, Mo.	Patman
DeGraffenried	Jones, N. C.	Patten
Delaney	Karst	Patterson
Denton	Karsten	Perkins
D'Ewart	Kearns	Peterson
Dollinger	Kee	Pfeifer, Joseph L.
Dolliver	Keefe	Philbin
Donohue		

Phillips, Tenn.	Scott,	Velde
Poage	Hugh D., Jr.	Vinson
Polk	Secrest	Wagner
Potter	Shelley	Walter
Poulson	Sikes	Welch
Powell	Simpson, Ill.	Wheeler
Preston	Sims	Whitaker
Price	Spence	White, Idaho
Priest	Staggers	Whitten
Rabaut	Steed	Whittington
Rains	Stigler	Wickersham
Rankin	Stockman	Wier
Regan	Sullivan	Williams
Richards	Sutton	Willis
Riehlman	Tackett	Wilson, Ind.
Rodino	Tauriello	Wilson, Okla.
Rogers, Fla.	Thomas	Withrow
Rogers, Mass.	Thompson	Wolverton
Rooney	Thornberry	Woodhouse
Roosevelt	Tollefson	Woodruff
Sadowski	Trimble	Yates
Saylor	Underwood	Young
Scott, Hardie	Van Zandt	Zablocki

NAYS—131

Abbitt	Gavin	Miller, Nebr.
Abernethy	Gillette	Mills
Allen, Calif.	Goodwin	Morton
Allen, Ill.	Gossett	Norblad
Andersen,	Graham	Norrell
H. Carl	Granger	Passman
Anderson, Calif.	Gwinn	Pfeiffer,
Andresen,	Hale	William L.
August H.	Hall,	Phillips, Calif.
Arends	Leonard W.	Pickett
Auchincloss	Halleck	Plumley
Barrett, Wyo.	Harrison	Reed, Ill.
Bishop	Harvey	Reed, N. Y.
Boggs, Del.	Herter	Rees
Boggs, La.	Hoeven	Ribicoff
Bolton, Md.	Hoffman, Ill.	Rich
Bolton, Ohio	Hoffman, Mich.	Sabath
Bramblett	Hope	Sadlak
Brehm	Horan	St. George
Brooks	James	Sanborn
Brown, Ohio	Jenison	Sasscer
Burleson	Jenkins	Scrivner
Byrnes, Wis.	Jensen	Scudder
Cannon	Johnson	Shafer
Chiperfield	Kean	Short
Clevenger	Kearney	Simpson, Pa.
Cole, Kans.	Keating	Smith, Kans.
Cole, N. Y.	Kennedy	Smith, Va.
Cotton	Kilburn	Smith, Wis.
Coudert	Latham	Stanley
Cox	LeFevre	Stefan
Curtis	Lind	Taber
Dague	Lodge	Talle
Davis, Wis.	Lucas	Taylor
Dondero	Lyle	Teague
Doughton	McCulloch	Towe
Ellsworth	McGregor	Vorys
Elston	Macy	Vursell
Engle, Calif.	Mahon	Wadsworth
Fellows	Martin, Iowa	Weichel
Fisher	Martin, Mass.	Widnall
Ford	Mason	Wigglesworth
Gamble	Meyer	Wilson, Tex.
Garmatz	Michener	Winstead
Gathings	Miller, Md.	Wood

NOT VOTING—41

Bailey	Hare	Nixon
Boykin	Hays, Ark.	Quinn
Bulwinkle	Hébert	Ramsay
Carlyle	Jackson, Calif.	Redden
Carnahan	Judd	Rhodes
Case, S. Dak.	Kunkel	Rivers
Cavalcante	LeCompte	Sheppard
Davenport	McConnell	Smathers
Davies, N. Y.	McMillan, S. C.	Smith, Ohio
Deane	McMillen, Ill.	Walsh
Dingell	Mansfield	Werdel
Douglas	Miller, Calif.	White, Calif.
Eaton	Morgan	Wolcott
Gilmer	Morrison	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Judd for, with Mr. Smith of Ohio against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Jackson of California.

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Case of South Dakota.

Mrs. Douglas with Mr. Kunkel.

Mr. Davenport with Mr. Werdel.

Mr. Gilmer with Mr. McMillen of Illinois.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. McConnell.

Mr. Hays of Arkansas with Mr. Eaton.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Nixon.

Mr. Redden with Mr. LeCompte.

Mr. Rhodes with Mr. Wolcott.

Mr. BARDEN changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE of South Dakota: On page 290, line 2, strike out "$11,700,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$8,750,000."

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BIEMILLER) there were—ayes 163, noes 124.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

The motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 222, nays 163, not voting 45, as follows:

[Roll No. 159]

YEAS—222

Abbitt	D'Ewart	Johnson
Abernethy	Dolliver	Jonas
Allen, Calif.	Dondero	Jones, N. C.
Allen, Ill.	Doughton	Kean
Allen, La.	Durham	Kearney
Andersen,	Ellsworth	Kearns
H. Carl	Elston	Keating
Anderson, Calif.	Engel, Mich.	Keefe
Andresen,	Fallon	Kilburn
August H.	Fellows	Kilday
Andrews	Fenton	Larcade
Arends	Fisher	Latham
Auchincloss	Ford	LeFevre
Barden	Frazier	Lemke
Barrett, Wyo.	Fugate	Lichtenwalter
Bates, Mass.	Fulton	Lodge
Battle	Gamble	Lovre
Beall	Gary	Lucas
Beckworth	Gathings	Lyle
Bennett, Fla.	Gavin	McCulloch
Bennett, Mich.	Gillette	McDonough
Bentsen	Golden	McGregor
Bishop	Goodwin	Mack, Wash.
Blackney	Gore	Macy
Boggs, Del.	Gossett	Marshall
Bolton, Md.	Graham	Martin, Iowa
Bolton, Ohio	Grant	Martin, Mass.
Bonner	Gross	Mason
Bramblett	Gwinn	Merrow
Brehm	Hagen	Meyer
Brooks	Hale	Michener
Brown, Ohio	Hall,	Miller, Md.
Bryson	Edwin Arthur	Miller, Nebr.
Burdick	Hall,	Mills
Burleson	Leonard W.	Monroney
Burton	Halleck	Morton
Byrnes, Wis.	Harden	Murray, Tenn.
Camp	Hardy	Murray, Wis.
Chatham	Harris	Nelson
Chiperfield	Harrison	Nicholson
Clevenger	Harvey	Norblad
Cole, Kans.	Herlong	Norrell
Cole, N. Y.	Herter	O'Hara, Minn.
Colmer	Heselton	Passman
Cooley	Hill	Patten
Cooper	Hinshaw	Patterson
Corbett	Hobbs	Pfeiffer,
Cotton	Hoeven	William L.
Coudert	Hoffman, Ill.	Phillips, Calif.
Cox	Hoffman, Mich.	Phillips, Tenn.
Crawford	Holmes	Pickett
Cunningham	Hope	Poage
Curtis	Horan	Potter
Dague	James	Poulson
Davis, Ga.	Jenison	Rankin
Davis, Tenn.	Jenkins	Reed, Ill.
Davis, Wis.	Jensen	Reed, N. Y.
Rees	Simpson, Pa.	Vorys
Regan	Smith, Kans.	Vursell
Rich	Smith, Va.	Wadsworth
Riehlman	Smith, Wis.	Weichel
Rogers, Fla.	Stanley	Wheeler
Rogers, Mass	Steed	White, Idaho
Sadlak	Stefan	Whitten
St. George	Stockman	Whittington
Sanborn	Sutton	Wickersham
Sasscer	Taber	Widnall
Saylor	Tackett	Wigglesworth
Scott, Hardie	Talle	Williams
Scott,	Taylor	Willis
Hugh D., Jr.	Teague	Wilson, Ind.
Scrivner	Thompson	Wilson, Okla.
Scudder	Towe	Wilson, Tex.
Shafer	Trimble	Winstead
Short	Van Zandt	Wood
Simpson, Ill.	Velde	Woodruff

NAYS—163

Addonizio	Green	Noland
Albert	Gregory	Norton
Angell	Hand	O'Brien, Ill.
Aspinall	Hart	O'Brien, Mich.
Baring	Havenner	O'Hara, Ill.
Barrett, Pa.	Hays, Ohio	O'Konski
Bates, Ky.	Hedrick	O'Neill
Biemiller	Heffernan	O'Sullivan
Blatnik	Heller	O'Toole
Boggs, La.	Holifield	Pace
Bolling	Howell	Patman
Bosone	Huber	Perkins
Breen	Hull	Peterson
Brown, Ga.	Irving	Pfeifer,
Buchanan	Jackson, Wash.	Joseph L.
Buckley, Ill.	Jacobs	Philbin
Buckley, N. Y.	Javits	Polk
Burke	Jones, Ala.	Powell
Burnside	Jones, Mo.	Preston
Byrne, N. Y.	Karst	Price
Canfield	Karsten	Priest
Cannon	Kee	Rabaut
Carroll	Kelley, Pa.	Rains
Case, N. J.	Kelly, N. Y.	Ribicoff
Celler	Kennedy	Richards
Chelf	Keogh	Rodino
Chesney	Kerr	Rooney
Christopher	King	Roosevelt
Chudoff	Kirwan	Sabath
Clemente	Klein	Sadowski
Combs	Kruse	Secrest
Crook	Lane	Shelley
Crosser	Lanham	Sikes
Dawson	Lesinski	Sims
DeGraffenried	Lind	Spence
Delaney	Linehan	Staggers
Denton	Lynch	Stigler
Dollinger	McCarthy	Sullivan
Donohue	McCormack	Tauriello
Doyle	McGrath	Thomas
Eberharter	McGuire	Thornberry
Elliott	McKinnon	Tollefson
Engle, Calif.	McSweeney	Underwood
Evins	Mack, Ill.	Vinson
Feighan	Madden	Wagner
Fernandez	Magee	Walter
Flood	Mahon	Welch
Fogarty	Marcantonio	Wier
Forand	Marsalis	Withrow
Furcolo	Mitchell	Wolverton
Garmatz	Morris	Woodhouse
Gordon	Moulder	Yates
Gorski	Multer	Young
Granahan	Murdock	Zablocki
Granger	Murphy	

NOT VOTING—45

Bailey	Hays, Ark.	Nixon
Boykin	Hébert	Plumley
Bulwinkle	Jackson, Calif.	Quinn
Carlyle	Jennings	Ramsay
Carnahan	Judd	Redden
Case, S. Dak.	Kunkel	Rhodes
Cavalcante	LeCompte	Rivers
Davenport	McConnell	Sheppard
Davies, N. Y.	McMillan, S. C.	Smathers
Deane	McMillen, Ill.	Smith, Ohio
Dingell	Mansfield	Walsh
Douglas	Miles	Werdel
Eaton	Miller, Calif.	Whitaker
Gilmer	Morgan	White, Calif.
Hare	Morrison	Wolcott

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Miller of California for, with Mr. Jackson of California against.

Mr. Dingell for, with Mr. Case of South Dakota against.

Mrs. Douglas for, with Mr. Kunkel against.

Mr. Davenport for, with Mr. Werdel against.
Mr. Gilmer for, with Mr. McConnell against.
Mr. Morrison for, with Mr. Nixon against.
Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. McMillen of Illinois against.
Mr. Whitaker for, with Mr. Eaton against.
Mr. Hare for, with Mr. Jennings against.
Mr. Bailey for, with Mr. Plumley against.
Mr. Morgan for, with Mr. Smith of Ohio against.
Mr. Hays of Arkansas for, with Mr. Wolcott against.
Mr. Deane for, with Mr. Judd against.
Mr. Redden for, with Mr. LeCompte against.

Mr. ANDERSON of California changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. THOMAS as amended by the Boggs substitute:

On page 305 line 18, strike out "$2,229,300" and insert "$3,175,000";

On page 306, line 3, strike out "$3,342,660" and insert "$5,886,000"; and

On page 306, line 3, strike out the remainder down to the end of the paragraph.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana) there were—ayes 105, noes 156.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Speaker pro tempore appointed as tellers Mr. RABAUT and Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana.

The House again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 137, noes 145.

So the amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. THOMAS: On page 411, following line 21, insert a new chapter, as follows:

"CHAPTER X-A—GENERAL REDUCTIONS IN APPROPRIATIONS AND CONTRACT AUTHORIZATIONS

"Reductions in appropriations and contract authorizations contained in this act are hereby made in the sum of $600,000,000.

"Not more than the following sums may be obligated by any agency or department provided for in this bill, viz: (1) For civilian personnel, not more than an amount 10 percent below the amount proposed in the President's budget estimates for fiscal year 1951, except that in the Department of Defense where no more than the amount of the President's budget estimate minus 2 percent shall be obligated. This paragraph shall not apply to nurses, doctors, or other medical personnel, including orderlies, in the Public Health Service and the Veterans' Administration.

"(2) For travel, not more than a total for all departments and agencies of $319,000,000, and not more than 5 percent less than the estimates provided for military personnel travel and not more than 20 percent less than the amount provided for civilian personnel travel, than the estimates therefor contained in the President's budget message for the fiscal year 1951.

"(3) For transportation of things, for all departments and agencies, not more than $720,000,000, provided further that in no case shall the amount obligated exceed a figure 10 percent below the estimates submitted by the President in his budget message for 1951 for each item for all agencies except the Department of Defense, and for the Department of Defense not more than 5 percent less than the estimates of the President, transmitted in said budget message.

"(4) For communications services, not more than $59,000,000 and not more for any department other than the Department of Defense than the amount of the President's budget estimates for 1951 minus 10 percent, and for the Department of Defense not more than a figure 5 percent below the President's budget estimates for 1951.

"(5) For rents and utilities, not more than $205,000,000 and for all establishments other than the Department of Defense not more than the President's budget estimates for fiscal year 1951 minus 10 percent.

"(6) For printing and reproduction, not more than $52,000,000 and not more in any case than the President's budget estimates for 1951 minus 10 percent.

"(7) For other contractual services, not more than $1,301,000,000 and for all departments other than the Department of Defense not more than the President's budget estimates for 1951 minus 10 percent.

"(8) For supplies and materials, not more than $3,888,000,000 and for all departments of the Government except the Department of Defense and the Veterans' Hospitals not more than the President's budget estimates for 1951 minus 10 percent.

"(9) For equipment, not more than $3,577,000,000 and for all departments other than the Department of Defense, not more than the President's budget estimates for 1951 minus 10 percent.

"(10) For lands and structures, for all departments of the Government, except the Department of Defense, not more than the President's budget estimates for 1951 minus 5 percent."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 274, nays 112, not voting 44, as follows:

[Roll No. 160]

YEAS—274

Abbitt	Bolton, Ohio	Corbett
Abernethy	Bonner	Cotton
Allen, Calif.	Bosone	Coudert
Allen, Ill.	Bramblett	Cox
Allen, La.	Brehm	Crawford
Andersen, H. Carl	Brooks	Cunningham
	Brown, Ohio	Curtis
Anderson, Calif.	Bryson	Dague
Andresen, August H.	Buckley, Ill.	Davis, Ga.
	Burdick	Davis, Tenn.
Andrews	Burleson	Davis, Wis.
Angell	Burnside	DeGraffenried
Arends	Burton	Denton
Auchincloss	Byrne, N. Y.	D'Ewart
Barden	Byrnes, Wis.	Dolliver
Baring	Camp	Dondero
Barrett, Wyo.	Canfield	Donohue
Bates, Mass.	Case, N. J.	Doughton
Battle	Chatham	Doyle
Beall	Chelf	Durham
Bennett, Fla.	Chesney	Elliott
Bennett, Mich.	Chiperfield	Ellsworth
Bentsen	Clevenger	Elston
Bishop	Cole, Kans.	Engel, Mich.
Blackney	Cole, N. Y.	Engle, Calif.
Boggs, Del.	Colmer	Evins
Boggs, La.	Cooley	Fallon
Bolton, Md.	Cooper	Fellows
Fenton	Kilburn	Rogers, Fla.
Fernandez	Kilday	Rogers, Mass.
Fisher	Kruse	Sadlak
Ford	Lanham	St. George
Frazier	Larcade	Sanborn
Fugate	Latham	Sasscer
Fulton	LeFevre	Saylor
Furcolo	Lemke	Scott, Hardie
Gamble	Lichtenwalter	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Garmatz	Lodge	
Gary	Lovre	Scrivner
Gathings	Lucas	Scudder
Gavin	Lyle	Secrest
Gillette	McCulloch	Shafer
Golden	McDonough	Short
Goodwin	McGregor	Sikes
Gossett	McKinnon	Simpson, Ill.
Graham	Mack, Ill.	Simpson, Pa.
Grant	Mack, Wash.	Sims
Gross	Macy	Smith, Kans.
Gwinn	Marshall	Smith, Va.
Hagen	Martin, Iowa	Smith, Wis.
Hale	Martin, Mass.	Stanley
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Mason	Steed
	Merrow	Stefan
Hall, Leonard W.	Meyer	Stockman
	Michener	Sutton
Halleck	Miller, Md.	Taber
Hand	Miller, Nebr.	Tackett
Harden	Mills	Talle
Hardy	Monroney	Taylor
Harris	Morton	Teague
Harrison	Moulder	Thomas
Harvey	Murray, Tenn.	Thompson
Hays, Ohio	Murray, Wis.	Thornberry
Herlong	Nelson	Tollefson
Herter	Nicholson	Towe
Heselton	Noland	Trimble
Hill	Norblad	Van Zandt
Hinshaw	Norrell	Velde
Hobbs	O'Hara, Minn.	Vorys
Hoeven	O'Konski	Vursell
Hoffman, Ill.	Pace	Wadsworth
Hoffman, Mich.	Patten	Wagner
Holmes	Patterson	Walter
Hope	Peterson	Weichel
Horan	Pfeiffer, William L.	Wheeler
Howell		White, Idaho
Hull	Philbin	Whitten
Irving	Phillips, Calif.	Whittington
James	Phillips, Tenn.	Wickersham
Jenison	Pickett	Widnall
Jenkins	Plumley	Wigglesworth
Jennings	Poage	Williams
Jensen	Polk	Willis
Johnson	Potter	Wilson, Ind.
Jonas	Poulson	Wilson, Okla.
Jones, Ala.	Rains	Wilson, Tex.
Jones, N. C.	Reed, Ill.	Winstead
Kean	Reed, N. Y.	Withrow
Kearney	Rees	Wolverton
Kearns	Regan	Wood
Keating	Ribicoff	Woodruff
Keefe	Rich	Young
Kennedy	Richards	
Kerr	Riehlman	

NAYS—112

Addonizio	Granahan	Magee
Albert	Granger	Mahon
Aspinall	Green	Marcantonio
Barrett, Pa.	Gregory	Marsalis
Bates, Ky.	Hart	Mitchell
Beckworth	Havenner	Morris
Biemiller	Heffernan	Multer
Blatnik	Heller	Murdock
Bolling	Holifield	Murphy
Breen	Huber	Norton
Brown, Ga.	Jackson, Wash.	O'Brien, Ill.
Buchanan	Jacobs	O'Brien, Mich.
Buckley, N. Y.	Javits	O'Hara, Ill.
Burke	Jones, Mo.	O'Neill
Cannon	Karst	O'Sullivan
Carroll	Karsten	O'Toole
Celler	Kee	Passman
Christopher	Kelley, Pa.	Patman
Chudoff	Kelly, N. Y.	Perkins
Clemente	Keogh	Pfeifer, Joseph L.
Combs	King	
Crook	Kirwan	Powell
Crosser	Klein	Preston
Dawson	Lane	Price
Delaney	Lesinski	Priest
Dollinger	Lind	Rabaut
Eberharter	Linehan	Rankin
Feighan	Lynch	Rodino
Flood	McCarthy	Rooney
Fogarty	McCormack	Roosevelt
Forand	McGrath	Sabath
Gordon	McGuire	Sadowski
Gore	McSweeney	Shelley
Gorski	Madden	Spence

Staggers	Underwood	Woodhouse
Stigler	Vinson	Yates
Sullivan	Welch	Zablocki
Tauriello	Wier	

NOT VOTING—44

Bailey	Hays, Ark.	Nixon
Boykin	Hébert	Quinn
Bulwinkle	Hedrick	Ramsay
Carlyle	Jackson, Calif.	Redden
Carnahan	Judd	Rhodes
Case, S. Dak.	Kunkel	Rivers
Cavalcante	LeCompte	Sheppard
Davenport	McConnell	Smathers
Davies, N. Y.	McMillan, S. C.	Smith, Ohio
Deane	McMillen, Ill.	Walsh
Dingell	Mansfield	Werdel
Douglas	Miles	Whitaker
Eaton	Miller, Calif.	White, Calif.
Gilmer	Morgan	Wolcott
Hare	Morrison	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Jackson of California for, with Mr. Miller of California against.

Mr. Judd for, with Mr. Davenport against.

Mr. Werdel for, with Mr. Dingell against.

Mr. Kunkel for, with Mr. Whitaker against.

Mr. McConnell for, with Mr. Morgan against.

Mr. LeCompte for, with Mr. Bailey against.

Mr. Eaton for, with Mr. Walsh against.

Mr. Smith of Ohio for, with Mr. Rhodes against.

Mr. Redden for, with Mrs. Douglas against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Davies of New York against.

Mr. Hare for, with Mr. White of California against.

Mr. Gilmer for, with Mr. Deane against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Wolcott.

Mr. Hays of Arkansas with Mr. McMillen of Illinois.

Mr. McMillan of South Carolina with Mr. Case of South Dakota.

Mr. BARING changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JENSEN: On page 425, after line 13, add a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 1113. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or position under the United States Government which may become vacant during the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1950:

"*Provided,* That this inhibition shall not apply—

"(a) to not to exceed 10 percent of all such vacancies in any agency caused by separation from such agency;

"(b) to positions filled from within the agency;

"(c) to offices or positions required by law to be filled by appointment of the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;

"(d) to scientific and technical positions in the Atomic Energy Commission and the armed services;

"(e) to nurses, doctors, or other medical personnel, including orderlies, in the Public Health Service and the Veterans' Administration;

"(f) to law-enforcement officers;

"(g) to temporary, emergency, seasonal, or cooperative positions;

"(h) to commissioned, commissioned warrant, warrant, and enlisted personnel, and cadets of the Coast Guard, and the undergraduates of the United States Military and Naval Academies; or

"(i) to any agency in the legislative or judicial branches of the Government or the municipal government of the District of Columbia."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 201, nays 185, not voting 44, as follows:

[Roll No. 161]

YEAS—201

Abbitt	Gillette	Norblad
Abernethy	Golden	Norrell
Allen, Calif.	Goodwin	O'Hara, Minn.
Allen, Ill.	Gossett	O'Konski
Andersen, H. Carl	Graham	Pace
	Gross	Patten
Anderson, Calif.	Gwinn	Patterson
Andresen, August H.	Hagen	Pfeiffer, William L.
	Hale	
Angell	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Phillips, Calif.
Arends		Phillips, Tenn.
Auchincloss	Hall, Leonard W.	Pickett
Barden		Plumley
Barrett, Wyo.	Halleck	Poage
Bates, Mass.	Harden	Potter
Beall	Harris	Poulson
Bennett, Fla.	Harrison	Reed, Ill.
Bennett, Mich.	Harvey	Reed, N. Y.
Bishop	Herlong	Rees
Blackney	Herter	Regan
Boggs, Del.	Heselton	Ribicoff
Bolton, Md.	Hill	Rich
Bolton, Ohio	Hinshaw	Riehlman
Bonner	Hobbs	Rogers, Fla.
Bramblett	Hoeven	Rogers, Mass.
Brehm	Hoffman, Ill.	Sadlak
Brown, Ga.	Hoffman, Mich.	St. George
Brown, Ohio	Holmes	Sanborn
Bryson	Hope	Saylor
Burdick	Horan	Scott, Hardie
Burleson	Irving	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Burton	James	
Byrnes, Wis.	Jenison	Scrivner
Camp	Jenkins	Scudder
Canfield	Jennings	Shafer
Chatham	Jensen	Short
Chiperfield	Johnson	Simpson, Ill.
Clevenger	Jonas	Simpson, Pa.
Cole, Kans.	Kean	Smith, Kans.
Cole, N. Y.	Kearney	Smith, Va.
Colmer	Kearns	Smith, Wis.
Corbett	Keating	Stanley
Cotton	Keefe	Stefan
Coudert	Kilburn	Stockman
Cox	Latham	Sutton
Crawford	LeFevre	Taber
Cunningham	Lemke	Tackett
Curtis	Lichtenwalter	Talle
Dague	Lodge	Taylor
Davis, Ga.	Lovre	Tollefson
Davis, Wis.	Lucas	Towe
D'Ewart	McCulloch	Van Zandt
Dolliver	McDonough	Velde
Dondero	McGregor	Vorys
Doughton	Mack, Wash.	Vursell
Ellsworth	Macy	Wadsworth
Elston	Martin, Iowa	Weichel
Engel, Mich.	Martin, Mass.	Wheeler
Fallon	Mason	White, Idaho
Fellows	Merrow	Whittington
Fenton	Meyer	Widnall
Fernandez	Michener	Wigglesworth
Fisher	Miller, Md.	Williams
Ford	Miller, Nebr.	Wilson, Ind.
Fulton	Mills	Wilson, Tex.
Gamble	Morton	Winstead
Gary	Murray, Wis.	Wolverton
Gathings	Nelson	Wood
Gavin	Nicholson	Woodruff

NAYS—185

Addonizio	Battle	Breen
Albert	Beckworth	Brooks
Allen, La.	Bentsen	Buchanan
Andrews	Biemiller	Buckley, Ill.
Aspinall	Blatnik	Buckley, N. Y.
Baring	Boggs, La.	Burke
Barrett, Pa.	Bolling	Burnside
Bates, Ky.	Bosone	Byrne, N. Y.
Cannon	Jackson, Wash.	O'Sullivan
Carroll	Jacobs	O'Toole
Case, N. J.	Javits	Passman
Celler	Jones, Ala.	Patman
Chelf	Jones, Mo.	Perkins
Chesney	Jones, N. C.	Peterson
Christopher	Karst	Pfeifer, Joseph L.
Chudoff	Karsten	
Clemente	Kee	Philbin
Combs	Kelley, Pa.	Polk
Cooley	Kelly, N. Y.	Powell
Cooper	Kennedy	Preston
Crook	Keogh	Price
Crosser	Kerr	Priest
Dawson	Kilday	Rabaut
DeGraffenried	King	Rains
Delaney	Kirwan	Rankin
Denton	Klein	Richards
Dollinger	Kruse	Rodino
Donohue	Lane	Rooney
Doyle	Lanham	Roosevelt
Durham	Larcade	Sabath
Eberharter	Lesinski	Sadowski
Elliott	Lind	Sasscer
Engle, Calif.	Linehan	Secrest
Evins	Lyle	Shelley
Feighan	Lynch	Sikes
Flood	McCarthy	Sims
Fogarty	McCormack	Spence
Forand	McGrath	Staggers
Frazier	McGuire	Steed
Fugate	McKinnon	Stigler
Furcolo	McSweeney	Sullivan
Garmatz	Mack, Ill.	Tauriello
Gordon	Madden	Teague
Gore	Magee	Thomas
Gorski	Mahon	Thompson
Granahan	Marcantonio	Thornberry
Granger	Marsalis	Trimble
Grant	Marshall	Underwood
Green	Mitchell	Vinson
Gregory	Monroney	Wagner
Hand	Morris	Walter
Hardy	Moulder	Welch
Hart	Multer	Whitten
Havenner	Murdock	Wickersham
Hays, Ohio	Murphy	Wier
Hedrick	Murray, Tenn.	Willis
Heffernan	Noland	Wilson, Okla.
Heller	Norton	Withrow
Holifield	O'Brien, Ill.	Woodhouse
Howell	O'Brien, Mich.	Yates
Huber	O'Hara, Ill.	Young
Hull	O'Neill	Zablocki

NOT VOTING—44

Bailey	Hare	Nixon
Boykin	Hays, Ark.	Quinn
Bulwinkle	Hébert	Ramsay
Carlyle	Jackson, Calif.	Redden
Carnahan	Judd	Rhodes
Case, S. Dak.	Kunkel	Rivers
Cavalcante	LeCompte	Sheppard
Davenport	McConnell	Smathers
Davies, N. Y.	McMillan, S. C.	Smith, Ohio
Davis, Tenn.	McMillen, Ill.	Walsh
Deane	Mansfield	Werdel
Dingell	Miles	Whitaker
Douglas	Miller, Calif.	White, Calif.
Eaton	Morgan	Wolcott
Gilmer	Morrison	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Jackson of California for, with Mr. Miller of California against.

Mr. Judd for, with Mr. Davenport against.

Mr. Kunkel for, with Mr. Dingell against.

Mr. McConnell for, with Mr. Whitaker against.

Mr. LeCompte for, with Mr. Morgan against.

Mr. Werdel for, with Mr. Bailey against.

Mr. Smith of Ohio for, with Mr. Redden against.

Mr. Hare for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Mr. Eaton for, with Mr. Rhodes against.

Mr. McMillen of Illinois for, with Mr. Deane against.

Mr. Rivers for, with Mr. Gilmer against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Nixon.

Mr. Walsh with Mr. Wolcott.

Mr. White of California with Mr. Case of South Dakota.

Mr. BATTLE and Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. FISHER changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. TABER. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TABER moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 362, nays 21, answered "present" 2, not voting 45, as follows:

[Roll No. 162]

YEAS—362

Abbitt	Burleson	Evins
Abernethy	Burnside	Fallon
Addonizio	Burton	Feighan
Albert	Byrne, N. Y.	Fellows
Allen, Calif.	Camp	Fenton
Allen, Ill.	Canfield	Fernandez
Allen, La.	Cannon	Fisher
Andersen, H. Carl	Carroll	Flood
Anderson, Calif.	Case, N. J.	Fogarty
Andresen, August H.	Celler	Forand
Andrews	Chatham	Ford
Angell	Chelf	Frazier
Arends	Chesney	Fugate
Aspinall	Chiperfield	Fulton
Auchincloss	Christopher	Furcolo
Barden	Chudoff	Gamble
Baring	Clemente	Garmatz
Barrett, Pa.	Clevenger	Gary
Barrett, Wyo.	Cole, Kans.	Gathings
Bates, Ky.	Colmer	Gavin
Bates, Mass.	Combs	Gillette
Battle	Cooley	Golden
Beall	Cooper	Goodwin
Beckworth	Corbett	Gordon
Bennett, Mich.	Coudert	Gore
Bentsen	Cox	Gorski
Biemiller	Crook	Gossett
Bishop	Crosser	Graham
Blackney	Cunningham	Granahan
Blatnik	Curtis	Granger
Boggs, Del.	Dague	Grant
Boggs, La.	Davis, Ga.	Green
Bolling	Dawson	Gregory
Bolton Md.	DeGraffenried	Gross
Bolton, Ohio	Delaney	Gwinn
Bonner	Denton	Hagen
Bosone	D'Ewart	Hale
Bramblett	Dollinger	Hall, Edwin Arthur
Breen	Dolliver	Hall, Leonard W.
Brooks	Dondero	Halleck
Brown, Ga.	Donohue	Hand
Brown, Ohio	Doughton	Harden
Bryson	Doyle	Hardy
Buchanan	Durham	Harris
Bulkley, Ill.	Eberharter	Harrison
Buckley, N. Y.	Elliott	Hart
Burdick	Ellsworth	Harvey
Burke	Elston	Havenner
Burleson	Engel, Mich.	Hays, Ohio
Burnside	Engle, Calif.	Hedrick
Burton	Evins	Heffernan
Byrne, N. Y.	Fallon	Heller
Camp	Feighan	Herlong
Canfield	Fellows	Herter
Cannon	Fenton	Heselton
Carroll	Fernandez	Hill
Case, N. J.	Fisher	Hinshaw
Celler	Flood	Hobbs
Chatham	Fogarty	Hoeven
Chelf	Forand	Hoffman, Ill.
Chesney	Ford	Holifield
Chiperfield	Frazier	Holmes
Christopher	Fugate	Hope
Chudoff	Fulton	Horan
Clemente	Furcolo	Howell
Clevenger	Gamble	Huber
Cole, Kans.	Garmatz	Hull
Colmer	Gary	Irving
Combs	Gathings	Jackson, Wash.
Cooley	Gavin	Jacobs
Cooper	Gillette	James
Corbett	Golden	Javits
Coudert	Goodwin	Jenison
Cox	Gordon	Jenkins
Crook	Gore	Jennings
Crosser	Gorski	Jensen
Cunningham	Gossett	Johnson
Curtis	Graham	Jonas
Dague	Granahan	Jones, Ala.
Davis, Ga.	Granger	Jones, Mo.
Dawson	Grant	Jones, N. C.
DeGraffenried	Green	Karst
Delaney	Gregory	Karsten
Denton	Gross	Kearney
D'Ewart	Gwinn	Kearns
Dollinger	Hagen	Keating
Dolliver	Hale	Kee
Dondero	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Keefe
Donohue	Hall, Leonard W.	Kelley, Pa.
Doughton	Halleck	Kelly, N. Y.
Doyle	Hand	Kennedy
Durham	Harden	Keogh
Eberharter	Hardy	Kerr
Elliott	Harris	Kilday
Ellsworth	Harrison	King
Elston	Hart	Kirwan
Engel, Mich.	Harvey	Klein
Engle, Calif.	Havenner	Kruse
Evins	Hays, Ohio	Lane
Fallon	Hedrick	Lanham
Feighan	Heffernan	Larcade
Fellows	Heller	Latham
Fenton	Herlong	LeFevre
Fernandez	Herter	Lemke
Fisher	Heselton	Lesinski
Flood	Hill	Lichtenwalter
Fogarty	Hinshaw	Lind
Forand	Hobbs	Linehan
Ford	Hoeven	Lodge
Frazier	Hoffman, Ill.	Lovre
Fugate	Holifield	Lucas
Fulton	Holmes	Lyle
Furcolo	Hope	Lynch
Gamble	Horan	McCarthy
Garmatz	Howell	McCormack
Gary	Huber	McCulloch
Gathings	Hull	McDonough
Gavin	Irving	McGrath
Gillette	Jackson, Wash.	McGregor
Golden	Jacobs	McGuire
Goodwin	James	McKinnon
Gordon	Javits	
Gore	Jenison	
Gorski	Jenkins	
Gossett	Jennings	
Graham	Jensen	
Granahan	Johnson	
Granger	Jonas	
Grant	Jones, Ala.	
Green	Jones, Mo.	
Gregory	Jones, N. C.	
Gross	Karst	
Gwinn	Karsten	
Hagen	Kearney	
Hale	Kearns	
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Keating	
Hall, Leonard W.	Kee	
Halleck	Keefe	
Hand	Kelley, Pa.	
Harden	Kelly, N. Y.	
Hardy	Kennedy	
Harris	Keogh	
Harrison	Kerr	
Hart	Kilday	
Harvey	King	
Havenner	Kirwan	
Hays, Ohio	Klein	
Hedrick	Kruse	
Heffernan	Lane	
Heller	Lanham	
Herlong	Larcade	
Herter	Latham	
Heselton	LeFevre	
Hill	Lemke	
Hinshaw	Lesinski	
Hobbs	Lichtenwalter	
Hoeven	Lind	
Hoffman, Ill.	Linehan	
Holifield	Lodge	
Holmes	Lovre	
Hope	Lucas	
Horan	Lyle	
Howell	Lynch	
Huber	McCarthy	
Hull	McCormack	
Irving	McCulloch	
Jackson, Wash.	McDonough	
Jacobs	McGrath	
James	McGregor	
Javits	McGuire	
Jenison	McKinnon	
Jenkins	Sabath	
Jennings	Sadlak	
Jensen	Sadowski	
Johnson	St. George	
Jonas	Sanborn	
Jones, Ala.	Sasscer	
Jones, Mo.	Saylor	
Jones, N. C.	Scott, Hardie	
Karst	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.	
Karsten	Scrivner	
Kearney	Scudder	
Kearns	Secrest	
Keating	Shelley	
Kee	Short	
Keefe	Sikes	
Kelley, Pa.	Simpson, Ill.	
Kelly, N. Y.	Simpson, Pa.	
Kennedy	Sims	
Keogh	Smith, Va.	
Kerr	Smith, Wis.	
Kilday	Spence	
King	Staggers	
Kirwan	Stanley	
Klein	Steed	
Kruse	Stefan	
Lane	Stigler	
Lanham	Stockman	
Larcade	Sullivan	
Latham	Sutton	
LeFevre	Tackett	
Lemke	Talle	
Lesinski	Tauriello	
Lichtenwalter	Taylor	
Lind	Teague	
Linehan	Thomas	
Lodge	Thompson	
Lovre	Thornberry	
Lucas	Tollefson	
Lyle	Towe	
Lynch	Trimble	
McCarthy	Underwood	
McCormack	Van Zandt	
McCulloch	Velde	
McDonough	Vinson	
McGrath	Vorys	
McGregor	Vursell	
McGuire	Wadsworth	
McKinnon	Wagner	
Sabath	Walter	
Sadlak	Weichel	
Sadowski	Welch	
St. George	Wheeler	
Sanborn	White, Idaho	
Sasscer	Whitten	
Saylor	Whittington	
Scott, Hardie	Wickersham	
Scott, Hugh D., Jr.	Widnall	
Scrivner	Wier	
Scudder	Wigglesworth	
Secrest	Williams	
Shelley	Willis	
Short	Wilson, Ind.	
Sikes	Wilson, Okla.	
Simpson, Ill.	Wilson, Tex.	
Simpson, Pa.	Winstead	
Sims	Withrow	
Smith, Va.	Wolverton	
Smith, Wis.	Wood	
Spence	Woodhouse	
Staggers	Woodruff	
Stanley	Yates	
Steed	Young	
Stefan	Zablocki	
Stigler		
Stockman		
Sullivan		
Sutton		
Tackett		
Talle		
Tauriello		
Taylor		
Teague		
Thomas		
Thompson		
Thornberry		
Tollefson		
Towe		
Trimble		
Underwood		
Van Zandt		
Velde		
Vinson		
Vorys		
Vursell		
Wadsworth		
Wagner		
Walter		
Weichel		
Welch		
Wheeler		
White, Idaho		
Whitten		
Whittington		
Wickersham		
Widnall		
Wier		
Wigglesworth		
Williams		
Willis		
Wilson, Ind.		
Wilson, Okla.		
Wilson, Tex.		
Winstead		
Withrow		
Wolverton		
Wood		
Woodhouse		
Woodruff		
Yates		
Young		
Zablocki		

NAYS—21

Bennett, Fla.	Hoffman, Mich.	Norblad
Brehm	Kean	Pace
Byrnes, Wis.	Kilburn	Reed, N. Y.
Cole, N. Y.	Macy	Rich
Cotton	Marcantonio	Shafer
Crawford	Marshall	Smith, Kans.
Davis, Wis.	Mason	Taber

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

O'Toole Powell

NOT VOTING—45

Bailey	Hare	Multer
Boykin	Hays, Ark.	Nixon
Bulwinkle	Hébert	Quinn
Carlyle	Jackson, Calif.	Ramsay
Carnahan	Judd	Redden
Case, S. Dak.	Kunkel	Rhodes
Cavalcante	LeCompte	Rivers
Davenport	McConnell	Sheppard
Davies, N. Y.	McMillan, S. C.	Smathers
Davis, Tenn.	McMillen, Ill.	Smith, Ohio
Deane	Mansfield	Walsh
Dingell	Miles	Werdel
Douglas	Miller, Calif.	Whitaker
Eaton	Morgan	White, Calif.
Gilmer	Morrison	Wolcott

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Jackson of California.
Mr. Mansfield with Mr. Kunkel.
Mr. Gilmer with Mr. Nixon.
Mr. Multer with Mr. Case of South Dakota.
Mr. Davenport with Mr. Eaton.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. LeCompte.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Judd.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Werdel.
Mr. Whitaker with Mr. Wolcott.
Mr. Rhodes with Mr. Smith of Ohio.
Mr. Redden with Mr. McMillen of Illinois.
Mr. Hays of Arkansas with Mr. McConnell.

Mr. HOLIFIELD changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

On motion by Mr. CANNON, a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all who have spoken on the bill may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

CORRECTION OF SECTION AND CHAPTER NUMBERS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk may have the right to correct section numbers and chapter numbers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR TOMORROW

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I take this time to ask the acting majority leader, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] as to the program for tomorrow, and next week and as much of the week thereafter as he can possibly inform the House.

Mr. PRIEST. May I say to the distinguished minority leader that the only legislation scheduled for tomorrow is the bill S. 2599, a bill better known as the Teague bill, which is some amendment to the Veterans' Training Act.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I understand that all the different forces appear to be in agreement.

Mr. PRIEST. That is my understanding. For some time there was some controversy over the bill, but it is my understanding that most of that controversy has been worked out by some amendments.

It is the intention to ask unanimous consent that we adjourn over until Monday.

As far as the program for next week is concerned, that will be announced to-

morrow. I am not able at this time to give the program for next week.

EXTENSION OF SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT

Mr. LYLE, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 597, Rept. No. 2035), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6826) to extend the Selective Service Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 604) for a period of 3 years, and for other purposes. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

CANCELLATION OF CERTAIN LICENSES GRANTED TO THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. McSWEENEY, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 598, Rept. No. 2036), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2128) to provide for the modification or cancellation of certain royalty-free licenses granted to the Government by private holders of patents and rights thereunder. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

CONSTRUCTION OF MILITARY AND NAVAL INSTALLATIONS

Mr. McSWEENEY, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 599, Rept. No. 2037), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, (S. 2440) to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

CONSTRUCTION OF NAVAL VESSELS

Mr. MADDEN, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 600, Rept. No. 2038), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7764) to authorize the construction of modern naval vessels, and for other purposes. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes today following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. ROOSEVELT asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes today following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

REORGANIZATION PLANS

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I wish to give notice that notwithstanding the announcement as to the legislative program for the remainder of this week and next week it is my purpose the first time I can get recognition to call up all of the resolutions which have been reported out by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair may state that he was under the impression that he had a talk with the gentleman from Michigan on the subject. Is that correct?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I understand what the talk was, but I am making that announcement so that there will be no mistake and so that I will not be shut off when I attempt to call up some resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair does not know about the phrase "shut off."

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, to have a correct ruling from the Chair to the effect that I cannot proceed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The present occupant of the Chair, or any other occupant, will certainly see that the rights of every Member are protected under the rules.

The Chair might observe, of course, that when agreements are made the Chair expects them to be carried out.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. And I say in answer to that, as far as I am concerned any agreement I have made will be carried out. But I am not making any more agreements. I have been unable to get those which have been made kept heretofore.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair knows nothing about any agreements made with the gentleman that have not been complied with. The Chair had an agreement with the gentleman with reference to next Thursday. Is that correct?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I am not stating. As I understand, the Senate is now not going to debate plan No. 12 until Friday. The agreement I made with the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON], of course, will be kept.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The only desire of the Chair is to try and protect the House and the Members.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. There will be no advantage, Mr. Speaker, taken by me of any of the House Members; but I do not intend, if I can help it—maybe I cannot—to be—perhaps the word is not strictly parliamentary—"jockeyed" out of any of the time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. No occupant of the chair would do that, and the present occupant of the chair would not concede that the gentleman from Michigan would permit anybody to "jockey" him.

CORRECTION

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, part of the remarks I made in the Committee of the Whole yesterday were inadvertently omitted from the RECORD.

I ask unanimous consent that my remarks in their entirety may be printed in the Appendix of today's RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix of today's RECORD.]

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL PROGRAM

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, some drastic changes affecting the Veterans' Administration hospital program were announced by President Truman on last Wednesday, May 3.

I am particularly interested in that portion of the President's announcement that he has directed that Oliver General Hospital at Augusta, Ga., be transferred to the Veterans' Administration, to be utilized in lieu of a 500-bed general hospital previously ordered to be constructed at Atlanta, Ga. As a result of this order, plans for the construction of the new 500-bed veterans' hospital at Atlanta have been canceled.

As a further result of that order, instructions have been issued to close Lawson General Hospital in Atlanta; also, to reconvert Peachtree Hospital No. 48

dustries of Germany and France. I am confident the free world will welcome the rebirth of leadership being shown by the great French nation. There can be no lasting peace until western Europe learns to work together. At long last, France is helping to show the way for western Europe to work together. This proposal, if earnestly and sincerely followed through, may become one of the important steps of our time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RAMSAY addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of today's RECORD.]

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to address the House today for 10 minutes, following the legislative program and any other special orders heretofore entered.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

IMPORTATION OF FOREIGN-MADE SHOES

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am greatly disturbed about the growing imports of shoes coming into this country from behind the iron curtain and competing with our own American produced shoes.

It is true that the well-being of many communities in my section of the country depends upon the shoe and leather industry, which employs thousands of workers at high wages.

Today, in Boston stores and in stores throughout Massachusetts and the Nation, women's shoes made in Czechoslovakia are being offered to the public.

These shoes are shipped into the United States from behind the iron curtain and are sold to importers at prices which are less than the American manufacturer must pay for leather and other materials and not allowing for the high wages paid American workers.

There is no question but that every pair of these Czechoslovakian shoes purchased in this country, feeds good American dollars into Communist-dominated areas, encourages and builds up totalitarian labor methods and undermines American prosperity and the free labor of our own shoe industry.

It is estimated by the trade that at the present rate of imports, over a million pairs of Czechoslovakian shoes will come into this country in 1950. These will be dumped here by an economy organized on totalitarian principles at below the American costs of production. In fact, some state that they can be sold in American markets at half the price of American-made shoes.

I think that Members of the House will agree that this is a very serious and alarming situation. I have strongly protested it many times with appropriate officials of this Government. It is unconscionable in my mind that it should be permitted to continue when it can be shown clearly that these imports, these Soviet-dumped goods, constitute a direct attack upon American labor, American business and American prosperity.

I am again urging that these imports be stopped at once in the national interest and hope that Government officials will move to this end at an early date.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILBIN. I yield.

Mr. KEARNEY. I am very interested to hear the gentleman speak as he has, because we are having the same trouble in our own district in the glove industry in Fulton County.

Mr. PHILBIN. I think it applies to many industries, and I am glad to have the gentleman's contribution.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILBIN. I yield.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Is not the thing which the gentleman complains about right in line with the administration, the very thing that is being done by the Economic Administration every day, flooding this country with foreign products and foreign metals? Is that not in line with the policy of the administration?

Mr. PHILBIN. The distinguished gentleman has put his finger on a very serious and grave condition, and I hope it may soon be remedied.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILBIN. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am glad the gentleman has called this to the attention of the House, because the same situation exists in the pottery and glass industry in my own State.

Mr. PHILBIN. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN] has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

PENNSYLVANIA'S FINANCES

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], frequently berates the Democratic administration for deficit spending, socialism, and confusion within the Democratic Party.

I want to call to the attention of my friend from Pennsylvania that all is not serene in his home State.

In fact, Governor Duff issued a statement last week in which he said that the boasted $260,000,000 surplus of his predecessor, Governor Martin, was actually a $23,000,000 deficit.

I also note with interest that Governor Duff's administration has supported a $500,000,000 bonus for veterans, but they have not levied taxes to take care of this obligation which was incurred over 6 months ago.

It therefore appears that the Republican Party administration in the State of Pennsylvania is also resorting to deficit financing.

Now as to confusion and dissension in the Democratic Party, I am sure that my friend obtains little comfort from the situation of his own party in Pennsylvania.

In the April 3 issue of Newsweek, there is a very interesting article on the internecine Republican Party fight between Governor Duff and what the Governor denounces as the "old guard reactionaries in the Grundy machine."

The article states that—

> Last week Jim Duff was having the brawl of his life. It was a brass-knuckle battle with Pennsylvania's powerful Grundy machine, fought under boom-town-barroom rules. Everything went, including rabbit punching, eye gouging, and kneeing in the clinches. Duff swore that he would smash the machine into a heap of twisted junk. It was that, he said, or else the machine would destroy the Republican Party in Pennsylvania and nationally.

So I say to my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, whom I admire for his unfailing service to his constituents and his frequent good-humored chastisements of the Democratic Party, "Save some of your energy and advice for the benefit of the strife-ridden and deficit-spending Republican Party in Pennsylvania."

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

PENNSYLVANIA POLITICS

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from California very graciously notified me in advance that he was going to say something about Pennsylvania politics. I want to say to him and to all Members from other States that if they will leave Pennsylvania alone we will wash our

own linen. We do not have to rely on the Crump machine in Tennessee, the Kelly-Nash machine in Chicago, the Hague machine in New Jersey, the Curley machine in Massachusetts, or the Pendergast machine in Kansas City, and ask for any help from any of them. We will do the job ourselves. To our own satisfaction and to the honor of the Republican Party and for the good of our country.

We have a contest up there in Pennsylvania and when we get through we will support the Republican Party, whoever is nominated, because we believe in the primary system. The fellow who is nominated honestly by the majority of our party we will support because we want good honest politics and good government. We believe in the two-party system. When the two-party system in this country fails, then we will not have any Government at all. We are builders. We are for a good government; we will have it if Republicans have charge.

Mr. Speaker, watch the train that is going out there to the West. Whenever the President of the United States can take a TAYLOR, knowing what a tailor will do in manufacturing his suit, when the time comes that he finds this suit does not fit him, he will determine then it has been wrong in the cut. The Democrats fight one year and condemn each other, then ride on the same train together in Idaho. Birds of a feather should travel together. Toot-toot, the train is off again. Whistle stop. Woo, woo, woo. The President says all will get a salary of $4,000 a year in sixty. He does not say that if that happens by his inflation their eggs will not be 60 cents a dozen, but $1.20 a dozen; bread 20 cents a loaf to 50 cents a loaf; milk 20 cents a quart to 45 cents a quart; a pair of shoes made in America, $50 a pair, but an imported pair of shoes, $15; and our shoemakers out of a job. Let Pennsylvania alone you other States. We will elect good Republicans this fall. We are sound Americans.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

PENNSYLVANIA POLITICS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I was very much interested in the statement made by my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] although I was not surprised. The Republicans in Pennsylvania have supported the Republican ticket, but I am just wondering what the Republicans will do this fall when they hear played back over the radio the things that the Republicans have been saying about Republicans.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

HAROLD E. STASSEN

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I hate to join in this attack which may embarrass the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. The gentleman cannot embarrass me.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to know that.

Mr. RANKIN. He is a gentleman whom no compliment can flatter and no criticism can embarrass.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, last week the people of the United States heard an extraordinary speech. It was extraordinary in its bitterness, it was extraordinary in its irresponsibility and also in its attempt to confuse the people of the United States. It was all the more extraordinary in that this bitter, disrespectful, misleading, and irresponsible speech was made by a man who is now president of the University of Pennsylvania and one who himself has sought the Presidency of the United States.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. If that statement is being made about a speech of the President of the United States, I must object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The point of order is overruled.

Mr. McCARTHY. It is made in reference to a speech made by the president of the great University of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, it is a cause of great embarrassment to me as a citizen of the State of Minnesota to admit that the author of this address was at one time the Governor of the State of Minnesota. It is a cause of embarrassment to me as a former member of the academic profession to see the president of a great university show such lack of responsibilty in a public address.

There is slight consolation in the fact that Minnesota no longer claims Mr. Stassen as a citizen. He is Pennsylvania's responsibilty by adoption. And to judge from a recent statement by Governor Duff, Pennsylvania seems to have discovered faults in its adopted son. Referring to another recent statement by Mr. Stassen, Governor Duff is quoted by the Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph as declaring.

It is beyond belief to me that the president of a university would make such a completely false and misleading statement to the people of this great State.

Governor Duff went on to say:

Mr. Stassen either knew what he said was false, and is, therefore, subject to the highest possible condemnation; or he failed to get the facts, and as president of one of the great universities of Pennsylvania, he had a distinct obligation not to be a traitor to the facts.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

SHOE IMPORTATION

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN] in the statement he has made about shoes. As the Representative of 20,000 Endicott Johnson shoe workers I wish to object loudly to a proposal recently made and introduced as a bill in this House which will eliminate the American selling price as a basis for computing the duty on imported rubber footwear. Such a proposal, if it is made law, will throw many Endiott-Johnson workers out of their jobs and will permit Japanese shoes to be brought into this country for about 70 cents a pair. It will enable shoes made behind the iron curtain to come into direct competition with American shoes being made up in my district. The American selling-price method of computing the duty on shoes is the only possible way that rubber-soled canvas oxfords and rubber-soled footwear can be adequately produced by American manufacturers. I think those in the State Department and the Treasury Department who are making these proposals and bringing them in here in the form of legislation had better think about the welfare of the American shoe industry before they do anything else.

If H. R. 8304, the bill I am referring to, is passed, the bars will be let down to such an extent that shoes made by slave labor from iron-curtain vassal states and also those produced in the sweatshops of Japan will flood the markets of America in direct competition with the products of American shoeworkers who enjoy the highest wage standard in the world.

This action can only result in the crippling of the rubber-footwear industry, with the accompanying loss of thousands of jobs in these plants. This action will force Americans, whose life work consists of the skilled and time-honored profession of building shoes, to accept unemployment insurance and eventually to seek unfamiliar lines of endeavor.

Such action can only lead to disastrous results to our domestic rubber-footwear industry.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

OMNIBUS APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, there is not a Member of this House who does not believe in intelligent economy. The Cannon amendment yesterday which I supported, would have helped in that direction. But I think that yesterday was a very black day for the Government services that the American people expect, and for the Government employees themselves. We were guilty, I think, in this House, of meat-ax economy. We ask for nothing but trouble when we apply indiscriminate across-the-board cuts. I

refer specifically to the Taber amendment and to the Jensen amendment.

I want to illustrate briefly with just one type of service that will be greatly hit as the result of our action if it is allowed to stand by the other body. All of us have been haranguing for the last several years about the need for modernization of equipment in the Post Office Department. We deplore the ancient trucks that are still in use, and the antiquated equipment of other sorts. We all want better service for the American people. As the result of yesterday's action we have slashed by 10 percent the funds available for modernization of the Post Office Department.

Secondly, many of us have been receiving loud protests from the people in our constituencies about the curtailment of mail service that has been put into effect by the Postmaster General. If the Jensen amendment is permitted to stand you are now faced with this situation, that if 10 carriers retire in your district during the next year, only 1 new carrier may be appointed; only 1 vacancy may be filled. How are you going to carry the mail under such circumstances? Better search your souls, you gentlemen who voted for these amendments.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

THE RAILWAY STRIKE

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, we read that the President's train, by reason of special privilege, is to be exempted from the operation of the railway strike in that the Brotherhoods have given instructions that there is to be no strike or interference with the President's train. Of course, we are glad to hear such courtesies extended to the Chief of our Government, but at the same time, by the acceptance of a favor from one side of a controversy as against the other side, does not the President disqualify himself either as an impartial mediator in his own person, or by reason of having accepted a favor, can anyone thereafter trust the President's good faith in a genuine effort to solve this strike by which the millions of Americans are inconvenienced, he himself having accepted convenience in preference to justice and impartiality?

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED, AND LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE] be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes and to revise and extend his remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I am not going to object, I simply take this opportunity to ask the distinguished acting majority leader as to the program for next week.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to respond to the inquiry of the distinguished minority leader.

The Consent Calendar will be called on Monday, and following that will be the consideration of the bill H. R. 5990, relating to the Baltimore-Washington Parkway.

On Tuesday the Private Calendar will be called, followed by the consideration of the bill H. R. 7058, which provides for some technical amendments to the laws with reference to the United States Naval and Military Academies. Following the disposition of that bill we will consider H. R. 5074, a bill relating to the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

On Wednesday the regular Memorial Services of the House of Representatives will be held.

On Thursday and Friday we hope to consider some reorganization resolutions. Following the disposition of any reorganization resolutions that may be considered on either of those days, we will take up for consideration H. R. 7941, the Federal Aid Road Act.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I thank the distinguished gentleman, and withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, in view of what has happened heretofore in the House with reference to unanimous-consent requests and also the announcement of the various legislative programs, I wish to give notice for myself and such other Members of the House as may desire to avail themselves of the privilege that I reserve the right to call up any privileged resolutions or motions which may be in order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

TRAINING OF VETERANS UNDER SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 447 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2596) relating to education or training of veterans under title II of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act (Public Law 346, 78th Cong., June 22, 1944). That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] and now yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2596) which relates to the education and training of veterans under title II of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, which was passed by the other body.

The rule provides for 1 hour of debate.

So far as I know, Mr. Speaker, there is no objection to the immediate consideration of the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. Will the gentleman kindly explain the provisions of the bill?

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield.

Mr. TEAGUE. This bill writes into permanent law what is now a regulation and what has been put in the appropriation bill for the last 3 years. It continues the ban against avocational and recreational training and the ban against a school taking veteran students, unless it has been in operation for a year. It puts into law a number of standards that the President recommended to the Congress on February 13, 1950, concerning the GI bill.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Does the passage of this bill mean that it will cost more to operate and handle the program?

Mr. LYLE. Yes, it will cost a little more.

Mr. TEAGUE. This bill will cost an additional $2,300,000, according to the Veterans' Administration. That money is to be used for the State approving agencies to check the schools to see that they are complying with the law. The Veterans' Administration and the President recommended that. My State approval agency tells me our inspection service and on-the-job training and farm training has gone down because no additional money was included, but the Veterans' Administration says it will cost $2,300,000.

Mr. JOHNSON. In other words, all the bill does is reducing to a statute the practice that has been carried on under their regulations.

Mr. TEAGUE. That is correct.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield.

Mr. KEARNEY. I would like to be clear in my own mind concerning which particular bill is under discussion. Is it Senate bill 2596?

Mr. LYLE. That is correct.

Mr. KEARNEY. It is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that while this committee has held no hearings on this particular bill, the testimony before the Committee on Appropriations was to the effect that if this bill passed, it would cost $2,500,000,000 a year, is that correct?

Mr. TEAGUE. The Veterans' Administration did testify that, but I wrote them and asked them to explain how it would cost that much. They said the preamble of the bill destroyed the expiration date of the GI bill. I wrote back to the Veterans' Administration and asked them to write an amendment which would correct that. That amendment will be offered.

I do not agree with the Veterans' Administration. I sent the bill to the legislative reference service and asked them for a report. They said there was nothing in the bill which changed the expiration date, but to be sure that there is no doubt about it the amendment prepared by the Veterans' Administration will be put in the bill.

Mr. KEARNEY. Is it the intention to offer the House bill, H. R. 8465, as a substitute?

Mr. TEAGUE. Yes; I intend to offer that as a substitute for the Senate bill 2596.

Mr. KEARNEY. If that is so, what would be the difference in the cost of the bill as it passed the Senate and the cost of the proposed amendment?

Mr. TEAGUE. The gentleman from New York [Mr. KEARNEY] heard the same testimony that I heard concerning S. 2596, in executive session in our committee. At that time the Veterans' Administration did not mention the expiration date of the GI bill. It would not change anything as pertains to the expiration date of the GI bill.

Mr. KEARNEY. But as I get the picture it changes the figures in the Senate bill from $2,500,000,000 to $2,500,000. If that is so I am going to ask the question now, How can we reconcile any differences in any conference committee between the sum of $2,000,000,000 and $2,000,000?

Mr. TEAGUE. The gentleman from New York knows that when the Senate passed this bill there was no thought of any such cost as that. The Veterans' Administration came up with that figure before the Appropriations Committee, after they had testified before our committee. There was no Senator that ever mentioned changing the expiration date of the GI bill. There is no Senator who will object to this amendment.

Mr. KEARNEY. You understand I am not criticizing my good friend from Texas, because there is not a harder worker on the Veterans' Affairs Committee than the geneleman from Texas, but I do say that as far as this particular legislation is concerned, as it stands now I am opposed to it, for the simple reason that we have never had any hearings on this bill.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. May I ask my colleague from Texas this question. About 3 days ago, Mr. Lawton, the present Director of the Bureau of the Budget, sent to the Committee on Appropriations covering the independent agencies a letter stating that S. 2596 will cost an additional $1,000,000,000 a year. If my memory serves me correctly, we appropriated for education and training for the fiscal year 1950, $2,900,000,000. He says this bill S. 2596 will cost an additional $1,000,000,000. I wonder if the gentleman is prepared to break down at this time the difference in cost of S. 2596 and H. R. 8465? I believe the gentleman intends to substitute H. R. 8465; is that correct?

Mr. TEAGUE. Yes, sir. Does the gentleman have a copy of H. R. 8465 before him?

Mr. THOMAS. Can the gentleman break down the difference in cost and give that more or less in round figures?

Mr. TEAGUE. I have not seen the letter from Mr. Lawton, but I did read the testimony before your subcommittee where they said it would cost an additional $2,500,000,000.

Mr. THOMAS. That was the Director of the Veterans' Administration, General Gray.

Mr. TEAGUE. I, in turn, wrote to them and asked them to explain where that could possibly happen. They said it was because of the preamble. There is one section in H. R. 8465, section 4, that contains the cost of $2,300,000.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. LYLE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. Will the gentleman again state how he feels assured that in the event his substitute bill is passed how we can be assured that in conference they will not split the difference, or do something like that, and run it into billions of dollar on this legislation.

Mr. TEAGUE. I will say to the gentleman that there was no intent by the people who passed this bill in the Senate to change the expiration date of the GI bill. As far as I am concerned, I am sure I can state for the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] and the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] that we would not agree to any such thing as that in conference.

Mr. JOHNSON. I am glad to have that assurance.

Mr. KEARNEY. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. LYLE. I yield.

Mr. KEARNEY. I bring up again my original thought about a compromise. How can you or any member of the conference committee adjust the differences between $2,000,000,000 and $2,000,000?

Mr. TEAGUE. If the gentleman from New York introduced a bill by which he intended to do something, and the agency involved came back and said that because of language that he had in the bill, an amount that he had never dreamed of, would be required, and he wrote the agency and asked for an amendment, would he worry about the amount then?

Mr. KEARNEY. Well, I am particularly worried about the amount in these two bills, I will say very frankly to the gentleman from Texas. I have here a statement which I referred to previously of the hearings before the Committee on Appropriations. The chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] stated:

> General Gray's figure was about $2,500,000,000 additional cost per annum. That would make a total expenditure of over $5,000,000,000 a year if S. 2596 goes through.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield.

Mr. MASON. I want to know if this changed expiration date is the thing that changed the $2,000,000 to $2,000,000,000.

Mr. TEAGUE. That is it exactly; the gentleman is correct.

Mr. MASON. Then if that change in the expiration date is corrected it will be approximately $2,000,000.

Mr. TEAGUE. Correct.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may need.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me obvious to everyone in this room after hearing the discussion here that the committee themselves do not agree on what the cost of this measure is going to be. Some say $2,000,000; some say $2,000,000,000; some say $5,000,000,000.

I personally am sorry that this bill is here before the Congress under these conditions, a bill on which they have had no hearings. I have attempted to obtain some information as to the provisions, cost, and so forth, but have been unable to do so. If this committee wants to come in where they themselves do not understand what is contained in the bill and ask Congress to pass something like that, I just think it is bad procedure.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. TEAGUE. There have been no specific hearings on this bill, but before the Senate committee, before our Committee on Appropriations, before the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, there have been hearings on this same provision.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. KEARNEY. As a matter of fact, is it not true that we adopted the hearings of the other body with reference to a bill we had on the floor here a short time ago which caused quite a bit of confusion? That was the 16,000-bed hospital bill.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. That is true. We do not know who appeared before the Senate committee, we do not know who appeared in opposition to the bill or in favor of it; no one knows that.

Mr. TEAGUE. Most of the hearings in the Senate were in executive session of the Committee on Education and Labor and they heard representatives of the Veterans' Administration. There were a number of conferences and my colleague from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] can verify this or tell whether it is true or not, that there were conferences between the Appropriations subcommittee and the Veterans' Administration trying to work out the language of this bill; and there were about 2 weeks of hearings over in the Senate before the Committee on Education and Labor. The bill was

When we get to the pages' side of this, the biggest boy that came to me said, "You all know that we are not just playing Democrats in this, don't you?" I said I presumed that all the pages were going to participate, and they came out. The pages participated on both sides. We did not have enough to fill the uniforms. May I tell you seriously we are urging the Republicans to turn out so that we will have enough to fill all the uniforms on the night of the nineteenth, but with the help of the pages assigned to us we made a few innings out there and the actual score was 6 to 4, by calling the game so that we could get back to our offices and do some work. Of course I do not know how many were on bases at the time, but there were not over three.

Mr. HARRIS. We are glad to have that clarification.

There is another development that my team mates had better take notice of. One of the ladies in this House may participate in this game. She has notified us by letter and I talked to her about it. So I can say to these so-called hold-outs that we are going to have a great deal of rivalry on this team and a lot of competition. However, seriously speaking, the game is to be played for a very worthy cause, and we would appreciate a good attendance.

Mrs. BOSONE. To clear this up, I am not that woman.

Mr. HARRIS. I would say to my distinguished colleague we would be very happy for her to join with us.

Mr. BISHOP. The ladies on our side have been invited but they said they loved baseball but they did not think they would be there in uniform that evening.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA AND HAWAII

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, May 5, President Truman requested the chairman of the Senate Interior Committee to direct his attention to the establishment of statehood for the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii. I am inserting President's Truman's letter in today's RECORD.

The momentum of recent events makes it certain that before long both Alaska and Hawaii will possess an equal voice in directing the affairs of this great Nation. Just how imminent is a 50-State Nation depends on the swiftness of Senate action. And there is every indication that such action may come sooner than anyone expects.

One of the corollary problems attendant to the establishment of statehood for Alaska and Hawaii is the significant change which will take place in the American flag when these new States are added. These are momentous times for Old Glory too. In the past, our flag has been changed without rhyme or reason, or to be more exact, without congressional direction, whenever a new State has come into the Union. For this reason, I have introduced a resolution to establish a committee of this great body to hold hearings and make recommendations regarding the appearance of our new flag, or should I say, our New Glory. I am certain that the passage of this resolution will insure us of a New Glory worthy of our hallowed institutions.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, May 5, 1950.

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: I am highly gratified by the thorough and objective consideration which your committee is giving to H. R. 331 and H. R. 49, bills which would enable the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii to take their rightful place as members of the Union. As you know, I have long supported the objectives of these important bills which carry out the pledges made to the people of the two Territories. I sincerely hope that the Congress, during its present session, will enact legislation granting statehood to Alaska and Hawaii. The need is more urgent today than ever before. By such action, we will not only promote the welfare and development of the two Territories, but also greatly strengthen the security of our Nation as a whole.

It should not be forgotten that most of our present States achieved statehood at a relatively early period of their development. The stimulus of being admitted as full partners in the Union, and the challenge of managing their own affairs were among the most significant factors contributing to their growth and progress. Very few of our existing States, at the time of their admission to the Union, possessed potential resources, both human and natural, superior to those of Alaska and Hawaii. I am confident that Alaska and Hawaii, like our present States, will grow with statehood and because of statehood.

There is no necessity for me to repeat at this time the arguments for statehood. The many qualified witnesses who have appeared before your committee have, I am sure, presented convincing evidence both as to the need for and the tangible benefits to be derived from statehood. There is, however, one objection made by opponents of H. R. 331 and H. R. 49 which I believe requires further discussion because it goes beyond the question of statehood and raises a fundamental constitutional issue. I am referring to the objection that Alaska and Hawaii as States would be entitled to representation in the Senate of the United States disproportionate to their population.

This argument is not only entirely without merit, but also directly attacks a basic tenet of the constitutional system under which this Nation has grown and prospered. Without the provision for equal representation in the Senate of all States, both great and small, regardless of population, there probably would have been no United States. This was one of the great compromises which the Federalist says was a result "not of theory, but of a spirit of amity, and that mutual deference and concession which the peculiarity of our political situation rendered indispensable." There is no justification for denying statehood to Alaska and Hawaii on the basis of an issue which was resolved by the Constitutional Convention in 1787.

America justly takes pride in its record of fulfilling to the letter its obligations to foreign nations. We should be no less scrupulous in carrying out the promises made to our own citizens in Alaska and Hawaii. The case for statehood rests on both legal and moral grounds.

These are troubled times. I know of few better ways in which we can demonstrate to the world our deep faith in democracy and the principal of self-government than by admitting Alaska and Hawaii to the Union as the forty-ninth and fiftieth States.

Sincerely,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

CORRECTION OF ROLL CALL

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, on roll call 157 of yesterday I was recorded as absent. I was present and answered to my name. I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD and the Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

THE TABER AND JENSEN AMENDMENTS TO THE APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in perusing the morning paper, the Washington Post, I noticed an article which purported to give an estimate of the Civil Service Commission in which they said that in the fiscal year 1951 there would be 310,000 vacancies in the Federal personnel. This is around 15 percent, I believe, of the total civilian personnel.

The Taber amendment, of course, and the Jensen amendment also, will have a direct bearing on the filling of these vacancies.

The Jensen amendment exempts doctors and nurses in the Veterans' Administration and the Public Health Service, but it is very interesting to note that it does not exempt St. Elizabeths Hospital; the doctors and nurses there are not exempted. This is the largest mental hospital in the world. It has a patient load of over 8,000. If we have a possible loss through resignation or otherwise of 15 percent in the doctor and nurse personnel at St. Elizabeths you can see the problem we are going to have confronting us. It is just another indication of passing a broad and sweeping amendment without knowing its effect. I predict that many other problems will arise. I think the adoption of the Jensen amendment is something which will be long regretted by this House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. Would the gentleman comment on the impact that yesterday's action of the House of Representatives, if it were to be sustained, would have with regard to the layoff of from 200,000 to a quarter of a million Government employees, the effect it would have on the economy of our country?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Undoubtedly it will add to the rapidly growing unemployment situation. But I am concerned even more with the Jensen amendment which will permit only one in ten of these vacancies to be replaced.

I certainly hope that the conferees on the Appropriations Committee in their conference with the Senate will revise this amendment to the point where it will at least be practical and workable.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. I think the gentleman will recall that there were only 21 votes against the bill as it finally passed the House yesterday.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I do not remember the size of the vote; the gentleman may be right. But it would not be the first time that the House of Representatives made a mistake. I can even remember some instances where the Supreme Court has overruled some of the decisions that have been made by this House.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. Is it not the fact that the number of votes against the bill yesterday on final passage is no true indication of anything, for the reason that the real vote was on the Thomas-Taber amendment?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I think the gentleman is speaking the truth in that regard.

FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, an ever-increasing burden is being imposed upon the taxpayers of the Nation.

Not only do the annual appropriation bills constantly grow larger—the present one calls for something more than $29,000,000,000—but, with this year's increase of more than $5,000,000,000 in the Federal debt, the total debt now being around $260,000,000,000, there is an annual interest charge on that debt of some $5,000,000,000. That interest charge continues to increase.

To date, while Congress talks economy, it takes no steps to give you economy.

But the ever-increasing tax burden, which now forces you to work 1 day out of 4 for Uncle Sam, is not our greatest concern.

Just a few days ago, President Truman, on his across-the-country speaking trip, told us the international situation was not as threatening today as it was in 1946; said he expected to reduce the defense budget next year.

It is my hope that the President knew what he was talking about, that the situation justified his hope.

But not so long ago, Defense Secretary Johnson, Gen. Omar Bradley, and George Kennen, spokesman for the State Department—three men who have all possible available information about military and political conditions—expressed grave concern over our defense problems.

All three stated they hoped that war would not come to us this year, but they admitted they have no way of accurately forecasting the plans of Russia. They did insist that they would be remiss in their duty if they failed to call for improvement of our present military preparedness situation.

Recently, Defense Secretary Johnson was striving to cut defense expenditures, but now all three are calling for an immediate greater national defense program.

In addition to dollars, Secretary Johnson is calling for a continuation of the law to draft into the Armed Services the youth of our land.

Now, folks, listen, and especially you wives and mothers. It is one thing to take from the wage earners, the people of this country, $1 out of every 4 they earn. That is a grievous burden. We may be able to survive that, if we stay out of war.

But, if we must pay that exorbitant tax, can this country survive a course which will again, and for the third time within 40 years, force the youth of this land to fight on foreign soil under other than the command of their own officers?

There is either something radically wrong with our system of government, or with those who administer it, when American young men are called repeatedly to fight and die everywhere in the world.

At the moment, it is the policy of our State Department, while thousands of our young men are maintaining order in Japan and Germany, to conscript other young men and send them to Indochina, there to fight in a prelude to third world war.

While demanding less spending and more efficient service in our Federal Government here at home, we should give the gravest consideration to the question of whether this country shall again, for the third time, send its boys and girls across the seas, to fight a third civilization-destroying world war.

It may be ruinous to send our dollars and strip our country of its natural resources to aid other nations.

It will be national suicide, to sacrifice our own flesh and blood on foreign soil, in a futile effort to make other nations live together in peace when they will do little or nothing to help toward that end.

It is silly and foolish, if we must have a war to get out of the mess in which we have become involved, to leave that "getting out" to those incompetents who have not ben able to keep us out of the situation in which we are now bogged down.

Instead of waiting until we get into the middle of the stream, let us change horses before we wet our feet.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

PLAN NO. 12 WOULD MAKE FOR INCREASED EFFICIENCY

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, some opponents of plan 12 have contended that the plan would increase delay in case handling, because certain duties would be restored to the Board.

I believe that the contrary result will follow. Who can deny that the spectacle of agency heads wrangling among themselves has a most demoralizing effect on staff work? The differences between the Board members and the general counsel which have arisen have not been kept secret or confidential. They have been fully aired before Congress and in the public press. Anyone familiar with Government knows the result of such public division. Factions develop within the staff. Gossip and malice are fostered. Employees are diverted from attention to their duties. Interest in the immediate internal conflict takes precedence over the performance of public service.

These are the inevitable consequences of a notorious inability of agency heads to agree. In this case both the general counsel and the members of the Board insist that no personal antagonism is involved. This is true, but it is no guaranty that subordinates on the staff can maintain the same objectivity. There must necessarily be a tremendous loss in agency output.

The general counsel and the Board are proceeding at cross purposes. They must devote much time to praiseworthy, but futile, efforts to compose their differences. These differences cannot be composed; they flow inevitably from the confusing and conflicting provisions of the law regarding the respective powers and duties of the officers concerned.

A third cause of loss in output under the present system is the necessity of processing cases which must ultimately be dismissed. These are the cases processed by the general counsel on his theory, which are later dismissed by the Board on the application of its theory.

Impartial minds must agree that the elimination of these present obstacles to output will more than offset the added responsibilities upon the Board members resulting from the restoration of their policy-making duties.

PLAN NO. 12 IS IN ACCORD WITH THE HOOVER COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

Mr. Speaker, we have heard much during debate and have read in the papers in the recent past the oft-repeated assertion that the provisions of plan No. 12 were not recommended by the Hoover Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government for the NLRB.

REPORTS DISTURBING

Osnaburgs have been quiet in the domestic cotton textile market recently and mills specializing in that type of cloth have been disturbed by reports that substantial additional quantities of Japanese osnaburgs are scheduled to arrive here to compete with the American product.

Recently trade sources reported as much as 500,000 yards of Japanese osnaburgs had been sold here at 1 cent a yard under the comparable domestic fabric.

The domestic market for cotton textiles has been slow for some weeks. But most trade sources feel that the fourth quarter will be good. They do not expect a robust third quarter but they point out that normally is a slack period of vacation slowdowns.

At the minute folks just aren't buying. Hand-to-month purchasing has returned to the retail and converter markets.

The fabric-making mills have curtailed production by cutting back premium shifts—shifts on which overtime is paid. They prefer this to piling up inventories in slow times.

Many trade sources look on this type of action as healthy. They say mills are a little gun shy after a depressing experience a year ago.

KEEP GOODS MOVING

Rather than be left with a warehouse full of unsold goods they slow production a bit, confine their operation to filling orders they have in hand. And when buying starts again they'll be set to roll again full tilt.

The slackness in recent weeks has been noticeable in woolens and worsteds as well as in cottons.

But the wool men, too, feel it is a temporary situation. One wool-trade spokesman termed it a great waiting period during which everyone is attempting to determine a level at which to stabilize.

Keen competition for the consumer dollar has brought the slow buying at retail levels. This in turn has delayed orders for fall goods by the converter—the garment maker.

But comes fall, he adds, business should be excellent. One source even went so far as to forecast a scramble for delivery of fabrics.

Meanwhile the Government is calling for bids on various types of cloth. Recent Government orders for woolen and worsted goods amount to around 5,000,000 yards. And in the cotton field, the Army Quartermaster has asked for bids on a total of 5,670,000 yards of gray cotton duck.

These orders probably will help several mills bridge a gap.

Prices for civilian goods in the fall? Most textile men think there will be no significant change. They say they just don't see how there can be with raw material and labor costs high and no likelihood of material changes in either category.

FOREIGN TEXTILES SEEN SOUTH CAROLINA PAYROLL THREAT

UNION, May 9 (AP).—South Carolina's economy is inescapably linked with the textile industry, now harassed by a potential influx of goods from cheap-labor foreign countries, a writer-lecturer on textiles said here today.

Mrs. Mildred Barnwell Andrews, long identified with the cotton and cotton-textile industries, said American textile exports have shrunk sharply and that a large quantity of Japanese osnaburgs sold cheaply on the American markets recently.

Mrs. Andrews, who addressed the Union Rotary Club, said the loss of a billion-yard annual market by American mills—exports were that much in 1948, but shrank drastically last year—can be translated into the equivalent of 50,000 jobs and an annual payroll of $104,000,000.

The American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, she added, believes United States tariff policy should provide proper safeguards to the American textile industry and its more than 500,000 employees. A joint Anglo-American textile group now is in Japan on a fact-finding mission.

Only in recent years have textile mills been able to earn profits comparable with those of American industry as a whole, Mrs. Andrews declared. A large part of these earnings had been plowed back into modernization and research, she said.

She cited State labor department statistics showing that South Carolina cotton-manufacturing plants began 1950 with $358,901,038 capital investment, an increase of $110,081,983 over 1948. She said average employment increased from 95,181 in 1937 to approximately 125,000 in 1949.

"You get a payroll in this State from the textile industry of approximately $284,000,000 a year (the 1949 figure, which reflected a recession in the industry) but which nevertheless is an amazing increase from the $72,000,000 in 1937," she said.

"Just visualize the enormous purchasing power represented by the textile-mill employment in South Carolina, and you get some idea of why continuous employment in the textile industry is important."

Senator McCarthy's Charges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the Saturday Review of Literature, an eminent and respected periodical published in New York, recently ran an editorial entitled "Subversion in the Senate." The editorial is an exercise in irony and is thought provoking. I ask unanimous consent of the Senate to insert it in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUBVERSION IN THE SENATE

The editors of the Saturday Review have carefully studied the records of the congressional hearings into the charges against communism in the State Department. As a result we have reluctantly come to the inescapable conclusion that the chief participant must inevitably be a Communist. We refer to Senator MCCARTHY of Wisconsin. This conclusion is based on a working definition of Communists and secret agents as used by Senator MCCARTHY. We are glad to present the documentary evidence:

First, guilt by association. For 4 years Senator MCCARTHY has belonged to an organization of which a well-known member has been a prominent supporter of the policies of the Soviet Union. Moreover, Senator MCCARTHY has actually worked full-time for that organization. We refer to the Congress of the United States, of which VITO MARCANTONIO, a consistent party liner, has been a Member since 1935.

Second, guilt by smokescreen. Senator MCCARTHY, inferentially and otherwise, has stated that the public anti-Communist activities of such persons as Dorothy Kenyon and Philip Jessup are ostensibly only a cover-up for their real activities and sympathies. The greater the apparent opposition to communism, the greater the real affiliation. This being the case, it is clear that Senator MCCARTHY's violent outbursts are merely intended to conceal his real sympathies somewhere on the other extreme. What better smokescreen than to attack the State Department of the United States?

Third, guilt by imitation. This is the most incriminating count of all, for it is apparent that Senator MCCARTHY has modeled his tactics after the notorious Russian purge trials. All the elements of justice in a democracy—due process of law, grand jury, presentation of direct evidence, the assumption that an individual is innocent until proved guilty—all these have been spurned by the Soviet as outworn bourgeois niceties. The Senator from Wisconsin has paid high honor to this Soviet conception of justice in his tactics on this matter; indeed, his use of slander and vilification under immunity bears an uncanny resemblance to the privileged position enjoyed by official character assassins of the Soviet Union.

Fourth, service to the cause. The easiest way to black any reasoned, impartial, and effective examination of subversion is through a helter-skelter, wild-jamboree approach that obscures the real problem. In addition, the damage to America's reputation abroad must be heartfelt satisfaction to those who have a large stake in the defamation of the United States. For this service to the cause the Senator is entitled to whatever distinctions the Kremlin can bestow.

Spending by Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1950

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, in my several visits to my district, I repeatedly said that I would vote for every cut offered in the appropriation bill, and that I would vote against all attempts to increase the amounts.

Mr. Speaker, the country is deeply disturbed about the spending of the Federal Government. They are disturbed about the 16 years of deficit spending under the Democrats. They realize their money is being polluted and the dollar buys less and less. They realize that inflation and increased taxes are two Frankenstein monsters that can destroy our economic system.

Mr. Speaker, the committee has been considering the one package appropriation bill for 5 weeks. It is interesting to note that 45 amendments have been offered to increase items of expenditures and 35 of them came from the Democratic side of the aisle. There were 36 amendments offered to reduce various items, and only 5 of them came from the Democratic side. The other 26 came from the Republican side, and they were rejected. We never did have more than five or six votes for reductions from the Democratic side of the House. That, Mr. Speaker, is the record to date. Your party has voted for continued deficit spending and high taxes. You did not vote for economy.

The amendments offered by Mr. TABER, of New York, and Mr. JENSEN, of Iowa, should be adopted. They will mean a further reduction in the Federal Government of about 300,000 people and will cut appropriations about $1,500,000,000. I voted for these amendments and I hope that they stay in the final bill.

The administration is full of expensive plans and programs for leading the American people down the road to socialism. The programs grow and multiply. They all cost money. It means more taxes, inflation, and deficit spending.

The only way to stop deficit spending and balance the budget is to stop spending. It is just as simple as that. The Government is no different than the people. We must stop spending money for things we might want but do not necessarily need.

Mother's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1950

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, May 14th, the second Sunday in May, will be observed throughout the land as Mother's Day. Each of us in his own way will bestow love and devotion upon the best mother who ever lived, our own, and in so doing give honor where honor is due. It will be a wonderful day indeed.

This beautiful custom of setting apart one day in each year to pay just tribute to our mothers should never be abandoned or forgotten. We regard mother as the noblest, sweetest and best of all God's creations and in appreciation of her love and devotion pause to pay especial tribute to her this sacred day.

The real origin of Mother's Day dates back to the period immediately following the Civil War, when Mrs. Anna Reeves Jarvis, organized the mothers of her community in West Virginia. The avowed purpose at that time was the reuniting of families and invitations were extended to Union and Confederate soldiers and their families to meet, reestablish friendships and pleasant associations. The results were so encouraging and successful as to instill in the Jarvis family a sincere desire to promote on a national scale the spirit of love and honor. Miss Anna Jarvis, a daughter of Mrs. Anna Reeves Jarvis, a woman of keen intellect, broad vision, high ideals and commanding personality, developed and promoted the idea of honoring the Mothers of America, both living and dead. It was through her persevering efforts over a long period of time that Mother's Day has been officially recognized and proclaimed. Therefore, when paying tribute to our mothers, let us spare a fine thought of appreciation for Miss Jarvis, whose efforts made this special day possible.

The Biggest Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the seventeenth article by Mr. Frank C. Waldrop on the infiltration of communism in our country:

BIGGEST STORY

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Communism, today, is an all-Russian power play. In every important country in the world there is now a tightly organized and carefully trained force of Russian agents whose sole aim and object is to carry out the purposes of Russian foreign policy.

There is a very simple way to distinguish between these Communists and the local political groups in any country.

In our own, for instance, we have a number of legally qualified political organizations seeking to elect their candidates to public offices.

The Communists here claim themselves, too, a political party with all the legal rights and powers of any other. But unlike any other group on these shores, the Communists take oaths of allegiance to something they called the Marxist-Leninist line.

That oath ties them to the Communists in France in Britain, in Germany—wherever other Communists may be—to fight and when need be, to die, for Stalin in Moscow.

Such is the Red thread that tied Dr. Klaus Fuchs, the German who became a Briton, to persons as yet undisclosed in the United States of America, and so resulted in the atom bomb being stolen for the Kremlin.

Such is the thread that binds the Harvard prize package, Alger Hiss, to the events of long ago and far away being reviewed here.

When you know how all this began, you know with certainty why things happen now and what to do about them.

And so it means something to us now that as soon as the Communists set up a government in Moscow in March 1918, they rebuilt the musical clock on the Spassky tower in the Kremlin so it would play not God Save the Czar, as of old, but the Internationale, world communism's fighting song.

Lev Davidovitch Bronstein, alias Leon Trotsky, knew why. He was home after years of exile and busy at the right hand of Lenin, the organizer of the Soviets.

In rapid order, Trotsky joined the Bolsheviks, became head of the Soviet foreign office, negotiated the peace of Brest-Litovsk with Germany that was the Kaiser's balance against United States entrance into Europe's war of 1914–18.

And then Trotsky became commissar for war, for he wanted to send Communist armies out against all the rest of the nations as soon as possible.

He was rolling high and wide with a private railroad train, a special commissary out of which to dole judicious gifts to factions that would remember him. For it was already obvious that among Communists as among all others, one boss follows another, sooner or later.

Trotsky, as Lenin's most spectacular lieutenant, was running with all his hands and feet and his lightning brain, to be next when Lenin would go over the river.

Trotsky was a really able soldier and he was a very clever plotter and deceiver. But Trotsky had one great weakness that turned out to be fatal. He was so vain that he could never see himself as others saw him.

He took flattery to be faithful adoration. And he was so interested in forming the Communist International that was to breed revolution abroad he overlooked something at home.

The consequences killed him.

He had failed to take care against somebody who was not a Russian at all, who did not care for drinking tea from a glass or wiggling his toes while he talked airily about "historical necessity" or "dialetical materialism" or explained to friends abroad the regrettable incident of machine-gunning the streets of Petrograd to "keep revolutionary discipline."

No. Lenin died, and Petrograd, which had been St. Petersburg, now became Leningrad. And Trotsky, unfortunately, was out of town when the boys got together to see who would be next up.

That was in 1924.

It took time, but just the same on January 20, 1929, the Gosudarstvennoye Politicheskoye Upravleniye, which means "state political board," and which we know as the GPU, issued the following order:

"Considered, the case of citizen Trotsky, Lev Davidovitch, under article 58/10 of the criminal code, on a charge of counterrevolutionary activity expressing itself in the organization of an illegal anti-Soviet party, whose activity has lately been directed toward provoking anti-Soviet activities and preparing for an armed struggle against the Soviet power.

"Resolved, citizen Trotsky, Lev Davidovitch, to be deported from the U. S. S. R."

The revolution was beginning to eat its own children.

Curtailment of Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD excerpts from a letter which I have received from a highly respected constituent, a close friend, and a leading surgeon in the city of New York, Dr. Richard Lewisohn, of 1155 Park Avenue, protesting against the curtailment of postal deliveries. The letter is typical of a large number of protests which I have received. I believe that it will interest the Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I was delighted to see that you spoke against curtailment of postal deliveries in New York. I hope you will get strong support from your colleagues in the Senate. It seems ludicrous that the richest city in the world should cut down on mail service. They have three deliveries in the residential section of London and four in the business section; one delivery a day seems a joke, like RFD.

This is the first time in my life that I write to a Member of Congress. So please don't disappoint me.

81ST CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 7786

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MAY 11 (legislative day, MARCH 29), 1950
Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the support of the Government, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, namely:

CHAPTER I—DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

For the general fund of the District of Columbia, $9,800,000, and for the water fund, established by law (D. C. Code, title 43, ch. 15), $1,000,000, both amounts to be advanced July 1, 1950.

This title may be cited as the "Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service Appropriation Act, 1951".

This chapter may be cited as the "Labor-Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1951".

CHAPTER VI—DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

TITLE I

RESEARCH AND MARKETING ACT OF 1946

To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of section 9 of title I and title II of the Act of August 14, 1946, as amended (7 U. S. C. 427, 427h, 427j, 1621–1629), as follows:

For payments to States, Territories, and Puerto Rico for agricultural experiment stations pursuant to section 9 of the Bankhead-Jones Act approved June 29, 1935, as amended by the Act of August 14, 1946, $5,000,000;

For the improvement and development, independently or through cooperation among Federal and State agencies, and others, of a sound and efficient system for the distribution and marketing of agricultural products pursuant to the "Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946" (title II of the Act of August 14, 1946, as amended), including the objects for which funds are available for titles II and III of such Act of August 14, 1946, $6,000,000: *Provided,* That not less than $650,000 of this amount shall be available for contracts in accordance with the provisions of section 205 of said Act: *Provided further,* That the Secretary may make available to any bureau, office, or agency of the Department such amounts from this appropriation as may be necessary to carry out the functions for which it is made (but amounts

made available to the Office of the Secretary, Office of the Solicitor, and Office of Information, shall not exceed those which the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives of the Department, shall determine), and any such amounts shall be in addition to amounts transferred or otherwise made available to other appropriation items of the Department: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for work relating to fish or shellfish or any product thereof, except for the support of equitable transportation rates before Federal agencies concerned with such rates and for development of foreign markets.

In all, $11,000,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for beginning construction of any building costing in excess of $15,000, except that a poultry breeding house may be constructed at Purdue University at a cost to this appropriation of not to exceed $29,000.

BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

For necessary expenses in carrying out the provisions of the Act establishing the Bureau of Agricultural Economics (5 U. S. C. 673) and related Acts, as follows:

Economic investigations: For conducting investigations and for acquiring and diffusing useful information among the people of the United States, relative to agricultural production, distribution, land utilization, and conservation in their

broadest aspects, including farm management and practice, utilization of farm and food products, purchasing of farm supplies, farm population and rural life, farm labor, farm finance, insurance and taxation, adjustments in production to probable demand for the different farm and food products; land ownership and values, farm structures, costs, prices and income in their relation to agriculture, including causes for their variations and trends, $2,600,000: *Provided,* That no part of the funds herein appropriated or made available to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics under the heading "Economic investigations" shall be used for State and county land-use planning, for conducting cultural surveys, or for the maintenance of regional offices.

Crop and livestock estimates: For collecting, compiling, abstracting, analyzing, summarizing, interpreting, and publishing data relating to agriculture, including crop and livestock estimates, acreage, yield, grades, staples of cotton, stocks, and value of farm crops and numbers, grades, and value of livestock and livestock products on farms, production, distribution, and consumption of turpentine and rosin pursuant to the Act of August 15, 1935 (5 U. S. C. 556b), and for the collection and publication of statistics of peanuts as provided by the Act approved June 24, 1936, as amended May 12, 1938 (7 U. S. C. 951–957), and data on farm construction as provided by title V of the Housing Act

of 1949 (Public Law 171), $2,725,000: *Provided,* That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be available for any expense incident to ascertaining, collating, or publishing a report stating the intention of farmers as to the acreage to be planted in cotton, or for estimates of apple production for other than the commercial crop.

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR

For necessary expenses of the Office of Administrator, including the purchase of one passenger motor vehicle, travel and subsistence expenses of Advisory Committee authorized by title III of the Act of August 14, 1946 (7 U. S. C. 1628–1629), and the maintenance, operation, and furnishing of facilities and services at the Agricultural Research Center, $600,000: *Provided,* That the appropriation current at the time services are rendered may be reimbursed (by advance credits or reimbursements based on estimated or actual charges) from applicable appropriations, to cover the charges, including handling and other related services, for equipment rentals (including depreciation, maintenance, and repairs); for services, supplies, equipment, and material furnished: *Provided further,* That of the several appropriations of the Agricultural Research Administration, not to exceed $15,000 shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706 (a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5

U. S. C. 574), as amended by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a): *Provided further*, That the several appropriations of the Agricultural Research Administration shall be available for the construction, alteration, and repair of buildings and improvements: *Provided, however*, That unless otherwise provided, the cost of constructing any one building (excepting headhouses connecting greenhouses) shall not exceed $5,000, the total amount for construction of buildings costing more than $2,500 each shall be within the limits of the estimates submitted and approved therefor, and the cost of altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed $2,500 or 2 per centum of the cost of the building as certified by the Research Administrator, whichever is greater.

WORKING CAPITAL FUND, AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH CENTER

For the establishment of a working capital fund, to be available without fiscal year limitation, for expenses necessary for furnishing facilities and services by the Agricultural Research Center to Government agencies, $300,000. Said fund shall be reimbursed from applicable appropriations or other funds to cover the charges for such facilities and services, including handling and related charges, for equipment rentals [(including depreciation, maintenance, and

repairs), for supplies, equipment and materials, stores of which may be maintained at the Center, and for building construction, alterations, and repair, and applicable appropriations or other funds may also be charged their proportionate share of the necessary general expenses of the Center not covered by the annual appropriation.

RESEARCH ON STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL AGRICULTURAL MATERIALS

For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to carry out his responsibilities under section 7 (b) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act of July 23, 1946 (50 U. S. C. 98f), $399,000, including not to exceed $30,000 for alterations at the Eastern Regional Research Laboratory, Wyndmoor, Pennsylvania, to provide pilot plant facilities for tannin extraction, and such amount shall be in addition to amounts otherwise available for alterations.

RESEARCH ON AGRICULTURAL PROBLEMS OF ALASKA

For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to conduct research into the basic agricultural needs and problems of the Territory of Alaska, through such agencies of the Department as he may designate, independently or in cooperation with appropriate agencies of the Territory of Alaska, $260,000.

OFFICE OF EXPERIMENT STATIONS

Payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico

For payments to the States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico to be paid quarterly in advance, to carry into effect the provisions of the following Acts relating to agricultural experiment stations:

Hatch, Adams, Purnell, Bankhead-Jones, and related Acts: Hatch Act, the Act approved March 2, 1887 (7 U. S. C. 362, 363, 365, 368, 377–379), $720,000; Adams Act, the Act approved March 16, 1906 (7 U. S. C. 369), $720,000; Purnell Act, the Act approved February 24, 1925 (7 U. S. C. 361, 366, 370, 371, 373–376, 380, 382), $2,880,000; Bankhead-Jones Act, title I of the Act approved June 29, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 427–427g), $2,863,-708; Hawaii, the Act approved May 16, 1928 (7 U. S. C. 386–386b), extending the benefits of certain Acts of Congress to the Territory of Hawaii, $90,000; Alaska, the Act approved February 23, 1929 (7 U. S. C. 386c), extending the benefits of the Hatch Act to the Territory of Alaska, $15,000, and the provisions of section 2 of the Act approved June 20, 1936 (7 U. S. C. 369a), extending the benefits of the Adams and Purnell Acts to the Territory of Alaska, $27,500; Puerto Rico, the Act approved March 4, 1931, as amended (7 U. S. C. 386d-386f), extending the benefits of certain Acts of Congress

to Puerto Rico, $90,000; in all, payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico, $7,406,208.

Salaries and Expenses

For necessary expenses in connection with administration of grants and coordination of research with States, to carry out the provisions of the Acts approved March 2, 1887, March 16, 1906, February 24, 1925, May 16, 1928, February 23, 1929, March 4, 1931, and June 20, 1936, and Acts amendatory thereto (7 U. S. C. 361–363, 365–383, 386–386f), and title I of the Act approved June 29, 1935, as amended by the Act of December 21, 1944 (7 U. S. C. 427–427g), relative to their administration and for the administration of an agricultural experiment station in Puerto Rico, $237,500; and the Secretary shall prescribe the form of the annual financial statement required under the above Acts, ascertain whether the expenditures are in accordance with their provisions, coordinate the research work of the State agricultural colleges and experiment stations in the lines authorized in said Acts with research of the Department in similar lines, and make report thereon to Congress.

Federal Experiment Station, Puerto Rico

For expenses necessary to establish and maintain an agricultural experiment station in Puerto Rico, including the preparation, illustration, and distribution of reports and

bulletins, and not to exceed $24,950 to replace water supply line and increase capacity of reservoir, $175,000.

BUREAU OF HUMAN NUTRITION AND HOME ECONOMICS

For necessary expenses in connection with conducting investigations of the relative utility and economy of agricultural products for food, clothing, and other uses in the home, with special suggestions of plans and methods for the more effective utilization of such products for these purposes, and such economic investigations, including housing and household buying, as have for their purpose the improvement of the rural home, for coordinating nutrition services made available by Federal, State, and other agencies, and for disseminating useful information on these subjects, $1,500,000.

BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY

Salaries and Expenses

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Act, as amended, establishing a Bureau of Animal Industry, and related Acts, and for investigations concerned with the livestock and meat industries and the domestic raising of fur-bearing animals, as follows:

Animal husbandry: For investigations and experiments in animal husbandry and animal and poultry feeding and breeding, and for carrying out the purposes of section 101 (b) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U. S. C. 429) authoriz-

ing cooperation with State authorities in the administration of regulations for the improvement of poultry, poultry products, and hatcheries, $2,250,000.

Diseases of animals: For scientific investigations of diseases of animals, and for investigations of tuberculin, serums, antitoxins, and analogous products, $1,300,000, including not to exceed $8,000 for the purchase of land and appurtenances near Ames, Iowa, for continuation of a hog cholera experiment station.

Animal disease control and eradication: For the control and eradication, including inspections and quarantines, of tuberculosis and paratuberculosis of animals, avian tuberculosis, Bang's disease of cattle, scabies in sheep and cattle, southern cattle ticks, hog cholera and related swine diseases, and dourine in horses, and inspection and quarantine work; for supervision of the transportation of livestock, including administration of the twenty-eight-hour law; for inspection of vessels; and for carrying out the provisions of the Act of March 4, 1913 (21 U. S. C. 151–158), relating to veterinary biological products, $7,950,000, including not to exceed $30,000 for the acquisition of land and construction of four buildings for inspection of livestock at Canadian border ports of entry: *Provided*, That no payment hereunder as compensation for any cattle condemned for slaughter for tuberculosis, paratuberculosis, or Bang's disease shall exceed

(1) $25 for any grade animal or $50 for any purebred animal, (2) one-third of the difference between the appraised value and the value of salvage thereof, or (3) the amount paid or to be paid by the State or other cooperating agency, and no payment hereunder shall be made for any animal if at the time of test or condemnation it shall belong to or be upon the premises of any person, firm, or corporation to which it has been sold, shipped, or delivered for slaughter: *Provided further*, That inspection service shall be maintained at all stockyards having such service during the current fiscal year.

Meat inspection: For carrying out the provisions of laws relating to Federal inspection of meat and meat-food products, $12,800,000.

Marketing Agreements, Hog Cholera Virus and Serum

The sum of $49,300 of the appropriation made by section 12 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, approved May 12, 1933 (7 U. S. C. 612), is hereby made available during the fiscal year for which appropriations are herein made to carry into effect sections 56 to 60, inclusive, of the Act approved August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 851–855).

Eradication of Foot-and-Mouth and Other Contagious Diseases of Animals

For expenses necessary in the arrest and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, rinderpest, contagious pleuropneu-

monia, or other contagious or infectious diseases of animals, or European fowl pest and similar diseases in poultry, including the payment of claims growing out of past and future purchases and destruction of animals (including poultry) affected by or exposed to, or of materials contaminated by or exposed to, any such disease, wherever found and irrespective of ownership, under like or substantially similar circumstances, when such owner has complied with all lawful quarantine regulations; and for foot-and-mouth disease and rinderpest programs undertaken pursuant to the provisions of the Act of February 28, 1947 (21 U. S. C. Supp. II, 114b–114d), and the Act of May 29, 1884, as amended (7 U. S. C., 391; 21 U. S. C., 111–122), including expenses in accordance with section 2 of said Act of February 28, 1947, the Secretary may transfer from other appropriations or funds available to the bureaus, corporations, or agencies of the Department such sums as he may deem necessary, to be available only in an emergency which threatens the livestock or poultry industry of the country, and any unexpended balances of funds transferred under this head in the next preceding fiscal year shall be merged with such transferred amounts: *Provided*, That, except for payments made pursuant to said Act of February 28, 1947, the payment for such animals hereafter purchased may be made on appraisement based on the meat, egg-production,

dairy, or breeding value, but in case of appraisement based on breeding value no appraisement of any such animal shall exceed three times its meat, egg-production, or dairy value, and, except in case of an extraordinary emergency, to be determined by the Secretary, the payment by the United States Government for any such animals shall not exceed one-half of any such appraisements: *Provided further*, That poultry may be appraised in groups when the basis for appraisal is the same for each bird.

BUREAU OF DAIRY INDUSTRY

For necessary expenses in carrying out the provisions of the Act of May 29, 1924 (7 U. S. C. 401–404), including investigations, experiments, and demonstrations in dairy industry, for carrying out the applicable provisions of the Act of May 9, 1902 (26 U. S. C. 2325, 2326 (c)), relating to process or renovated butter, as amended, and the Act of May 23, 1908 (21 U. S. C. 94 (a)), insofar as it relates to the exportation of process or renovated butter, $1,600,000.

BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL AND INDUSTRIAL CHEMISTRY

For expenses necessary for investigations, experiments, and demonstrations established under the provisions of section 202 (a) to 202 (e), inclusive, of title II of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U. S. C. 1292); for the development of new and extended food, feed, and in-

dustrial uses for agricultural commodities, both plant and animal, and potential replacement crops, and processing, biological, chemical, physical, pharmacological, toxicological, and technological investigation thereof, $7,750,000: *Provided,* That not to exceed $20,000 shall be available for the alteration to buildings of the Naval Stores Station at Olustee, Florida.

BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY, SOILS, AND AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING

For expenses necessary for investigations, experiments, and demonstrations in connection with the production and improvement of farm crops and other plants and plant industries; soils and soil-plant relationships, and the application of engineering principles to agriculture; plant diseases, including nematodes, and methods for their prevention and control; plant and plant-disease collections, and surveys; the distribution of weeds and means for their control; methods of handling, processing, transportation, and storage of agricultural products; and plants in foreign countries and our possessions for introduction into the United States, including explorations and surveys, and propagation and testing in this country; and for the operation and maintenance of airplanes, as follows:

Field crops: For investigations on the production, improvement, and diseases of alfalfa, barley, clover, corn, cotton,

flax, grasses, oats, rice, rubber crops, sorghums, soybeans, sugar beets, sugarcane, tobacco, wheat, and other field crops, $3,400,000.

Fruit, vegetable, and specialty crops: For investigations on the production, improvement, and diseases of fruit, vegetable, nut, ornamental, and related crops and plants, $2,950,000.

Forest diseases: For investigations of diseases of forest and shade trees and forest products, and methods for their control, $450,000.

Soils, fertilizers, and irrigation: For investigations of soil management methods to increase and maintain productivity, including fertilization, liming, crop rotations, tillage practices, and other means of improving soils; fertilizers, fertilizer ingredients, and their improvement for agricultural use; soil management and crop production on dry and irrigated lands, and the quality of irrigation water and its use by crops; and for the classification of soils in a national system and indication of their extent and distribution on maps, and determination of their potential productivity under adapted cropping and improved soil management, $2,680,000, including not to exceed $100,000 for construction or acquisition of buildings, facilities, and equipment for the station at Brawley, California.

Agricultural engineering: For investigations involving

the application of engineering principles to agriculture, including farm power and equipment, rural water supply and sanitation, and rural electrification; farm buildings and their appurtenances and buildings for processing and storing farm products, and the preparation and distribution of building plans and specifications; cotton ginning, and other engineering problems relating to the production, processing, transportation, and storage of agricultural products; $1,120,000.

National Arboretum: For the maintenance and development of the National Arboretum established under the provisions of the Act approved March 4, 1927 (20 U. S. C. 191–194), $152,700.

BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY AND PLANT QUARANTINE

Salaries and Expenses

For expenses necessary for investigations, experiments, demonstrations, and surveys for the promotion of economic entomology, for investigating and ascertaining the best means of destroying insects and related pests injurious to agriculture, for importing useful and beneficial insects and bacterial, fungal, and other diseases of insects and related pests, for investigating and ascertaining the best means of destroying insects affecting man and animals, and the best ways of utilizing beneficial insects, for carrying into effect the provisions of the Plant Quarantine Act of August 20,

1912, as amended (7 U. S. C. 151–167), the Honey Bee Act (7 U. S. C. 281–283), the Insect Pest Act (7 U. S. C. 141–144), the Mexican Border Act (7 U. S. C. 149), and the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U. S. C. 147a), as amended, authorizing the eradication, control, and prevention of spread of injurious insects and plant pests; including the operation and maintenance of airplanes and the purchase of not to exceed two, as follows:

Insect investigations: For the investigation of insects affecting fruits, grapes, nuts, trees, shrubs, forests and forest products, truck and garden crops, cereal, forage and range crops, cotton, tobacco, sugar plants, ornamental and other plants and agricultural products, household possessions, and man and animals; for bee culture and apiary management; for classifying, identifying, and collecting information to determine the distribution and abundance of insects; for investigations in connection with introduction of natural enemies of injurious insects and related pests and for the exchange with other countries of useful and beneficial insects and other arthropods; for developing methods, equipment, and apparatus to aid in enforcing plant quarantines and in the eradication and control of insect pests and plant diseases; and for investigations of insecticides and fungicides, including methods of their manufacture and use and the effects of their application, $4,100,000: *Provided*, That of

the amount allotted for oriental fruitfly, not to exceed $250,000 may be used for contracts with public or private agencies for research without regard to provisions of existing law, and the amounts obligated for contract research shall remain available until expended: *Provided further,* That $50,000 shall be transferred to applicable appropriations of the Public Health Service for investigations and studies of effects of insecticidal and fungicidal residue on human health.

Insect and plant-disease control: For carrying out operations or measures to eradicate, suppress, control, or to prevent or retard the spread of Japanese beetle, sweetpotato weevil, Mexican fruitflies, phony peach and peach mosaic, cereal rusts, pink bollworm and Thurberia weevil, golden nematode, citrus blackfly, white-fringed beetle, and the Hall scale, including the enforcement of quarantine regulations and cooperation with States to enforce plant quarantines as authorized by the Plant Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912, as amended (7 U. S. C. 151–167), and including the establishment of such cotton-free areas as may be necessary to stamp out any infestation of the pink bollworm as authorized by the Act of February 8, 1930 (46 Stat. 67), and for cooperation with States in the compensation of growers for losses resulting from the destruction of or for not planting potatoes and tomatoes on lands infested or exposed to infestations of the golden nematode for the purpose author-

lzed by the Golden Nematode Act (Public Law 645, approved June 15, 1948), and for the enforcement of domestic plant quarantines through inspection in transit, including the interception and disposition of materials found to have been transported interstate in violation of Federal plant quarantine laws or regulations, and operations under the Terminal Inspection Act (7 U. S. C. 166), $4,185,900: *Provided,* That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay the cost or value of trees, farm animals, farm crops, or other property injured or destroyed, except potatoes and tomatoes as authorized under the Golden Nematode Act: *Provided further,* That, in the discretion of the Secretary, no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the control of sweetpotato weevil in any State until such State has provided cooperation necessary to accomplish this purpose, or for barberry eradication until a sum or sums at least equal to such expenditures shall have been appropriated, subscribed, or contributed by States, counties, or local authorities, or by individuals or organizations for the accomplishment of this purpose, or with respect to the golden nematode except as prescribed in section 4 of the Golden Nematode Act.

Foreign plant quarantines: For operations against the introduction of insect pests or plant diseases into the United States, including the enforcement of foreign-plant quaran-

tines and regulations promulgated under sections 5 and 7 of the Plant Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912, as amended (7 U. S. C. 151–167), the Insect Pest Act of 1905 (7 U. S. C. 141–144), and the Mexican Border Act of 1942 (7 U. S. C. 149), for enforcement of domestic-plant quarantines as they pertain to Territories of the United States and enforcement of regulations governing the movement of plants into and from the District of Columbia promulgated under section 15 of the Plant Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912, as amended, and for inspection and certification of plants and plant products to meet the sanitary requirements of foreign countries, as authorized in section 102 of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U. S. C. 147a), $2,325,000.

Control of Emergency Outbreaks of Insects and Plant Diseases

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the joint resolution approved May 9, 1938 (7 U. S. C. 148–148e), including the operation and maintenance of airplanes and the purchase of not to exceed two, and surveys and control operations in Canada in cooperation with the Canadian Government or local Canadian authorities, and the employment of Canadian citizens, $850,000.

Control of Forest Pests

For expenses necessary for carrying out operations, measures, or surveys necessary to eradicate, suppress, con-

trol, or to prevent or retard the spread of insects or diseases which endanger forest trees on any lands in the United States, and for such quarantine measures relating thereto as may be necessary pursuant to the Plant Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912, as amended (7 U. S. C. 151–167), including the purchase (not to exceed three) and operation and maintenance of airplanes, construction and alteration of necessary buildings, not to exceed $23,500 for the purchase of one building at Greenfield, Massachusetts: *Provided*, That the cost of constructing or altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed $2,500, as follows:

Gypsy and brown-tail moths: Gypsy and brown-tail moths, pursuant to section 102 of the Act of September 21, 1944 (7 U. S. C. 147a), $539,500.

Forest Pest Control Act: For carrying out the provisions of the Act approved June 25, 1947 (16 U. S. C., Supp. I, 594–1—594–5), $900,000.

White pine blister rust: White pine blister rust, pursuant to the Act of April 26, 1940 (16 U. S. C. 594a), $3,280,000, of which amount $508,750 shall be available to the Department of the Interior for the control of white pine blister rust on or endangering Federal lands under the jurisdiction of that Department or lands of Indian tribes which are under the jurisdiction of or retained under restrictions of the United States; $1,727,800 of said amount to

the Forest Service for the control of white pine blister rust on or endangering lands under its jurisdiction; and $1,043,450 of said amount to the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine for leadership and general coordination of the entire program, method development, and for operations conducted under its direction for such control, including, but not confined to, the control of white pine blister rust on or endangering State and privately owned lands.

FOREST SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary including not to exceed $10,000 for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706 (a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as amended by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); to experiment and make investigations and report on forestry, national forests, forest fires, and lumbering, but no part of this appropriation shall be used for any experiment or test made outside the jurisdiction of the United States; to advise the owners of woodlands as to the proper care of the same; to investigate and test American timber and timber trees and their uses, and methods for the preservative treatment of timber; to seek, through investigations and the planting of native and foreign

species, suitable trees for the treeless regions; to erect necessary buildings: *Provided,* That the cost of any building purchased, erected, or as improved, exclusive of the cost (not to exceed $1,000) of constructing a water-supply or sanitary system and of connecting the same with any such building, and exclusive of the cost of any tower upon which a lookout house may be erected, shall not exceed $15,000, with the exception that any building erected, purchased, or acquired, the cost of which was $15,000 or more, may be improved out of the appropriations made under this chapter for the Forest Service by an amount not to exceed 2 per centum of the cost of such building as certified by the Chief of the Forest Service, and that not to exceed $8,000 may be expended for the installation of an elevator in the Yeon Avenue warehouse in Portland, Oregon; to protect, administer, and improve the national forests, including tree planting and other measures to prevent erosion, drift, surface wash, soil waste, and the formation of floods, and to conserve water; to ascertain the natural conditions upon and utilize the national forests, to transport and care for fish and game supplied to stock the national forests or the waters therein; to collate, digest, report, and illustrate the results of experiments and investigations made by the Forest Service, as follows:

General administrative expenses: For general adminis-

tration, including expenses of the National Forest Reservation Commission as authorized by section 14 of the Act of March 1, 1911 (16 U. S. C. 514), $665,000.

National forest protection and management: For the administration, protection, use, maintenance, improvement, and development of the national forests, including the establishment and maintenance of forest tree nurseries, including the procurement of tree seed and nursery stock by purchase, production, or otherwise, seeding and tree planting and the care of plantations and young growth; the operation and maintenance of aircraft and the purchase of not to exceed three; the maintenance of roads and trails and the construction and maintenance of all other improvements necessary for the proper and economical administration, protection, development, and use of the national forests, including experimental areas under Forest Service administration, except that where direct purchases will be more economical than construction, improvements may be purchased; the construction (not to exceed $15,000 for any one structure), equipment, and maintenance of sanitary and recreational facilities; timber cultural operations; development and application of fish and game management plans; propagation and transplanting of plants suitable for planting on semiarid portions of the national forests; estimating and appraising of timber and other resources and development and application

of plans for their effective management, sale, and use; examination, classification, surveying, and appraisal of land incident to effecting exchanges authorized by law and of lands within the boundaries of the national forests that may be opened to homestead settlement and entry under the Act of June 11, 1906, and the Act of August 10, 1912 (16 U. S. C. 506–509), as provided by the Act of March 4, 1913 (16 U. S. C. 512); investigation and establishment of water rights, including the purchase thereof or of lands or interests in lands or rights-of-way for use and protection of water rights necessary or beneficial in connection with the administration and public use of the national forests; and all expenses necessary for the use, maintenance, improvement, protection, and general administration of the national forests, $26,890,000, of which not to exceed $75,000 shall be available for the purchase of three nursery sites, and not to exceed $5,000 shall be available for the purchase of administrative sites.

Fighting forest fires: For fighting and preventing forest fires on or threatening lands under Forest Service administration, including lands under contract for purchase or in process of condemnation for Forest Service purposes, and for liquidation of obligations incurred in the preceding fiscal year for such purpose, $6,000,000, of which $2,500,000 shall be apportioned for use, pursuant to section 3679 of

the Revised Statutes, as amended, only to the extent that the Secretary, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, finds necessary to meet emergency conditions.

Forest research: For forest research in accordance with the provisions of sections 1, 2, 7, 8, 9, and 10 of the Act approved May 22, 1928, as amended (16 U. S. C. 581, 581a, 581f–581i), including the construction and maintenance of improvements, as follows:

Forest and range management investigations: Fire, silvicultural, watershed, and other forest investigations and experiments under said section 2, as amended, and investigations and experiments to develop improved methods of management of forest and other ranges under section 7, at forest or range experiment stations or elsewhere, $2,995,000.

Forest products: Experiments, investigations, and tests of forest products under section 8, at the Forest Products Laboratory, or elsewhere, $1,300,000.

Forest resources investigations: A comprehensive forest survey under section 9, and investigations in forest economics under section 10, $880,000.

FOREST DEVELOPMENT ROADS AND TRAILS

For expenses necessary for carrying out the provisions of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act approved November 9, 1921, as amended (23 U. S. C. 23, 23a), relating to forest development roads and trails, including the

construction, reconstruction, and maintenance of roads and trails on experimental areas under Forest Service administration, $10,348,000, which sum is authorized to be appropriated by the Act of June 29, 1948 (Public Law 834), to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That this appropriation shall be available for the rental, purchase, construction, or alteration of buildings necessary for the storage and repair of equipment and supplies used for road and trail construction and maintenance, but the total cost of any such building purchased, altered, or constructed under this authorization shall not exceed $15,000 with the exception that any building erected, purchased, or acquired, the cost of which was $15,000 or more, may be improved within any fiscal year by an amount not to exceed 2 per centum of the cost of such buildings certified by the Chief of the Forest Service.

ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR NATIONAL FORESTS

Weeks Act: For the acquisition of forest lands under the provisions of the Act approved March 1, 1911, as amended (16 U. S. C. 513–519, 521), $100,000, to be available only for payment toward the purchase price of any lands acquired, including the cost of surveys in connection with such acquisition: *Provided,* That no part of such funds shall be used for the purchase of lands in the counties of Adair,

Cherokee, and Sequoyah, in the State of Oklahoma, without the specific approval of the Board of County Commissioners of the county in which such lands are situated.

Superior National Forest: For the acquisition of forest land within the Superior National Forest, Minnesota, under the provisions of the Act approved June 22, 1948 (Public Law 733), $150,000, to remain available until expended.

Special Acts: For the acquisition of land to facilitate the control of soil erosion and flood damage originating within the exterior boundaries of the following national forests, in accordance with the provisions of the following Acts authorizing annual appropriations of forest receipts for such purposes, and in not to exceed the following amounts from such receipts: Uinta and Wasatch National Forests, Utah. Act of August 26, 1935 (Public Law 337), as amended, $40,000; Cache National Forest, Utah, Act of May 11, 1938 (Public Law 505), as amended, $10,000; San Bernardino and Cleveland National Forests, Riverside County, California, Act of June 15, 1938 (Public Law 634), as amended, $22,000; Nevada and Toiyabe National Forests, Nevada, Act of June 25, 1938 (Public Law 748), as amended, $10,000; Angeles National Forest, California, Act of June 11, 1940 (Public Law 591), $20,000; Cleveland National Forest, San Diego County, California, Act of June

11, 1940 (Public Law 589), $5,000; Sequoia National Forest, California, Act of June 17, 1940 (Public Law 637), $35,000; in all $142,000.

FOREST-FIRE COOPERATION

For cooperation with the various States or other appropriate agencies in forest-fire prevention and suppression and the protection of timbered and cut-over lands in accordance with the provisions of sections 1, 2, and 3 of the Act approved June 7, 1924, as amended (16 U. S. C. 564–566), $9,500,000.

FARM AND OTHER PRIVATE FORESTRY COOPERATION

To enable the Secretary through the Forest Service to advise timberland owners and associations, wood-using industries or other appropriate agencies in the application of forest management principles to federally owned lands leased to States and to private forest lands, so as to attain sustained-yield management, the conservation of the timber resources, the productivity of forest lands, and the stabilization of employment and economic continuance of forest industries, and to carry into effect, through such agencies of the Department as he may designate, the provisions of the Cooperative Farm Forestry Act, approved May 18, 1937 (16 U. S. C. 568b), (not to exceed $490,382) and the provisions of sections 4 (not to exceed $671,392) and 5 (not to exceed $138,226) of the Act approved June 7,

1924 (16 U. S. C. 567–568), and Acts supplementary thereto; $1,300,000.

FLOOD CONTROL

For expenses necessary, in accordance with the Flood Control Act, approved June 22, 1936 (Public Law 738), as amended and supplemented, to make preliminary examinations and surveys, and to perform works of improvement, and to plan the agricultural phases of the development of the Columbia Basin area in accordance with the provisions of laws relating to the activities of the Department, to remain available until expended, $10,750,000, with which shall be merged the unexpended balances of funds heretofore appropriated or transferred to the Department for flood-control purposes: *Provided*, That no part of such funds shall be used for the purchase of lands in the Yazoo and Little Tallahatchie watersheds without specific approval of the county board of supervisors of the county in which such lands are situated, nor shall any part of such funds be used for the purchase of lands in the counties of Adair, Cherokee, and Sequoyah, in the State of Oklahoma, without the specific approval of the Board of County Commissioners of the county in which such lands are situated.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Act approved April 27, 1935 (16 U. S. C. 590a–590f),

which provides for a national program of erosion control and soil and water conservation, furnishing of subsistence to employees, operation and maintenance of aircraft, and the purchase and erection or alteration of permanent buildings: *Provided,* That the cost of any building purchased, erected, or as improved, exclusive of the cost of constructing a water supply or sanitary system and connecting the same with any such building, shall not exceed $2,500 except where buildings are acquired in conjunction with land being purchased for other purposes and except for eight buildings to be constructed at a cost not to exceed $15,000 per building: *Provided further,* That no money appropriated in this chapter shall be available for the construction of any such building on land not owned by the Government: *Provided further,* That in the State of Missouri where the State has established a central State agency authorized to enter into agreements with the United States or any of its agencies on policies and general programs for the saving of its soil by the extension of Federal aid to any soil conservation district in such State, the agreements made by or on behalf of the United States with any such soil conservation district shall have the prior approval of such central State agency before they shall become effective as to such district, as follows:

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Soil conservation research: For research and investigations into the character, cause, extent, history, and effects of erosion, soil and moisture depletion and methods of soil and water conservation (including the construction and hydrologic phases of farm irrigation and land drainage, and water regulation to conserve the soil and reduce fire hazards in the Everglades region of Florida, except that expenditures for all work in the Everglades region shall be limited to a sum not in excess of funds made available for such work by the State of Florida, or political subdivisions thereof); and for construction, operation, and maintenance of experimental watersheds, stations, laboratories, plots, and installations, $1,500,000.

Soil conservation operations: For carrying out preventive measures to conserve soil and water, including such special measures as may be necessary to prevent floods and the siltation of reservoirs, and including the improvement of farm irrigation and land drainage, the establishment and operation of conservation nurseries, the making of conservation plans and surveys, and the dissemination of information, $52,900,000: *Provided,* That no part of this appropriation may be expended for soil and water conservation operations in demonstration projects: *Provided further,* That not to

exceed $5,000 may be used for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706 (a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as amended by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a).

LAND UTILIZATION AND RETIREMENT OF SUBMARGINAL LAND

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1010–1012), and the provisions of the Act approved August 11, 1945 (7 U. S. C. 1011 note), $1,490,000.

WATER CONSERVATION AND UTILIZATION PROJECTS

For expenses necessary to carry into effect the functions of the Department under the Acts of May 10, 1939 (53 Stat. 685, 719), October 14, 1940 (16 U. S. C. 590y–z–10), as amended and supplemented, and June 28, 1949 (Public Law 132), relating to the construction, operation, and maintenance of water conservation and utilization projects, to remain available until expended, $400,000, which sum shall be merged with the unexpended balances of funds heretofore appropriated or transferred to said Department for the purposes of said Act.

PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION

CONSERVATION AND USE OF AGRICULTURAL LAND RESOURCES

To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, approved February 29, 1936, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590g–590q), including not to exceed $6,000 for the preparation and display of exhibits, including such displays at State, interstate, and international fairs within the United States; $282,500,000, to remain available until December 31 of the next succeeding fiscal year for compliance with the program of soil-building practices and soil- and water-conserving practices authorized under this head in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1950, carried out during the period July 1, 1949, to December 31, 1950, inclusive: *Provided*, That not to exceed $25,500,000 of the total sum provided under this head shall be available during the current fiscal year for salaries and other administrative expenses for carrying out such program, the cost of aerial photographs, however, not to be charged to such limitation; but not more than $5,000,000 shall be transferred to the appropriation account,

"Administrative expenses, section 392, Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938": *Provided further*, That payments to claimants hereunder may be made upon the certificate of the claimant, which certificate shall be in such form as the Secretary may prescribe, that he has carried out the conservation practice or practices and has complied with all other requirements as conditions for such payments and that the statements and information contained in the application for payment are correct and true, to the best of his knowledge and belief, under the penalties of title 18, United States Code: *Provided further*, That none of the funds herein appropriated or made available for the functions assigned to the Agricultural Adjustment Agency pursuant to the Executive Order Numbered 9069, of February 23, 1942, shall be used to pay the salaries or expenses of any regional information employees or any State information employees, but this shall not preclude the answering of inquiries or supplying of information at the county level to individual farmers: *Provided further*, That such amount shall be available for salaries and other administrative expenses in connection with the formulation and administration of the 1951 program of soil-building practices and soil- and water-conserving practices, under the Act of February 29, 1936, as amended (amounting to $285,000,000, including administration, and formulated on the basis of a distribution

of the funds available for payments and grants among the several States in accordance with their conservation needs as determined by the Secretary, except that the proportion allocated to any State shall not be reduced more than 15 per centum from the distribution for the next preceding program year, and no participant shall receive more than $2,500) ; but the payments or grants under such programs shall be conditioned upon the utilization of land with respect to which such payments or grants are to be made in conformity with farming practices which will encourage and provide for soil-building and soil- and water-conserving practices in the most practical and effective manner and adapted to conditions in the several States, as determined and approved by the State committees appointed pursuant to section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590h (b)), for the respective States: *Provided further,* That not to exceed 5 per centum of the allocation for the agricultural conservation program for any county may be allotted to the Soil Conservation Service for services of its technicians in formulating and carrying out the agricultural conservation program and the funds so allotted shall not be utilized by the Soil Conservation Service for any purpose other than technical and other assistance in such county: *Provided*

further, That such amounts shall be available for the purchase of seeds, fertilizers, lime, trees, or any other farming materials, or any soil-terracing services, and making grants thereof to agricultural producers to aid them in carrying out farming practices approved by the Secretary under programs provided for herein: *Provided further*, That no part of any funds available to the Department, or any bureau, office, corporation, or other agency constituting a part of such Department, shall be used in the current fiscal year for the payment of salary or travel expenses of any person who has been convicted of violating the Act entitled "An Act to prevent pernicious political activities", approved August 2, 1939, as amended, or who has been found in accordance with the provisions of title 18, United States Code, section 1913, to have violated or attempted to violate such section which prohibits the use of Federal appropriations for the payment of personal services or other expenses designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress to favor or oppose any legislation or appropriation by Congress except upon request of any Member or through the proper official channels.

ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS AND MARKETING QUOTAS

To enable the Secretary to formulate and carry out acre-

age allotment and marketing quota programs pursuant to the provisions of title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1301-1393), $32,300,000, of which not more than $5,500,000 shall be transferred to the appropriation account "Administrative expenses, section 392, Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938": *Provided,* That $4,000,000 of this appropriation shall be placed in reserve pending determination by the Secretary as to necessity of marketing quotas on the 1951 crops of wheat, corn, and rice, to be released in such amounts and at such times as determined by the Bureau of the Budget to be necessary in connection with such marketing quotas.

SUGAR ACT

To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948 (7 U. S. C. 1101-1160), $60,000,000, to remain available until June 30 of the next succeeding fiscal year: *Provided,* That expenditures (including transfers) from this appropriation for other than payments to sugar producers shall not exceed $1,500,000.

NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT

To enable the Secretary to carry out the provisions of the National School Lunch Act (42 U. S. C. 1751-1760), $83,500,000: *Provided,* That no part of this appropriation

shall be used for nonfood assistance under section 5 of said Act.

MARKETING SERVICES

For expenses necessary in conducting investigations, experiments, and demonstrations, as follows:

Market news service: For collecting, publishing, and distributing, by telegraph, mail, or otherwise, timely information on the market supply and demand, commercial movement, location, disposition, quality, condition, and market prices of livestock, meats, fish, and animal products, dairy and poultry products (including broilers), fruits and vegetables, peanuts and their products, grain, hay, feeds, cottonseed, and seeds, and other agricultural products, $2,050,000.

Market inspection of farm products: For the investigation and certification, in one or more jurisdictions, to shippers and other interested parties of the class, quality, and condition of any agricultural commodity or food product, whether raw, dried, canned, or otherwise processed, and any product containing an agricultural commodity or derivative thereof when offered for interstate shipment or when received at such important central markets as the Secretary may from time to time designate, or at points which may be

conveniently reached therefrom under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, including payment of such fees as will be reasonable and as nearly as may be to cover the cost for the service rendered, $780,000.

Marketing farm products: For acquiring and diffusing among the people of the United States useful information relative to the needed supplies, standardization, classification, grading, preparation for market, handling, transportation, storage, and marketing of farm and food products, including the demonstration and promotion of the use of uniform standards of classification of American farm and food products throughout the world, for making analyses of cotton fiber as provided by the Act of April 7, 1941 (7 U. S. C. 473d), for carrying out the provisions of section 201 (a) to 201 (d), inclusive, of title II of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U. S. C. 1291), including not to exceed $25,000 for employment at rates not to exceed $100 per diem, pursuant to the second sentence of section 706 (a), of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as amended by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), and not to exceed $20,000 for transportation and other necessary expenses including not to exceed $10 per diem of persons serving without compensation while away from

their homes or regular places of business, $1,260,000: *Provided,* That the Secretary may make available to any bureau, office, or agency of the Department such amounts from this appropriation as may be necessary to carry out the functions for which this appropriation is made, and any such amounts shall be in addition to amounts transferred or otherwise made available to appropriation items in this Act.

Tobacco Acts: To carry into effect the provisions of the Act to establish and promote the use of standards of classification for tobacco, to provide and maintain an official tobacco-inspection service, approved August 23, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 511–511q), the Act to provide for the collection and publication of statistics of tobacco by the Department, approved January 14, 1929 (7 U. S. C. 501–508), as amended, and the Act to prohibit the exportation of tobacco seed and plants, approved June 5, 1940 (7 U. S. C. 516), $1,660,500.

Cotton Statistics, Classing, Standards and Futures Acts: To carry into effect the provisions of the Act authorizing the Secretary to collect and publish statistics of the grade and staple length of cotton, approved March 3, 1927, as amended by the Act of April 13, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 471–476), and to perform the duties imposed upon him by chapter 14 of the Internal Revenue Code relating to cotton

futures (26 U. S. C. 1920–1935), and to carry into effect the provisions of the United States Cotton Standards Act, approved March 4, 1923, as amended (7 U. S. C. 51–65), $1,675,000.

Marketing regulatory Acts: For expenses necessary to carry into effect the provisions of the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, as amended (7 U. S. C. 499a–499r), the Act to prevent the destruction or dumping of farm produce (7 U. S. C. 491–497), the Act to provide standards for baskets and containers for fruits and vegetables, as amended (15 U. S. C. 251–256), the Act to fix standards for hampers, round stave baskets, and splint baskets for fruits and vegetables (15 U. S. C. 257–257i), the Act to provide export standards for apples and pears (7 U. S. C. 581–589), the United States Grain Standards Act (7 U. S. C. 71–87), the United States Warehouse Act (7 U. S. C. 241–273), the Federal Seed Act (7 U. S. C. 1551–1610), the Packers and Stockyards Act, as amended (7 U. S. C. 181–229), the Naval Stores Act (7 U. S. C. 91–99), and the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U. S. C. 135–135k), $3,550,000.

COMMODITY EXCHANGE AUTHORITY

To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1–17a), $650,000.

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION

For operating and administrative expenses, $6,854,000.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

To carry into effect the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended (7 U. S. C. 901–915), as follows:

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For administrative expenses, including not to exceed $500 for financial and credit reports, $8,150,000.

LOAN AUTHORIZATION

For loans in accordance with said Act, and for carrying out the provisions of section 7 thereof, to be borrowed from the Secretary of the Treasury in accordance with the provisions of section 3 (a) of said Act as follows: Rural electrification program, $350,000,000; and rural telephone program, $25,000,000; and additional amounts, not to exceed a total of $150,000,000 (including the uncommitted balance available as a carry-over from the fiscal year 1950), may be borrowed for the rural electrification program under the same terms and conditions if and to the extent that the Secretary of Agriculture shall certify, from time to time, to the Secretary of the Treasury that such additional amounts are required during the fiscal year 1951, under the then existing conditions, for the expeditious and orderly development of the program.

FARMERS' HOME ADMINISTRATION

To carry into effect the provisions of titles I, II, and the related provisions of title IV of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1000–1031), the Farmers' Home Administration Act of 1946 (7 U. S. C. 1001, note; 31 U. S. C. 82h; 12 U. S. C. 371; 35 D. C. Code 535; 60 Stat. 1062–1080); the Act of July 30, 1946 (40 U. S. C. 436–439); the Act of October 19, 1949 (Public Law 361); the Act of August 28, 1937, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590r–590x, 590z–5), for the development of facilities for water storage and utilization in the arid and semiarid areas of the United States; and the provisions of title V of the Housing Act of 1949 relating to financial assistance for farm housing (Public Law 171, approved July 15, 1949), as follows:

LOAN AUTHORIZATION

For loans (including payments in lieu of taxes and taxes under section 50 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, and advances incident to the acquisition and preservation of security of obligations under the foregoing several authorities): Title I and section 43 of title IV of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended and title V of the Housing Act of 1949 (except grants under 504 (a)) $56,350,000 (sums available for loans under title V of the Housing Act of 1949 to remain avail-

under title V of the Housing Act of 1949 to remain available until expended); title II of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, $85,000,000; the Act of August 28, 1937, as amended, $4,000,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed the foregoing several amounts shall be borrowed in one account from the Secretary of the Treasury on the request of the Secretary of Agriculture at such rate of interest as may be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, but not in excess of 3 per centum per annum; and the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to lend such sums to the Secretary upon the security of any obligations of borrowers from the Secretary under the provisions of said Acts: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may utilize proceeds from payments of principal and interest under such Acts to repay the Secretary of the Treasury the amounts borrowed therefrom for the purposes of such Acts.

GRANTS

For grants and for the grant portion of combination loans and grants for the purpose of section 504 (a) of the Housing Act of 1949, $650,000, to remain available until expended.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For the making, servicing, and collecting of loans and insured mortgages, the servicing and collecting of loans made under prior authority, the liquidation of assets transferred to Farmers Home Administration pursuant to the Farmers Home Administration Act of 1946, and the extension of financial assistance under the Housing Act of 1949, $27,700,000, together with a transfer to this appropriation item of not to exceed $80,000 of the fees and administrative expense charges made available by subsections (d) and (e) of section 12 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended.

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses, including not to exceed $5,000 for attendance at meetings or conventions of members of organizations at which matters of importance to the work of the Farm Credit Administration are to be discussed or transacted; library membership fees or dues in organizations which issue publications to members only or to members at a lower price than to others, payment for which may be made in advance; not to exceed $20,000 for expenditures authorized by section 602 of the Organic Act of 1944 (12 U. S. C.

833); purchase of one passenger motor vehicle (for replacement only) for use in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; garage rental in the District of Columbia; payment of actual transportation and other necessary expenses and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of subsistence of persons serving, while away from their homes, without other compensation from the United States, in an advisory capacity to the Farm Credit Administration, except that such expenditures shall not exceed $10,000; examination of corporations, banks, associations, and institutions operated, supervised, or regulated by the Farm Credit Administration $585,000, together with not to exceed $2,325,000 of collections from Federal Farm Credit agencies of assessments and charges, to be advanced by transfer and counter warrant to this appropriation, to cover the cost of Farm Credit Administration facilities, examinations, and other services rendered to such agencies; $2,910,000.

Extension Service

payments to states, hawaii, alaska, and puerto rico

For payments to the States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico, for cooperative agricultural extension work as follows:

Capper-Ketcham, Bankhead-Jones, and related Acts: Capper-Ketcham Act, the Act approved May 22, 1928 (7 U. S. C. 343a, 343b), $1,480,000; Bankhead-Jones Act, section 21, title II, of the Act approved June 29, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 343c), $12,000,000; Bankhead-Jones Act, section 23, title II, of the Act approved June 29, 1935, as amended by the Act of June 6, 1945 (7 U. S. C. 343d–1), $12,500,000; additional extension work, the Act approved April 24, 1939, as amended (7 U. S. C. 343c-1), $555,000; Alaska, the Act approved February 23, 1929 (7 U. S. C. 386c), extending the benefits of the Smith-Lever Act to the Territory of Alaska, $13,950, and section 3 of the Act approved June 20, 1936 (7 U. S. C. 343e), extending the benefits of the Capper-Ketcham Act to the Territory of Alaska, $10,000; the Act approved August 28, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 343f–343g), extending the benefits of section 21 of the Bankhead-Jones Act to Puerto Rico, $408,000; and section 506a of title V of the Housing Act of 1949 (Public Law 171), $33,050; in all, payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico, $27,000,000.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary to administer the provisions of

the Smith-Lever Act, approved May 8, 1914 (7 U. S. C. 341–348), and Acts amendatory or supplementary thereto, and to coordinate the extension work of the Department and the several States, Territories, and insular possessions, $900,000.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

For expenses of the Office of the Secretary of Agriculture, including the purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only; travel expenses, including examination of estimates for appropriations in the field; stationery, supplies, materials, and equipment; freight, express, and drayage charges; advertising, communication service, postage, washing towels, repairs and alterations, and other miscellaneous supplies and expenses not otherwise provided for and necessary for the practical and efficient work of the Department of Agriculture, $2,143,300, together with such amounts from other appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules in the Budget for the current fiscal year for such services and expenses, which several amounts or portions thereof as may be determined by the Secretary not exceeding a total of $109,280, shall be transferred to and made a part of this appropria-

tion: *Provided, however,* That if the total amounts of such appropriations or authorizations for the current fiscal year shall at any time exceed or fall below the amounts estimated, respectively, therefor in the Budget for such year, the amounts transferred or to be transferred therefrom to this appropriation shall be increased or decreased in such amounts as the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives of the Department, shall determine are appropriate to the requirements as changed by such reductions or increases in such appropriations or authorizations.

OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

For necessary expenses, including payment of fees or dues for the use of law libraries by attorneys in the field service, $2,450,000.

OFFICE OF FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL RELATIONS

For necessary expenses for the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations and for enabling the Secretary to coordinate and integrate activities of the Department in connection with foreign agricultural work, $600,000.

OFFICE OF INFORMATION

For necessary expenses in connection with the publication, indexing, illustration, and distribution of bulletins,

documents, and reports, the preparation, distribution, and display of agricultural motion and sound pictures, and exhibits, and the coordination of informational work in the Department, $1,265,800, together with such amounts from other appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules in the Budget for the current fiscal year for such expenses, which several amounts or portions thereof, as may be determined by the Secretary, not exceeding a total of $16,200, shall be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation, of which total appropriation amounts not exceeding those specified may be used for the purposes enumerated as follows: For preparation and display of exhibits, $109,959; for preparation, distribution, and display of motion and sound pictures, $58,700; for farmers' bulletins, which shall be adapted to the interests of the people of the different sections of the country, an equal proportion of four-fifths of which shall be delivered to or sent out under the addressed franks furnished by the Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress, as they shall direct (7 U. S. C. 417) and not less than two hundred thirty thousand eight hundred and fifty copies for the use of the Senate and House of Representatives of part 2 of the annual report of

the Secretary (known as the Yearbook of Agriculture), as authorized by section 73 of the Act of January 12, 1895 (44 U. S. C. 241), $611,128: *Provided further,* That in the preparation of motion pictures or exhibits by the Department, not exceeding a total of $10,000 may be used for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706 (a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as amended by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a): *Provided further,* That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the establishment or maintenance of regional or State field offices, or for the compensation of employees in such offices except that not to exceed $10,000 may be used to maintain the San Francisco radio office.

LIBRARY

For necessary expenses, including dues, for library membership in societies or associations which issue publications to members only or at a price to members lower than to subscribers who are not members; $713,293.

Not to exceed $12,000,000 of the funds appropriated in this title shall be available for travel expenses. Amounts available from appropriations contained in this title are

hereby reduced by the total sum of $645,496, such amount to be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury immediately upon approval of this chapter.

TITLE II—CORPORATIONS

The following corporations and agencies are hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to each such corporation or agency and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the Budget for the fiscal year 1951 for such corporation or agency, except as hereinafter provided:

Federal Crop Insurance Corporation.

Commodity Credit Corporation: Nothing in this chapter shall be so construed as to prevent the Commodity Credit Corporation from carrying out any activity or any program authorized by law: *Provided,* That not to exceed $16,000,000 shall be available for administrative expenses of the Corporation: *Provided further,* That all necessary expenses (including legal and special services performed

on a contract or fee basis, but not including other personal services) in connection with the acquisition, operation, maintenance, improvement, or disposition of any real or personal property belonging to the Corporation or in which it has an interest, including expenses of collections of pledged collateral, shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses for the purposes hereof: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to discharge $170,515,131 of the indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation to the Secretary of the Treasury by canceling notes in such amount issued by the Corporation to the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to section 4 of the Act of March 8, 1938, as amended (15 U. S. C. 713a–4).

Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation: Not to exceed $1,280,000 (to be computed on an accrual basis) of the funds of the Corporation shall be available for administrative expenses, including employment on a contract or fee basis of persons, firms, and corporations for the performance of special services, including legal services, and the use of the services and facilities of Federal land banks, national farm loan associations, Federal Reserve banks, and

agencies of the Government as authorized by the Act of January 31, 1934 (12 U. S. C. 1020–1020h); and said total sum shall be exclusive of services and facilities furnished and examinations made by the Farm Credit Administration central office, interest expense, and expenses in connection with the acquisition, operation, maintenance, improvement, protection, or disposition of real or personal property belonging to the Corporation or in which it has an interest: *Provided,* That promptly after June 30 of each fiscal year all cash funds in excess of the estimated operating requirements for the current fiscal year shall be declared as dividends and paid into the general fund of the Treasury: *Provided further,* That the aggregate amount of bonds the Corporation may issue and have outstanding at any one time shall not exceed $500,000,000.

Federal intermediate credit banks: Not to exceed $1,496,000 (to be computed on an accrual basis) of the funds of the banks shall be available for administrative expenses and services performed for the banks by other Government agencies (except services and facilities furnished and examinations made by the Farm Credit Administration central office, and services performed by any Federal Reserve bank and by the United States Treasury in connection with

the financial transactions of the banks); and said total sum shall be exclusive of interest expense, legal and special services performed on a contract or fee basis, and expenses in connection with the acquisition, operation, maintenance, improvement, protection, or disposition of real or personal property belonging to the banks or in which they have an interest.

Production credit corporations: Not to exceed $1,358,000 (to be computed on an accrual basis) of the funds of the corporations shall be available for administrative expenses and services performed for the corporations by other Government agencies (except services and facilities furnished and examinations made by the Farm Credit Administration central office); and said total sum shall be exclusive of interest expense, legal and special services performed on a contract or fee basis, and expenses in connection with the acquisition, operation, maintenance, improvement, protection, or disposition of real or personal property belonging to the corporations or in which they have an interest.

TITLE III—REDUCTIONS IN APPROPRIATIONS

Amounts available from appropriations are hereby reduced in the sums hereinafter set forth, such sums to be

carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury immediately upon the approval of this Chapter:

An amount of $199,990,000 in the revolving fund held in the Treasury available to the Governor, Farm Credit Administration, as authorized by the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act, as amended (12 U. S. C. 1020b), for resubscriptions to the capital stock of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation.

The total amount of $125,000,000 in the revolving fund appropriated to the Office of the Secretary, Treasury Department, as authorized by the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended (12 U. S. C. 698), for subscriptions to the capital stock of the Federal land banks.

TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. Within the unit limit of cost fixed by law, the lump-sum appropriations and authorizations made for the Department under this chapter shall be available for the purchase of not to exceed 497 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, and for the hire of such vehicles, necessary in the conduct of the work of the Department outside the District of Columbia.

SEC. 402. Provisions of law prohibiting or restricting

the employment of aliens shall not apply to (1) the temporary employment of translators when competent citizen translators are not available; (2) employment in cases of emergency of persons in the field service of the Department for periods of not more than sixty days; and (3) employment under the appropriation for the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations.

SEC. 403. Appropriations and authorizations made in this chapter shall be available for health service programs as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150).

SEC. 404. Funds available to the Department during the current fiscal year shall be available for the payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672).

SEC. 405. Funds available to the Department of Agriculture during the current fiscal year may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

SEC. 406. Funds available to the Department of Agriculture may be used for printing and binding, including the purchase of reprints of scientific and technical articles.

SEC. 407. Of appropriations herein made which are available for the purchase of lands, not to exceed $1 may

be expended for each option to purchase any particular tract or tracts of land.

SEC. 408. No part of the funds appropriated by this chapter shall be used for the payment of any officer or employee of the Department who, as such officer or employee, or on behalf of the Department or any division, commission, or bureau thereof, issues, or causes to be issued, any prediction, oral or written, or forecast, except as to damage threatened or caused by insects and pests, with respect to future prices of cotton or the trend of same.

SEC. 409. Except to provide materials required in or incident to research or experimental work where no suitable domestic product is available, no part of the funds appropriated by this chapter shall be expended in the purchase of twine manufactured from commodities or materials produced outside of the United States.

SEC. 410. Not less than $575,000 shall be available for contracts in accordance with section 10 (a) of the Act of August 14, 1946 (7 U. S. C. 427i) from appropriations herein made for the Bureau of Agricultural Economics; Bureau of Animal Industry; Bureau of Dairy Industry; Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineer-

ing; Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine; Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry; Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics; and the Forest Service.

This chapter may be cited as the "Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1951".

CHAPTER VII—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

TITLE I

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary of the Interior (hereafter in this chapter referred to as the Secretary), including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; for purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only at not to exceed $4,500; printing and binding; employment of a Director of the Oil and Gas Division without regard to the civil service laws; and teletype rentals and service; $2,315,000.

ENFORCEMENT OF THE CONNALLY HOT OIL ACT

For expenses necessary for controlling the interstate shipment of contraband oil as required by law (15 U. S. C. 715), including personal services in the District of Columbia; purchase of not to exceed four passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; and printing and binding; $200,000.

WORKING CAPITAL FUND

For establishment of a working capital fund, to be available without fiscal year limitation, for expenses necessary for the maintenance and operation of (1) a central reproduction service; (2) communication services; (3) a central supply service for stationery, supplies, equipment, blank forms, and miscellaneous materials, for which adequate stocks

CHAPTER X-A—GENERAL REDUCTIONS IN APPROPRIATIONS AND CONTRACT AUTHORIZATIONS

Reductions in appropriations and contract authorizations contained in this Act are hereby made in the sum of $600,000,000.

Not more than the following sums may be obligated by any agency or department provided for in this Act, viz:

(1) For civilian personnel, not more than an amount 10 per centum below the amount proposed in the President's budget estimates for fiscal year 1951, except that in the Department of Defense where no more than the amount of the President's budget estimate minus 2 per centum shall be obligated. This paragraph shall not apply to nurses, doctors, or other medical personnel, including orderlies, in the Public Health Service and the Veterans' Administration.

(2) For travel, not more than a total for all departments and agencies of $319,000,000, and not more than 5 per centum less than the estimates provided for military personnel travel and not more than 20 per centum less than the amount provided for civilian personnel travel, than the estimates therefor contained in the President's budget message for the fiscal year 1951.

(3) For transportation of things, for all departments and agencies, not more than $720,000,000: *Provided fur-*

ther, That in no case shall the amount obligated exceed a figure 10 per centum below the estimates submitted by the President in his budget message for 1951 for each item for all agencies except the Department of Defense, and for the Department of Defense not more than 5 per centum less than the estimates of the President, transmitted in said budget message.

(4) For communications services, not more than $59,000,000, and not more for any department other than the Department of Defense than the amount of the President's budget estimates for 1951 minus 10 per centum, and for the Department of Defense not more than a figure 5 per centum below the President's budget estimates for 1951.

(5) For rents and utilities, not more than $205,000,000, and for all establishments other than the Department of Defense not more than the President's budget estimates for fiscal year 1951 minus 10 per centum.

(6) For printing and reproduction, not more than $52,000,000, and not more in any case than the President's budget estimates for 1951 minus 10 per centum.

(7) For other contractual services, not more than $1,301,000,000, and for all departments other than the Department of Defense not more than the President's budget estimates for 1951 minus 10 per centum.

(8) For supplies and materials, not more than $3,888,-

000,000, and for all departments of the Government except the Department of Defense and the Veterans' hospitals not more than the President's budget estimates for 1951 minus 10 per centum.

(9) For equipment, not more than $3,577,000,000, and for all departments other than the Department of Defense, not more than the President's budget estimates for 1951 minus 10 per centum.

(10) For lands and structures, for all departments of the Government, except the Department of Defense not more than the President's budget estimates for 1951 minus 5 per centum.

CHAPTER XI—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Departments and Agencies

SEC. 1101. Unless otherwise specifically provided, the maximum amount allowable during the current fiscal year, in accordance with section 16 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 78), for the purchase of any passenger motor vehicle (exclusive of busses, ambulances, and station wagons), is hereby fixed at $1,400.

SEC. 1102. Unless otherwise specified and during the current fiscal year, no part of any appropriation contained in this or any other Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any officer or employee of the Government of the United States (including any agency the majority of the stock of which is owned by the Government of the United States) whose post of duty is in continental United States unless such person (1) is a citizen of the United States, (2) is a person in the service of the United States on the date of enactment of this Act who, being eligible for citizenship, had filed a declaration of intention to become a citizen of the United States prior to such date, or (3) is a person who owes allegiance to the United States: *Provided,* That for the purpose of this section, an affidavit signed by any such person shall be considered prima facie evidence that the requirements of this section with respect to his status have been complied with: *Provided further,*

That any person making a false affidavit shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $4,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penal clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law: *Provided further*, That any payment made to any officer or employee contrary to the provisions of this section shall be recoverable in action by the Federal Government. This section shall not apply to citizens of the Republic of the Philippines or to nationals of those countries allied with the United States in the prosecution of the war.

SEC. 1103. Appropriations of the executive departments and independent establishments for the current fiscal year, available for expenses of travel or for the expenses of the activity concerned, are hereby made available for living quarters allowances in accordance with the Act of June 26, 1930 (5 U. S. C. 118a), and regulations prescribed thereunder, and cost-of-living allowances similar to those allowed under section 901 (2) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, in accordance with and to the extent prescribed by regulations of the President, for all civilian officers and employees of the Government permanently stationed in foreign countries: *Provided*, That the availability of appropriations made

to the Department of State for carrying out the provisions of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 shall not be affected hereby.

SEC. 1104. No part of any appropriation for the current fiscal year contained in this or any other Act shall be paid to any person for the filling of any position for which he or she has been nominated after the Senate has voted not to approve of the nomination of said person.

SEC. 1105. No part of any appropriation contained in this or any other Act shall be used to pay in excess of $4 per volume for the current and future volumes of the United States Code Annotated and such volumes shall be purchased on condition and with the understanding that latest published cumulative annual pocket parts issued prior to the date of purchase shall be furnished free of charge, or in excess of $4.25 per volume for the current or future volumes of the Lifetime Federal Digest.

SEC. 1106. Funds made available by this or any other Act for administrative expenses in the current fiscal year of the corporations and agencies subject to the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended (31 U. S. C. 841), shall be available, in addition to objects for which such funds are otherwise available, for personal services and rent in the District of Columbia; printing and binding; examination of budgets and estimates of appropriations in the field; services in accordance with section 15 of the Act of

August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); and the objects specified in the sections of this title under the head "Departments and agencies", all the provisions of which shall be applicable to the expenditure of such funds unless otherwise specified in the Act by which they are made available: *Provided*, That in the event any functions budgeted as administrative expenses are subsequently transferred to or paid from other funds, the limitations on administrative expenses shall be correspondingly reduced.

SEC. 1107. No part of any funds of or available to any wholly owned Government corporation shall be used for the purchase or construction, or in making loans for the purchase or construction of any office building at the seat of government primarily for occupancy by any department or agency of the United States Government or by any corporation owned by the United States Government.

SEC. 1108. Funds of corporations and agencies, subject to the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, covered by the provisions of this or any other Act shall be available during the current fiscal year for payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672).

SEC. 1109. No part of any appropriation contained in this or any other Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation included in this or any other Act, shall

be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of the United States, is not a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation or fund contained in this or any other Act shall be guilty of a felony

and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law: *Provided further*, That, as applicable to the Departments of Agriculture and Interior, nothing in this section shall be construed to require an affidavit from any person employed for less than sixty days for sudden emergency work involving the loss of human life or destruction of property, and the payment of salary or wages may be made to such persons from applicable appropriations for services rendered in such emergency without execution of the affidavit contemplated by this section.

SEC. 1110. No funds made available by this or any other Act shall be withdrawn from one appropriation account for credit to another, or to a working fund, except as authorized by law: *Provided*, That, except as otherwise specifically provided by law, any funds so withdrawn and credited shall be available for the same purposes, and subject to the same limitations, conditions, and restrictions, as provided by the Act appropriating such funds: *Provided further*, That any such withdrawal and credit shall be made, without warrant action, by check: *Provided further*, That no funds withdrawn and credited pursuant to section 601 of the Act of June 30, 1932, as amended (47 Stat. 417; 31 U. S. C. 686),

shall be available for any period beyond that provided by the Act appropriating such funds.

SEC. 1111. Section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U. S. C. 665), is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3679. (a) No officer or employee of the United States shall make or authorize an expenditure from or create or authorize an obligation under any appropriation or fund in excess of the amount available therein; nor shall any such officer or employee involve the Government in any contract or other obligation, for the payment of money for any purpose, in advance of appropriations made for such purpose, unless such contract or obligation is authorized by law.

"(b) No officer or employee of the United States shall accept voluntary service for the United States or employ personal service in excess of that authorized by law, except in cases of emergency involving the safety of human life or the protection of property.

"(c) (1) Except as otherwise provided in this section, all appropriations or funds available for obligation for a definite period of time shall be so apportioned as to prevent obligation thereof in a manner which would indicate a necessity for deficiency or supplemental appropriations for such period; and all appropriations or funds not limited to

a definite period of time, and all authorizations to create obligations by contract in advance of appropriations, shall be so apportioned as to achieve the most effective and economical use thereof. As used hereafter in this section, the term 'appropriation' means appropriations, funds, and authorizations to create obligations by contract in advance of appropriations.

"(2) In apportioning any appropriation, reserves may be established to provide for contingencies, or to effect savings whenever savings are made possible by or through changes in requirements, greater efficiency of operations, or other developments subsequent to the date on which such appropriation was made available. Whenever it is determined by an officer designated in subsection (d) of this section to make apportionments and reapportionments that any amount so reserved will not be required to carry out the purposes of the appropriation concerned, he shall recommend the rescission of such amount in the manner provided in the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, for estimates of appropriations.

"(3) Any appropriation subject to apportionment shall be distributed by months, calendar quarters, operating seasons, or other time periods, or by activities, functions, projects, or objects, or by a combination thereof, as may be deemed appropriate by the officers designated in subsection

(d) of this section to make apportionments and reapportionments. Except as otherwise specified by the officer making the apportionment, amounts so apportioned shall remain available for obligation, in accordance with the terms of the appropriation, on a cumulative basis unless reapportioned.

"(4) Apportionments shall be reviewed at least four times each year by the officers designated in subsection (d) of this section to make apportionments and reapportionments, and such reapportionments made or such reserves established, modified, or released as may be necessary to further the effective use of the appropriation concerned, in accordance with the purposes stated in paragraph (1) of this subsection.

"(d) (1) Any appropriation available to the legislative branch, the judiciary, or the District of Columbia, which is required to be apportioned under subsection (c) of this section, shall be apportioned or reapportioned in writing by the officer having administrative control of such appropriation. Each such appropriation shall be apportioned not later than thirty days before the beginning of the fiscal year for which the appropriation is available, or not more than thirty days after approval of the Act by which the appropriation is made available, whichever is later.

"(2) Any appropriation available to an agency, which is required to be apportioned under subsection (c) of this

section, shall be apportioned or reapportioned in writing by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. The head of each agency to which any such appropriation is available shall submit to the Bureau of the Budget information, in such form and manner and at such time or times as the Director may prescribe, as may be required for the apportionment of such appropriation. Such information shall be submitted not later than forty days before the beginning of any fiscal year for which the appropriation is available, or not more than fifteen days after approval of the Act by which such appropriation is made available, whichever is later. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall apportion each such appropriation and shall notify the agency concerned of his action not later than twenty days before the beginning of the fiscal year for which the appropriation is available, or not more than thirty days after the approval of the Act by which such appropriation is made available, whichever is later. When used in this section, the term 'agency' means any executive department, agency, commission, authority, administration, board, or other independent establishment in the executive branch of the Government, including any corporation wholly or partly owned by the United States which is an instrumentality of the United States. Nothing in this subsection shall be so construed as to interfere with the initiation, operation, and adminis-

tration of agricultural price support programs. The provisions of this section shall not apply to any corporation which obtains funds for making loans, other than paid in capital funds, without legal liability on the part of the United States.

"(e) (1) No apportionment or reapportionment which, in the judgment of the officer making such apportionment or reapportionment, would indicate a necessity for a deficiency or supplemental estimate shall be made except upon a determination by such officer that such action is required because of (A) any laws enacted subsequent to the transmission to the Congress of the estimates for an appropriation which require expenditures beyond administrative control; or (B) emergencies involving the safety of human life, the protection of property, or the immediate welfare of individuals in cases where an appropriation has been made to enable the United States to make payment of, or contributions toward, sums which are required to be paid to individuals either in specific amounts fixed by law or in accordance with formulae prescribed by law.

"(2) In each case of an apportionment or a reapportionment which, in the judgment of the officer making such apportionment or reapportionment, would indicate a necessity for a deficiency or supplemental estimate, such officer shall immediately submit a detailed report of the facts of

the case to the Congress. In transmitting any deficiency or supplemental estimates required on account of any such apportionment or reapportionment, reference shall be made to such report.

"(f) The officers designated in subsection (d) of this section to make apportionments and reapportionments may exempt from apportionments receipts from industrial and power operations available under law and any appropriation made specifically for—

"(1) interest on, or retirement of, the public debt;

"(2) payment of claims, judgments, refunds, and draw-backs;

"(3) any item determined by the President to be of a confidential nature;

"(4) payment under private relief Acts or other laws requiring payments to designated payees in the total amount of such appropriation;

"(5) contingent expenses of the Senate or of the House of Representatives.

"(g) Any appropriation which is apportioned or reapportioned pursuant to this section may be divided and subdivided administratively within the limits of such apportionments or reapportionments. The officer having administrative control of any such appropriation available to the legislative branch, the judiciary, or the District of Columbia,

and the head of each agency, subject to the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, shall prescribe, by regulation, a system of administrative control (not inconsistent with any other accounting procedures prescribed by or pursuant to law) which shall be designed to (A) restrict obligations against each appropriation to the amount of apportionments or reapportionments made for each such appropriation, and (B) enable such officer or agency head to fix responsibility for the creation of any obligation in excess of an apportionment or reapportionment.

"(h) No officer or employee of the United States shall authorize or create any obligation (A) in excess of an apportionment or reapportionment, or (B) in excess of the amount permitted by regulations prescribed pursuant to subsection (g) of this section.

"(i) (1) In addition to any penalty or liability under other law, any officer or employee of the United States who shall violate subsection (a), (b), or (h) of this section shall be subjected to appropriate administrative discipline, including, when circumstances warrant, suspension from duty without pay or removal from office; and any officer or employee of the United States who shall knowingly and willfully violate subsection (a), (b), or (h) of this section shall, upon conviction, be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned for not more than two years, or both.

"(2) In the case of a violation of subsection (a), (b), or (h) of this section by an officer or employee of an agency, or of the District of Columbia, the head of the agency concerned or the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, shall immediately report to the President, through the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and to the Congress all pertinent facts together with a statement of the action taken thereon."

SEC. 1112. No part of the funds of, or available for expenditure by any corporation or agency included in this Act shall be available to pay for annual leave accumulated by any officer or employee during the calendar year 1950 and unused at the close of business on December 31, 1950: *Provided,* That this section shall not apply to officers and employees whose post of duty is outside the continental United States.

SEC. 1113. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 6 of the Act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 555), or the provisions of any other law, the Secretary of State may, in his absolute discretion, during the current fiscal year, terminate the employment of any officer or employee of the Department of State or of the Foreign Service of the United States whenever he shall deem such termination necessary or advisable in the interests of the United States.

Notwithstanding the provisions of section 6 of the Act

of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 555), or the provisions of any other law, the Secretary of Commerce may, in his absolute discretion, during the current fiscal year, terminate the employment of any officer or employee of the Department of Commerce whenever he shall deem such termination necessary or advisable in the best interests of the United States.

SEC. 1114. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or position under the United States Government which may become vacant during the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1950: *Provided,* That this inhibition shall not apply—

(a) to not to exceed 10 per centum of all such vacancies in any agency caused by separation from such agency,

(b) to positions filled from within the agency,

(c) to offices or positions required by law to be filled by appointment of the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate,

(d) to scientific and technical positions in the Atomic Energy Commission and the Armed Services,

(e) to nurses, doctors, or other medical personnel, including orderlies, in the Public Health Service and the Veterans' Administration,

(f) to law enforcement officers,

(g) to temporary, emergency, seasonal, or cooperative positions,

(h) to commissioned, commissioned warrant, warrant, and enlisted personnel, and cadets of the Coast Guard, and the undergraduates of the United States Military and Naval Academies, or

(i) to any agency in the legislative or judicial branches of the Government, or the municipal government of the District of Columbia.

This Act may be cited as the "General Appropriation Act, 1951".

Passed the House of Representatives May 10, 1950.

Attest: RALPH R. ROBERTS,

Clerk.

81ST CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 7786

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

MAY 11 (legislative day, MARCH 29), 1950
Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

Calendar No. 1944

81ST CONGRESS } SENATE { REPORT
2d Session } { No. 1941

GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1951

JULY 6 (legislative day, JULY 1), 1950.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. MCKELLAR, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 7786]

The Committee on Appropriations, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, reports the same to the Senate with various amendments and presents herewith information relative to the changes made.

Heretofore the appropriations for the support of the Government have been considered in 11 annual bills submitted separately. The present bill is a consolidation of all of these bills. The bill is subdivided into chapters, each chapter representing 1 of the 11 annual bills previously considered, separately.

Such chapters and the chairmen of the subcommittees having jurisdiction are as follows:

		Report page No.	Bill page No.
Chapter I.	District of Columbia, Hon. Lister Hill	7	2
II.	Legislative branch, Hon. Allen J. Ellender	9	3
III.	State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, Hon. Pat McCarran	23	40
IV.	Treasury and Post Office, Hon. Burnet R. Maybank	55	106
V.	Labor-Federal Security, Hon. Dennis Chavez	69	128
VI.	Agriculture Department, Hon. Richard B. Russell	89	168
VII.	Interior Department, Hon. Carl Hayden	121	230
VIII.	Independent offices, Hon. Joseph C. O'Mahoney	179	277
IX.	Civil functions, Hon. Kenneth McKellar	211	358
X.	Defense Establishment, Hon. Elmer Thomas	269	374
X–A.	General reductions in appropriations, Hon. Kenneth McKellar	292	444
X–B.	Foreign aid, Hon. Kenneth McKellar	293	447
XI.	General provisions, Hon. Kenneth McKellar	299	462

Budget Estimates, House Action, and Senate Committee Recommendations

Amount of bill as passed the House	$27,346,713,664
Amount of increase by Senate (net)	5,158,259,008
Amount of bill as reported to the Senate	32,504,972,672
Amount of regular and supplemental estimates, 1951, including $5,198,427,480 not considered by the House	33,900,208,648
Amount of appropriations, 1950	33,629,581,616
The bill as reported to the Senate—	
Under the regular and supplemental estimates, 1951	1,395,235,976
Under the appropriations for 1950	1,124,608,944

Summary of Cash Appropriations

The following table compares the foregoing amounts as distributed by chapters in the accompanying bill:

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1950, budget estimates and amounts recommended by the House and by the Senate subcommittees for 1951—Cash appropriations

Chapter	Subcommittee	Appropriations, 1950	Estimates, 1951	Amount recommended in House bill	Amount recommended in Senate bill	Senate bill compared with—					
						Appropriations, 1950		Estimates, 1951		House bill	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)		(7)		(8)	
							Percent		*Percent*		*Percent*
I	District of Columbia	$12,000,000	$12,000,000	$10,800,000	$12,000,000					+$1,200,000	11.1
II	Legislative branch	65,716,916	87,820,747	56,322,450	79,305,795	+$13,588,879	20.67	−$8,514,952	9.69	+22,983,345	40.8
III	State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary	1,130,867,639	1,185,612,897	1,110,870,462	1,066,096,732	−64,770,907	5.7	−119,516,165	10.0	−44,773,730	4.0
IV	Treasury and Post Office	969,969,299	1,132,379,100	948,105,000	1,079,305,360	+109,336,061	11.27	−53,073,740	4.68	+131,200,360	13.83
	Treasury	508,506,500	577,686,100	546,605,000	552,805,360	+44,298,860	8.7	−24,880,740	4.3	+6,200,360	1.1
	Post Office	461,462,799	554,693,000	[1] 401,500,000	[2] 526,500,000	+65,037,201	14.0	−28,193,000	5.08	+125,000,000	31.1
V	Labor-Federal Security	2,335,290,285	2,463,008,500	2,271,099,614	2,273,385,034	−61,905,251	2.65	−189,623,466	7.69	+2,285,420	.1
VI	Agriculture	731,328,607	810,626,946	764,032,701	780,336,574	+49,007,967	6.7	−30,290,372	3.7	+16,303,873	2.1
VII	Interior	590,203,947	674,971,505	622,134,130	617,005,030	+26,802,083	4.5	−57,965,475	8.58	−5,128,100	.82
VIII	Independent offices	8,559,498,235	8,466,982,724	8,021,827,007	8,017,871,977	−541,626,258	6.3	−449,110,747	5.3	−3,955,030	.04
IX	Civil functions	665,254,190	834,867,500	630,820,000	762,924,620	+97,670,430	14.6	−71,942,880	8.6	+132,104,620	20.9
X	Defense Establishment	13,055,562,498	13,376,865,000	12,910,702,300	13,294,581,821	+239,019,323	1.8	−82,283,179	.6	+383,879,521	2.9
XB	Foreign aid	5,513,890,000	4,855,073,729		4,522,158,729	−991,731,271	17.98	−332,915,000	6.85	+4,522,158,729	
	Total	33,629,581,616	[3] 33,900,208,648	[4] 27,346,713,664	[5] 32,504,972,672	−1,124,608,944	3.34	−1,395,235,976	4.11	[5] +5,158,259,008	18.86

[1] $401,500,000 direct appropriation from the Treasury for the Post Office Department to supplement postal receipts.

[2] Senate bill recommends an indefinite appropriation from the Treasury for the Post Office Department to make up the difference between the total in the bill and the estimated postal revenues. For comparability purposes, the figure of $526,500,000 is used. This figure represents the total of the amount recommended by the House ($401,500,000) and the amount of $125,000,000 additional postal receipts which it was expected would be raised by the bill pending in Congress to increase certain postal rates, which bill has not been enacted into law.

[3] This amount includes $5,198,427,480 of budget estimates which were not considered by the House, but which were considered by Senate committee in arriving at the total of $32,504,972,672 appearing in column 5.

[4] Reductions effected by chapter X–A, Taber-Thomas amendment, have not been taken into consideration in this figure of $27,346,713,664.

[5] Senate committee figures include approval of $1,861,724,664 of total of $5,198,427,480 budget estimates not considered by House.

Summary of Contract Authorizations

The committee considered estimates for new contract authority amounting to $2,261,149,500. Of this amount, $2,183,336,000 was granted, which is $35,709,500 more than proposed by the House and $77,813,500 less than the budget estimates. Contract authority for the fiscal year 1950 amounted to $4,272,647,098.

The following table is a summary by chapters:

CHAPTER VI

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

SUBCOMMITTEE

RICHARD B. RUSSELL, Georgia, *Chairman*

CARL HAYDEN, Arizona
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, Wyoming
PAT McCARRAN, Nevada
DENNIS CHAVEZ, New Mexico
BURNET R. MAYBANK, South Carolina
LISTER HILL, Alabama
HARLEY M. KILGORE, West Virginia
MILTON R. YOUNG, North Dakota
CHAN GURNEY, South Dakota
HOMER FERGUSON, Michigan
GUY CORDON, Oregon
KENNETH S. WHERRY, Nebraska

EX OFFICIO MEMBERS FROM AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY COMMITTEE

ELMER THOMAS, Oklahoma
ALLEN J. ELLENDER, Louisiana
EDWARD J. THYE, Minnesota

BUDGET ESTIMATES, HOUSE ACTION AND SENATE COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount in chapter VI as passed House	$764,032,700
Amount of increase by Senate (net)	16,303,873
Amount in chapter VI as reported to Senate	780,336,574
Amount of regular estimates for 1951	[1] 810,626,946
Amount of appropriations, 1950	731,328,671
Chapter VI as reported to the Senate—	
Under the estimates for 1951	30,290,372
Exceeds the appropriations for 1950	49,007,967

[1] Includes budget amendments of $4,348,500 in H. Doc. 495.

COMPARATIVE SUMMARY TABLE

The table below shows the over-all action on chapter VI of the bill, setting forth the 1951 budget estimates, the amounts allowed by the House, and the amounts recommended by the Senate committee. The table appearing on pages 114 to 120 of this report gives these comparisons by subappropriations in the bill.

Comparative table showing over-all action on ch. VI, Department of Agriculture

Bureau or function	1950 appropriation	1951 budget estimates	Recommended in House bill, 1951	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (−), House bill compared with estimates		Increase (+) or decrease (−), Senate committee compared with 1950 appropriation		Increase (+) or decrease (−), Senate committee compared with 1951 estimates		Increase (+) or decrease (−), Senate committee compared with House bill	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)		(7)		(8)		(9)	
						Percent		*Percent*		*Percent*		*Percent*
Research and Marketing Act, 1946	$11,000,000	$11,102,000	$11,000,000	$6,000,000	−$102,000	0.9	−$5,000,000	45.4	−$5,102,000	46.0	−$5,000,000	45.5
Bureau of Agricultural Economics	5,438,900	6,293,400	5,325,000	5,624,000	−968,400	15.4	+185,100	3.4	−669,400	10.6	+299,000	5.6
Agricultural Research Administration	69,433,323	76,567,008	66,741,308	75,155,508	−9,825,700	12.8	+5,722,185	8.2	−1,411,500	1.8	+8,414,200	12.6
Control of forest pests	5,220,000	8,213,500	4,719,500	6,190,000	−3,494,000	42.5	+970,000	18.6	−2,023,500	24.6	+1,470,500	31.2
Forest Service	59,904,500	68,749,300	60,270,000	65,523,500	−8,479,300	12.3	+5,619,000	9.3	−3,225,800	4.7	+5,253,500	8.7
Flood control	9,500,000	11,700,000	10,750,000	9,880,000	−950,000	8.1	+380,000	4.0	−1,820,000	15.6	−870,000	8.1
Soil Conservation Service	53,293,300	56,452,100	56,290,000	56,065,175	−162,100	.3	+2,771,875	5.2	−386,925	.7	−224,825	.4
Production and Marketing Administration	441,219,713	481,487,000	469,275,500	473,607,500	−12,211,500	2.5	+32,387,787	7.3	−7,879,500	1.6	+4,332,000	.9
Commodity Exchange Authority	558,200	675,000	650,000	650,000	−25,000	3.7	+91,800	16.4	−25,000	3.7		
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation	5,054,000	7,450,000	6,854,000	7,204,000	−596,000	8.0	+2,150,000	42.5	−246,000	3.3	+350,000	.5
Rural Electrification Administration	6,963,000	9,525,000	8,150,000	8,750,000	−1,375,000	14.4	+1,787,000	25.7	−775,000	8.1	+600,000	7.4
Farmers' Home Administration	28,149,000	35,000,000	28,350,000	29,650,000	−6,650,000	19.0	+1,501,000	5.3	−5,350,000	15.3	+1,300,000	4.6
Farm Credit Administration	531,000	592,000	585,000	585,000	−7,000	1.2	+54,000	10.2	−7,000	1.2		
Extension Service	28,002,450	28,814,738	27,900,000	28,018,498	−914,738	3.2	+16,048	.6	−796,240	2.8	+118,498	.4
Office of the Secretary	2,151,300	2,275,300	2,143,300	2,179,300	−132,000	5.8	+28,000	1.3	−96,000	4.2	+36,000	1.7
Office of the Solicitor	2,364,000	3,070,000	2,450,000	2,675,000	−620,000	20.2	+311,000	13.2	−395,000	12.9	+225,000	9.2
Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations	576,400	623,400	600,000	600,000	−23,400	3.8	+23,600	4.1	−23,400	3.8		
Office of Information	1,256,228	1,297,200	1,265,800	1,265,800	−31,400	2.4	+9,572	.8	−31,400	2.4		
Library	713,293	740,000	713,293	713,293	−26,707	3.6			−26,707	3.6		
Total, direct appropriations	731,328,607	[1] 810,626,946	764,032,701	780,335,574	−46,594,245	5.7	+49,007,967	6.7	−30,290,372	3.7	+16,303,873	2.1
Permanent appropriations	142,223,682	126,059,210	126,059,210	126,059,210			−16,164,472	11.4				
Loan authorizations [3]	503,000,000	610,000,000	520,350,000	550,350,000	−89,650,000	17.8	+47,350,000	9.4	−59,650,000	9.78	+30,000,000	5.8
Corporate administrative expense limitations	19,226,000	20,884,000	20,134,000	20,484,000	−750,000	.36	+1,258,000	6.5	−400,000	1.92	+350,000	1.7

Reduction in appropriations:													
Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation [2]		199,990,000	199,990,000	199,990,000			+199,990,000	100.0					
Federal land banks [2]	189,000,000	125,000,000	125,000,000	125,000,000			−64,000,000	33.9					
Rescission stated in proviso limiting travel expense funds to $12,000,000			645,496	791,888	+645,496		+791,888	100.0	+791,888		+146,392	22.7	
Cancellation of notes to restore capital of Commodity Credit Corporation		170,515,131	170,515,131	66,698,457			+66,698,457	100.0	−103,816,674	60.9	−103,816,674	60.9	

[1] Includes budget amendments of $2,355,000 for "Control of emergency outbreaks of insect and plant diseases" and $1,993,500 for "Forest Pest Control Act" requested in H. Doc. No. 495 and deferred by House committee to 1952 estimates.
[2] From revolving funds in Office of Secretary of the Treasury.
[3] Authority to REA for additional $150,000,000 as required is provided for 1950 and 1951.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES

Supplemental estimates considered by the committee are contained in House Documents Nos. 457 and 495 and in Senate Documents Nos. 161 and 170.

RESEARCH AND MARKETING ACT OF 1946

The committee recommends a change in language in order to distribute $5,000,000 for section 9 funds to the appropriation for "Office of Experiment Stations" in line with the action of the House in distributing $5,000,000 for section 10 (a) and $3,000,000 for section 10 (b) funds to the various bureaus. No change in the amounts appropriated are recommended. The effect will be that all funds for title I are distributed to the bureaus, leaving $6,000,000 for title II in the appropriation item, to cover research on distribution and marketing.

With reference to the limitation on work relating to fish or shellfish except for the support of equitable transportation rates and for development of foreign markets, the committee is advised that the workload on transportation rates is being carried by one full-time employee. The committee suggests that consideration be given to the advisability of assigning additional personnel to this work.

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR

The committee recommends a language change to provide for travel and subsistence expenses of advisory committees in order to cover the various types of committees established by the Secretary of Agriculture, including representatives of producers, industry, Government, and science.

In this connection, the committee believes that no commodity advisory committee can properly appraise and evaluate the agricultural research within its jurisdiction unless it has a clear understanding of the entire pattern, not only of such research work, but also of the proportionate distribution of funds available for such work and the cumulative totals of previous expenditures on specific active research projects. To function effectively, the committee feels that such committees must be informed on all such research work, including costs and proportionate use of funds, regardless of whether the work is financed with regular bureau appropriations or with Research and Marketing Act or other research funds, and that each advisory committee should know approximately the amount of funds available or to be available for research within the purview of that committee, how much has been spent in the past on each specific project and the best available estimate of the cost of each specific project under way or proposed. Also, the committee is of the opinion that it is important for the Department to have the advice of such committees as to what work should be terminated, as well as what work should be undertaken.

BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY

ANIMAL DISEASE CONTROL AND ERADICATION

The committee recommends striking the proviso authorizing $30,000 for the acquisition of land and construction of four buildings for inspection of livestock at Canadian border ports of entry. No

change is recommended in the amount allowed by the House, but in expending the $30,000 provided the committee feels that the Department should go as far as they can to provide the facilities needed at the Canadian border ports involved.

BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY, SOILS, AND AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING

FIELD CROPS

The committee recommends, in addition to $35,000 for repairs and reconditioning of field station facilities, an increase of $40,000 for research on American-Egyptian extra-long-staple cotton as well as development of new hybrid cottons of the American upland type. Evidence submitted to the committee indicates a need to intensify in particular research with Pima 32, Amsak, and other extra-long-staple cottons in order that we may be able to develop higher yielding strains of American-Egyptian varieties. The strains already developed have proven satisfactory for spinning products heretofore spun from imported cottons. Facilities and equipment for this work are already available at Sacaton, Ariz., Las Cruces, N. Mex., and Ysleta, Tex. The committee was also impressed with the desirability of intensive work in the development of new hybrid cottons adapted to production in American uplands. Recent research has produced new hybrid crosses of cotton which produce cotton fiber of an unusual quality.

AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING

The committee recommends an increase of $20,000 in order to strengthen the research in farm electrification. The committee is advised that, in addition to former accomplishments of recent years which have aided the farmers, it is now indicated that expanded research is desirable on insect electrocuters for corn borer, tobacco hornworm, the cotton bollworm and tomato hornworm moth, and that other insect pests are also known to be photo positive and therefore may be attracted by an electric lamp.

FOREST SERVICE

NATIONAL FOREST PROTECTION AND MANAGEMENT

The committee recommends an increase of $2,430,500 in order to provide more adequately for the various types of management operations involved on timber, range, wildlife, water, and recreation properties. The report of the House committee earmarked specific amounts for several projects named therein. The committee is informed that compliance with such earmarking would compel the curtailment of other activities which are of equal importance. Accordingly, the committee does not favor specifically earmarking the increase allowed for the appropriation item, and prefers to leave the allocation of such increase to the best judgment of the Forest Service in the economical performance of their property management functions.

The committee recommends the addition of a new section on "Cooperative range improvements," with an appropriation of $750,000, which covers the use to be made on the national forests of the grazing fees received. In view of this addition, the committee disapproves the earmarking of $200,000 for reseeding, as well as the

requirement that the increase be contingent upon an offsetting increase in the grazing fees.

The committee is advised that the recreation use of the national forests has now increased to an estimated 26,000,000 visitors annually. The committee is also advised that there is critical need in many of the areas for replacement and expansion of public facilities to maintain structures and to assure safe water, proper sanitation, and fire prevention, for which funds are not available to the Forest Service. Accordingly, the committee requests the Forest Service to make appropriate provisions for selling or leasing such recreation areas to public or semipublic groups in order to assure that the areas may be rehabilitated and properly maintained from funds made available by such sale or lease, and to suggest to the appropriate legislative committee such legislation as may be necessary to effectuate this recommendation.

FOREST DEVELOPMENT ROADS AND TRAILS

The committee recommends an increase of $1,652,000 in order to provide more adequately for the construction and betterment of forest development roads for the purpose of aiding the production of timber from the national forests. In this connection, the committee suggests that the Forest Service give consideration to the need for the improvement of the unpaved section of Tellico River Road in Cherokee National Forest.

ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR NATIONAL FORESTS—WEEKS ACT

The committee recommends an increase of $301,000 in order to continue the acquisition program at the 1950 level of operation. In this connection, the committee suggests that the Forest Service give consideration to the purchase of Battell Park Forest owned by Middlebury College at Middlebury, Vt.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

LAND UTILIZATION

The committee recommends an increase of $75,175 for the strengthening of an existing barrier structure to prevent further serious erosion on the San Simon Valley land utilization project in Arizona. The committee is advised that this nonrecurring item will stop the process of head cutting which is destroying valuable grazing land and resulting in depositing a large amount of silt in the San Carlos irrigation reservoir as well. Therefore, the committee recommends the full amount of the budget estimate for this work.

The committee also recommends an increase of $100,000 for the purpose of stepping up the program of revegetating and improving undeveloped project lands in order to remove them from the hazards of wind and water erosion. The committee is informed that there are about 175,000 acres of former cropland which it will be necessary to reseed in order to eliminate the erosion hazards, and the increase recommended will aid in accelerating the program.

PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION

CONSERVATION AND USE OF AGRICULTURAL LAND RESOURCES

The committee recommends an increase of $500,000 in order to provide for the full amount of the payments to farmers as authorized by the program specified by the 1950 act. The committee approves

the reduction of $2,000,000 made by the House from the estimate for administrative expenses, but is of the opinion that the conservation payments are a definite commitment and should be paid in full.

The committee also recommends striking the proviso limiting to 5 percent the allocation for any county for services of technicians of the Soil Conservation Service. The committee is advised that only about 250 counties have made any use of the provision, and in view of such limited benefit to the Soil Conservation Service the committee feels the provision is not effective and should be eliminated.

MARKET NEWS SERVICE

The committee recommends an increase of $12,000 in order to establish a market news service on naval stores and an increase of $125,000 in order to establish and improve market news and reporting services in the critical marketing areas as planned by the Department. The Department is also directed to give careful consideration to providing a cooperative service on livestock and feed in Arkansas.

In this connection, the committee has examined the report submitted by the Department, including their proposals for expanding and improving the market news service, and feels that the initiation of new services and improvement of existing operations should be undertaken as the need arises and as available funds will permit. The committee believes that the financing of the services should be on a cooperative basis with the States concerned, with particular emphasis placed upon obtaining a larger share of the funds from State and local contributions.

MARKET INSPECTION OF FARM PRODUCTS

The committee is advised again this year that Government laboratories are competing with private laboratories in the testing and grading of oilseeds and oilseed products, as well as in similar services. The committee again emphasizes that it views with disfavor the creation of laboratories by the Government which compete with commercial laboratories for such testing work, particularly since no charge has been made that the commercial fees are excessive or that the service is unavailable.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

The question of REA loans for the construction of generating and transmission facilities to be leased by the Southwestern Power Administration was a matter of considerable controversy in both the Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriation and in the full committee. This involves a question of policy which cannot be properly determined by the Committee on Appropriations. In view of the importance of this matter the committee respectfully suggests that the standing committee on Agriculture and Forestry review this entire subject to determine whether legislation is necessary. The committee is somewhat concerned by the large increases in the proportion of the funds made available that is devoted to loans for generating and transmission facilities. The committee believes that no loan should be made for construction of such facilities unless in areas where private power companies cannot or will not furnish adequate power at reasonable rates and within a reasonable time.

The committee has examined the method of computing fees for engineering and legal services in connection with rural electrification loans, as referred to in the House report, and finds no evidence that

the schedules used have caused the payment of excessive fees. With respect to the legal fees, the committee is advised that the schedules by which the Administration controls the maximum to be spent by the cooperative from loan funds for such purpose take into consideration the amount and nature of the various legal services expected to be required for each loan, and the fees are not determined merely on the basis of a percentage of the loan or of the cost of the project. The committee is advised that with respect to engineering fees for distribution lines and internal-combustion generating plants, the Administration's standard form of contract provides for compensation on a fixed-fee basis, rather than a percentage of the cost of construction. In the case of transmission lines and steam and hydroelectric plant loans, some engineering fees have been approved on a percentage basis, but the Administration insists that the fees in such cases are lower than the compensation paid for comparable services by private utility companies generally.

Increases and Limitations

The changes recommended by the committee in the amounts of chapter VI of the House bill are as follows:

Bureau of Agricultural Economics:

Economic investigations $120,000

The increase recommended by the committee is to partially restore the reduction by the House below the 1950 level of operation, in the amount of $30,000, and to provide the full estimate of $90,000 for State estimates on farm production expenpitures and net farm income. In addition, the committee disapproves the earmarking of $15,000 for economic research on farm housing and farm construction. The total provided is $2,720,000, which is $195,600 below the budget estimate.

The committee also recommends the deletion of the words "farm structures."

Crop and livestock estimates 179,000

The increase recommended by the committee is to restore the reduction by the House below the 1950 level of operation, including pay adjustment costs, in the amount of $179,000. In addition, the committee disapproves the use of funds for work relative to current farm construction. The total amount provided is $2,904,000, which is $473,800 below the budget estimate.

The committee also recommends the deletion of the following:

> and data on farm construction as provided by title V of the Housing Act of 1949 (Public Law 171),

Total, Bureau of Agricultural Economics 299,000

Agricultural Research Administration:

Office of Administrator:

The committee recommends striking out "Advisory Committee" and inserting in lieu thereof "advisory committees," in order to provide expenses for the various types of committees established by the Secretary of Agriculture.

INCREASES AND LIMITATIONS—Continued

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION—Con.

Research on agricultural problems of Alaska $20,000

The increase recommended by the committee will provide a total of $280,000, which is $36,200 below the budget estimate.

Office of Experiment Stations:

Payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico 5,010,000

The increase recommended by the committee in this item is to conform to the distribution of sec. 9 funds from the item for Research and Marketing Act of 1946 in the amount of $5,000,000, and to restore $10,000 to the amount for the Territory of Alaska. The total provided for the item is $12,416,208, the amount of the estimate plus the $5,000,000 for sec. 9 funds.

For the purpose of distributing sec. 9 funds from the item for Research and Marketing Act of 1946, the committee further recommends that the following be added to the bill:

Sections 3 and 5, $2,863,708, and sections 9 and 11 of said Act as added by the Act of August 14, 1946 (7 U. S. C. 427h, 427j), including administration by the Office of Experiment Stations in the United States Department of Agriculture, $5,000,000, no part of which latter amount shall be used for beginning construction of any building costing in excess of $15,000, except that a poultry breeding house may be constructed at Purdue University at a cost to this appropriation of not to exceed $29,000

The committee also recommends that the words "where applicable" be inserted after the provision that the payments are to be paid quarterly in advance.

The committee further recommends that the amount stated for the Territory of Alaska be increased from $27,500 to $37,500, to restore the budget estimate.

Salaries and expenses 15,000

The increase recommended by the committee is to provide a total of $252,500, which is $11,150 below the budget estimate.

The committee also recommends to strike out "December" and insert in lieu thereof "September," in order to correct an error in the date of the amendatory act of 1944.

Total, Office of Experiment Stations 5,025,000

BUREAU OF HUMAN NUTRITION AND HOME ECONOMICS 263,200

The increase recommended by the committee is to restore the funds of the Bureau to the 1950 level of operation, including pay adjustment costs, for a total of $1,763,200, which is $454,000 below the budget estimate.

INCREASES AND LIMITATIONS—Continued

BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY:

Animal husbandry $69,000

The increase recommended by the committee is to add $50,000 to the $20,880 allowed by the House for repairs, reconditioning, and replacement of facilities and equipment to strengthen the research program, and to add $19,000 for continuing the light horse breed experimental work at Middlebury, Vt., which was estimated to be closed out. The total provided for the item is $2,319,000, which is $200,700 below the estimate.

Diseases of animals 50,000

The increase recommended by the committee is to provide $50,000 of the estimated $143,100 for repairs, reconditioning, and replacement of present facilities and equipment to strengthen the research program. The total provided for the item is $1,350,000, which is $148,100 below the budget estimate.

Total Bureau of Animal Industry 119,000

BUREAU OF DAIRY INDUSTRY 135,000

The increase recommended by the committee is to provide $35,000 of the estimated $125,000 for repairs and reconditioning of physical facilities at field stations to strengthen the research program, and $100,000 as the amount estimated to construct urgently needed housing facilities for dairy employees at the Agricultural Research Center at Beltsville, Md. The total provided for the item is $1,735,000, which is $164,300 below the budget estimate.

The committee also recommends that the following be added to the bill:

not to exceed $100,000 for construction of 10 or more housing units for employees,

BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL AND INDUSTRIAL CHEMISTRY 750,000

The increase recommended by the committee is to provide $140,000 for research into the utilization of plant materials potentially valuable as sources of the drug cortisone, in place of the transfer from the Public Health Service provided by the House, and to provide $610,000 as a partial restoration of the reduction by the House below the 1950 level of operation. The total provided for the item is $8,500,000, which is $318,800 below the budget estimate.

BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY, SOILS, AND AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING:

Field crops 75,000

The increase recommended by the committee is to provide $35,000 of the estimated $185,000 for repairs and reconditioning of physical facilities at field stations to strengthen the research program and $40,000 for research on American-Egyptian extra-long-staple cotton as well as development of new hybrid cottons of the American upland type. The total provided for the item is $3,475,000, which is $163,300 below the budget estimate.

INCREASES AND LIMITATIONS—Continued

BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY, SOILS, AND AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING—Continued

Fruit, vegetable, and specialty crops $125,000

The increase recommended by the committee is to provide $50,000 of the estimated $190,000 for repairs and reconditioning of physical facilities at field stations to strengthen the research program; $60,000 for research work on vegetable sources for the new drug cortisone, in place of the transfer from the Public Health Service provided by the House, and $15,000 additional to provide a total of $40,000 for gladiolus research. The total provided for the item is $3,075,000, which is $253,900 below the budget estimate.

Forest diseases 5,000

The increase recommended by the committee is to provide $5,000 of the estimated $20,000 for repairs and reconditioning of physical facilities at field stations to strengthen the research program. The total provided for the item is $455,000, which is $46,500 below the budget estimate.

Soils, fertilizers, and irrigation 87,500

The increase recommended by the committee is to provide $12,500 of the estimated $90,000 for repairs and reconditioning of physical facilities at field stations to strengthen the research program, and to provide $75,000 of the estimated $150,000 to accelerate the preparation of soil maps for publication through improved methods. The total provided for the item is $2,767,500, which is $246,700 below the budget estimate.

Agricultural engineering 20,000

The increase recommended by the committee is to strengthen the research in farm electrification. The total provided for the item is $1,140,000, which is $209,500 below the budget estimate.

Total, Bureau of Plant Iudustry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering 312,500

BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY AND PLANT QUARANTINE:

Insect investigations 65,000

The increase recommended by the committee is to provide $45,000 of the $168,300 increase requested to strengthen the research program at selected locations, and to provide $20,000 of the $93,600 increase requested to investigate new chemicals and methods for protecting man and animals against injurious insect pests. The total provided for the item is $4,165,000, which is $386,700 below the budget estimate.

The committee also recommends that the following be stricken from the bill:

: *Provided further*, That $50,000 shall be transferred to applicable appropriations of the Public Health Service for investigations and studies of effects of insecticidal and fungicidal residue on human health

INCREASES AND LIMITATIONS—Continued

BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY AND PLANT QUARANTINE—Continued

Insect and plant disease control $465,100

The increase recommended by the committee is to provide restoration of the House reduction below the 1950 level of operation, excluding pay act costs. The total provided for the item is $4,651,000, which is $101,000 below the budget estimate.

Foreign plant quarantine 59,400

The increase recommended by the committee is to provide restoration of the House reduction below the 1950 level of operation, including pay adjustment costs. The total provided for the item is $2,384,400, which is $233,600 below the budget estimate.

Control of emergency outbreaks of insects and plant diseases 1,500,000

The increase recommended by the committee is to provide for a contingency fund, in order to eliminate the necessity for later submission of deficiency estimates, as requested by the budget amendment in H. Doc. 495. The total provided for the item is $2,350,000, which is $2,505,000 below the budget estimate as revised.

The committee also recommends that the following be added to the bill:

, of which $1,500,000 shall be apportioned for use pursuant to Section 3679 of the Revised Statutes for the purposes of said joint resolution only to the extent that the Secretary, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, finds necessary to meet emergency conditions

Total, Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine 2,089,500

Total, Agricultural Research Administration 8,714,200

CONTROL OF FOREST PESTS:

Gypsy and brown-tail moths 50,500

The increase recommended by the committee is to provide restoration of the House reduction below the 1950 level of operation, including pay adjustment costs. The total provided for the item is $590,000, which is $23,500 below the budget estimate.

Forest Pest Control Act 1,000,000

The increase recommended by the committee is to provide for a contingency fund, in order to eliminate the necessity for later submission of deficiency estimates, as requested by the budget amendment in H. Doc. 495. The total provided for the item is $1,900,000, which is $1,100,000 below the budget estimate as revised.

The committee also recommends that the following be added to the bill:

, of which $1,000,000 shall be apportioned for use pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes for the purposes of said Act only to the extent that the Secretary, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, finds necessary to meet emergency conditions

INCREASES AND LIMITATIONS—Continued

CONTROL OF FOREST PESTS—Continued

White-pine blister rust $420,000

The increase recommended by the committee is to provide restoration of the House reduction below the 1950 level of operation, including pay adjustment costs. The total provided for the item is $3,700,000, which is $900,000 below the budget estimate.

The committee also recommends that the amount stated as available to the Forest Service be increased to $1,947,150, and that the amount stated as available to the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine be increased to $1,187,500.

Total, control of forest pests 1,470,500

FOREST SERVICE:

National forest protection and management 2,430,500

The increase recommended by the committee is to provide more adequately for the property management functions involved, without earmarking the funds for specific purposes or projects. The total provided for the item is $29,320,500, which is $950,000 below the budget estimate.

Cooperative range improvements 750,000

The increase recommended by the committee is to provide for a new section to be added to the bill, as follows:

Cooperative range improvements: For artificial revegetation, construction, and maintenance of range improvements, control of rodents, and eradication of poisonous and noxious plants on national forest lands, pursuant to section 12 of the Act of April 24, 1950 (Public Law Numbered 478), $750,000, to remain available until expended.

Forest products:

The committee recommends that the following be added to the bill:

, of which $30,000 shall be made available for the establishment of a forest utilization service unit in the Southwest.

Forest resources investigations 120,000

The increase recommended by the committee is to prevent a slowing up of the needed surveys of forest resources. The total provided for the item is $1,000,000, which is $293,500 below the budget estimate.

Forest development roads and trails 1,652,000

The increase recommended by the committee is to provide more adequately for the construction and betterment of forest development roads as an aid for timber production. The total provided for the item is $12,000,000, which is $465,000 below the budget estimate.

INCREASES AND LIMITATIONS—Continued

FOREST SERVICE—Continued

Acquisition of lands for national forests, Weeks Act $301,000

The increase recommended by the committee is to continue the acquisition program at the 1950 level of operation. The total provided for the item is $401,000, which is $299,000 below the budget estimate.

Farm and other private forestry cooperation:

The committee recommends the following changes in the amounts of the stated limitations, in order to permit the use of funds for the purposes stated in the House report, with which the committee agrees:

Cooperative Farm Forestry Act (Norris-Doxey)	$785,034
Sec. 4, Clarke-McNary Act	449,200
Sec. 5, Clarke-McNary Act	65,766
Total	1,300,000

Total, Forest Service 5,253,500

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE:

Land utilization and retirement of submarginal land 175,175

The increase recommended by the committee is to provide the estimated $75,175 for strengthening an existing barrier structure to prevent further serious erosion on the San Simon Valley land utilization project in Arizona, and to provide $100,000 of the estimated $231,875 to revegetate and otherwise improve undeveloped project lands to remove them from erosion hazards. The total provided for the item is $1,665,175, which is $227,925 below the budget estimate.

Water conservation and utilization projects 100,000

The increase recommended by the committee is to provide more adequately for land development. The total provided for the item is $500,000, which is $469,900 below the budget estimate.

Total, Soil Conservation Service 275,175

PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION:

Conservation and use of agricultural land resources 500,000

The increase recommended by the committee is to provide for the full amount of the payments to farmers authorized by the 1950 act. The total provided for the item is $283,000,000, which is $2,000,000 below the budget estimate.

The committee further recommends that the following proviso be stricken from the bill:

: *Provided further*, That not to exceed 5 per centum of the allocation for the agricultural conservation program for any county may be allocated to the Soil Conservation Service for services of its technicians in formulating and carrying out the agricultural conservation program, and the funds so allocated shall not be utilized by the Soil Conservation Service for any purpose other than technical and other assistance in such county

INCREASES AND LIMITATIONS—Continued

PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION—Con.

Sugar Act $3,750,000

The increase recommended by the committee is to provide for conditional payments to sugar growers on the 1950 sugar crop. The total provided for the item is $63,750,000, which is $3,750,000 below the budget estimate.

Market news service 137,000

The increase recommended by the committee is to provide $12,000 for establishing a market news service on naval stores, and to provide $125,000 additional for establishing and improving market news and reporting services in the critical marketing areas planned by the Department. The total provided for the item is $2,187,000, which is $87,300 below the budget estimate.

Total, Production and Marketing Administration 4,387,000

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION 350,000

The increase recommended by the committee is to provide more adequately for extending the insurance program and servicing the contract increase. The total provided for the item is $7,204,000, which is $246,000 below the budget estimate.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION:

Salaries and expenses 600,000

The increase recommended by the committee is to provide more adequately for carrying out the rural telephone program, on which a total of $1,250,000 is provided out of a request of $1,850,000. The total provided for the item is $8,750,000, which is $775,000 below the budget estimate.

The committee also recommends that the borrowing authorization for the rural telephone program be increased by $15,000,000, to provide a total authorization of $40,000,000, which is $10,000,000 below the budget estimate.

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION:

Salaries and expenses 1,300,000

The increase recommended by the committee is to provide more adequately for increased activities under the farm housing loan program. The total provided for the item is $29,000,000, which is $1,000,000 below the budget estimate.

The committee also recommends an increase of $15,000,000 in the borrowing authorization for farm tenancy and housing loans, to provide the full estimate of $30,000,000. The total authorization for all loans is $160,350,000, which is $2,650,000 below the budget estimate.

The committee further recommends that the following be added to the bill:

, of which not to exceed $3,500,000 of the amount available for the purposes of title I and section 43 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, may be distributed to States and Territories without regard to farm population and prevalence of tenancy, in addition to the amount otherwise distributed thereto,

INCREASES AND LIMITATIONS—Continued

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION—Continued

for loans in reclamation projects and to entrymen on unpatented public land

The committee further recommends that the following be added to the bill:

: Provided further, That for the purpose of making loans pursuant to the foregoing authority, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public-debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under that Act are extended to include such loans to the Secretary: Provided further, That repayments to the Secretary of the Treasury on such loans shall be treated as a public-debt transaction.

EXTENSION SERVICE:

Payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico $103,498

The increase recommended by the committee is to extend to Puerto Rico and to the Territory of Alaska the benefits of the Capper-Ketcham Act and of the Bankhead-Jones Act. The total provided for the item is $27,103,498, which is $753,040 below the budget estimate.

The committee also recommends that the following be deleted from the bill:

section 3 of the Act approved June 20, 1936 (7 U. S. C. 343e), extending the benefits of the Capper-Ketcham Act to the Territory of Alaska, $10,000

and that the following be inserted in lieu thereof:

the Act approved October 27, 1949 (Public Law 417), extending to the Territory of Alaska the benefits of the Capper-Ketcham Act and sections 21 and 23 of title II of the Bankhead-Jones Act, $42,150; Puerto Rico, section 3 of the Act of March 4, 1931 (7 U. S. C. 386f), authorizing extension of the Capper-Ketcham Act to Puerto Rico, $31,348,

The committee further recommends that the following be added to the bill:

, and the Act approved October 26, 1949 (Public Law 406), extending the benefits of section 23 of title II of the Bankhead-Jones Act to Puerto Rico, $40,000

Salaries and expenses 15,000

The increase recommended by the committee is to provide for a portion of the pay adjustment costs needed to keep the program at the 1950 level of operation. The total provided for the item is $915,000, which is $43,200 below the budget estimate.

Total, Extension Service 118,498

INCREASES AND LIMITATIONS—Continued

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY $36,000

The increase recommended by the committee is to provide $30,000 for pay act costs, including executive pay increases and to provide $6,000 for regulatory hearings under the Office of Hearing Examiners. The total provided for the item is $2,179,300, which is $94,000 below the budget estimate.

OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR 225,000

The increase recommended by the committee is to provide for the increased activities contemplated in the farm housing program and in the rural telephone program. The total provided for the item is $2,675,000, which is $395,000 below the budget estimate.

The committee also recommends that the following be added to the bill:

, together with such amounts from other appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules in the budget for the current fiscal year for such expenses which several amounts not exceeding a total of $207,000 shall be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation

OFFICE OF INFORMATION:

The committee recommends that the following be added to the bill:

: Provided, That when and to the extent that in the judgment of the Secretary agricultural exhibits and motion and sound pictures relating to the authorized programs of the various agencies of the Department can be more advantageously prepared, displayed, or distributed by the Office of Information, as the central agency of the Department therefor, additional funds not exceeding $300,000 for these purposes may be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation, from the funds applicable, and shall be available for the objects specified herein

TITLE II—CORPORATIONS

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION:

The committee recommends that the administrative expense limitation be increased from $16,000,000 to $16,350,000. The increase is intended to provide more adequately for their program work. The amount provided is $400,000 below the budget estimate.

The committee also recommends that the amount of the authorization to the Secretary of the Treasury to discharge the indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation by canceling notes be reduced from $170,515,131 to $66,698,457. The decrease is to conform to the budget amendment in S. Doc. No. 161 and is based on the losses allowed by the appraisal committee.

TOTAL INCREASES 23,028,873

Decreases

Research and Marketing Act of 1946_____ $5,000,000

For the purpose of distributing section 9 funds to the Office of Experiment Stations, the committee recommends that the following section be stricken from the bill:

To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of section 9 of title I and title II of the Act of August 14, 1946, as amended (7 U. S. C. 427, 427h, 427j, 1621–1629), as follows:

For payments to States, Territories, and Puerto Rico for agricultural experiment stations pursuant to section 9 of the Bankhead-Jones Act approved June 29, 1935, as amended by the Act of August 14, 1946, $5,000,000;

For the improvement and development, independently or through cooperation among Federal and State agencies, and others, of a sound and efficient system for the distribution and marketing of agricultural products pursuant to the "Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946" (title II of the Act of August 14, 1946, as amended), including the objects for which funds are available for titles II and III of such Act of August 14, 1946, $6,000,000: *Provided*, That not less than $650,000 of this amount shall be available for contracts in accordance with the provisions of section 205 of said Act: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may make available to any bureau, office, or agency of the Department such amounts from this appropriation as may be necessary to carry out the functions for which it is made (but amounts made available to the Office of the Secretary, Office of the Solicitor, and Office of Information, shall not exceed those which the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives of the Department, shall determine), and any such amounts shall be in addition to amounts transferred or otherwise made available to other appropriation items of the Department: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for work relating to fish or shellfish or any product thereof, except for the support of equitable transportation rates before Federal agencies concerned with such rates and for development of foreign markets.

In all, $11,000,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for beginning construction of any building costing in excess of $15,000, except that a poultry breeding house may be constructed at Purdue University at a cost to this appropriation of not to exceed $29,000.

and that the following be inserted in lieu thereof:

To enable the Secretary to improve and develop, independently or through cooperation among Federal and State agencies, and others, a sound and efficient system for the distribution and marketing of agricultural products under the provisions of title II of the Act of August 14, 1946, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1621–1629), including the objects for which funds are available for titles II and III of such Act of August 14, 1946, $6,000,000: Provided, That not less than $650,000 of this amount shall be available for contracts in accordance with the provisions of section 205 of said Act: Provided further, That the Secretary may make available to any bureau, office, or agency of the Department such amounts from this appropriation as may be necessary to carry out the functions for which it is made (but amounts made available to the Office of the Secretary, Office of the Solicitor, and Office of Information, shall not exceed those which the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives of the Department, shall determine),

DECREASES—Continued

RESEARCH AND MARKETING ACT OF 1946—Continued

and any such amounts shall be in addition to amounts transferred or otherwise made available to other appropriation items of the Department: Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for work relating to fish or shellfish or any product thereof, except for the support of equitable transportation rates before Federal agencies concerned with such rates and for development of foreign markets.

(NOTE.—See also additional language inserted under "Office of Experiment Stations)."

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION:

Working capital fund, Agricultural Research Center $300,000

The committee recommends that the following paragraph be stricken from the bill:

WORKING CAPITAL FUND, AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH CENTER

For the establishment of a working capital fund, to be available without fiscal year limitation, for expenses necessary for furnishing facilities and services by the Agricultural Research Center to Government agencies, $300,000. Said fund shall be reimbursed from applicable appropriations or other funds to cover the charges for such facilities and services, including handling and related charges, for equipment rentals (including depreciation, maintenance, and repairs), for supplies, equipment and materials, stores of which may be maintained at the center, and for building construction, alterations, and repair, and applicable appropriations or other funds may also be charged their proportionate share of the necessary general expenses of the center not covered by the annual appropriation.

Bureau of Animal Industry:

Animal disease control and eradication.

The committee recommends that the following proviso be stricken from the bill:

, including not to exceed $30,000 for the acquisition of land and construction of four buildings for inspection of livestock at Canadian border ports of entry:

FLOOD CONTROL 870,000

Decreases have been recommended in most of the long-range construction items contained in other chapters of the bill. Works of this nature may be postponed without any unusual detriment to the total over-all program. The total provided for this item is $9,880,000, which is $1,820,000 below the budget estimates. This is a highly desirable work, but the committee feels that in view of the general budgetary situation it can be deferred.

Decreases—Continued

Soil Conservation Service:

Soil conservation research.

The committee recommends that the caption "Salaries and Expenses" be deleted as a center heading. The purpose of the deletion is to prevent the limitation on alteration and construction of buildings in the general language under Soil Conservation Service from being construed as limiting the authority contained in the basic law for land utilization under which the Secretary may "protect, improve, develop, and administer any property so acquired and to construct such structures thereon as may be necessary to adapt it to its most beneficial use."

Soil conservation operations $500,000

The House increased the appropriation for soil conservation operations $1,000,000 above the budget estimates for this purpose. The committee recognizes the great importance of the work of the soil conservation districts and has therefore approved a substantial increase over the budget estimates and the amount to be expended in the current fiscal year. The committee believes that the amount allowed for this purpose is adequate to make great progress in the programing and planning of soil conservation work in the several districts and urges the Soil Conservation Service to utilize its large staff of specialists in such a way as to render the maximum amount of assistance to cooperating farmers.

Production and Marketing Administration:

Marketing services:

Marketing regulatory acts 55,000

The decrease recommended by the committee results from the disapproval by the committee of any part of the estimated $130,000 requested to carry out the second year of a 3-year plan for posting and supervising all eligible stockyards under the Packers and Stockyards Act, and the approval by the committee of the estimated $30,000 for increased activity under the Grain Standards Act and the approval by the committee of $15,000 of the estimated $30,000 for increased seed testing under the Federal Seed Act; toward which requests the House allowed $100,000. The total provided for the item is $3,495,000, which is $252,600 below the budget estimate.

Decreases—Continued

Travel Expense Limitation and Reduction:

The committee recommends that the following be stricken from title I of the bill:

Not to exceed $12,000,000 of the funds appropriated in this title shall be available for travel expenses. Amounts available from appropriations contained in this title are hereby reduced by the total sum of $645,496, such amount to be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury immediately upon approval of this chapter.

and that the following be inserted in lieu thereof:

Sec. 411. Of the funds appropriated in this chapter for travel expenses $791,888 shall be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury on or before August 1, 1950; but such amount shall be credited toward any other reduction in amounts available for such travel expenses resulting from decreases in appropriations made by this Act below the budget estimates.

Total decrease, chapter VI	$6,725,000
Total increase, ch. VI	23,028,873
Total decrease, ch. VI	6,725,000
Net increase, ch. VI	16,303,873
Amount of ch. VI (Department of Agriculture) as reported to Senate	780,336,574

PERMANENT APPROPRIATIONS

Agency and item	Appropriation, 1950	Estimates, 1951	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Cooperative agriculture extension work	$4,704,710	$4,704,710	----------
Payments to school funds, Arizona and New Mexico national forest fund	61,000	61,000	----------
Payments to States and Territories from national forest fund	7,719,490	7,500,000	−$219,490
Roads and trails for States, national forest fund	3,088,000	3,000,000	−88,000
Payments due counties, submarginal-land program	247,500	243,500	−4,000
Removal of surplus agricultural commodities (30 percent of customs receipts)	125,606,982	110,000,000	−15,606,982
Payment from proceeds of sales, motor-propelled vehicles, etc	796,000	550,000	−246,000
Net total, permanent appropriation	142,223,682	126,059,210	−16,164,472

TRUST FUNDS

[Not a charge against revenues]

Animal Industry: Expenses and refunds, inspection and grading of canned wet animal foods	$95,000	$95,000	----------
Forest Service: Cooperation work	6,000,000	6,000,000	----------
Soil Conservation Service:			
Payments in lieu of taxes and operation and maintenance costs, water conservation and utilization projects	75,640	19,350	−$56,290
Operation and maintenance, water distribution systems, water conservation and utilization projects	9,800	9,800	----------
Production and Marketing Administration:			
Expenses and refunds, inspection and grading of farm products	5,280,000	5,375,000	+95,000
Grading of agriculture commodities	691,000	683,800	−7,200
Indemnity fund, county associations	500	500	----------
Undistributed cotton price adjustment payments	200	200	----------
Farmers Home Administration:			
Liquidation of deposits, lease and purchase contracts	20,000	24,000	+4,000
State rural rehabilitation corporation funds	11,000,000	9,000,000	−2,000,000
Miscellaneous contributed funds	378,100	411,600	+33,500
Return of excess deposits for reproduction of photographs, mosaics, and maps	800	800	----------
Total, trust accounts	23,551,040	21,620,050	−1,930,990

LOAN AUTHORIZATIONS

Agency and item	Authorization, 1950	Estimates, 1951	House bill, 1951	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (−) Senate bill compared with—		
					Authorization, 1950	Estimates, 1951	House bill
Farmers Home Administration:							
Farm tenancy and housing loans	$40,000,000	$70,000,000	$56,350,000	[1] $71,350,000	+$31,350,000	+$1,350,000	+$15,000,000
Production and subsistence loans	85,000,000	85,000,000	85,000,000	85,000,000			
Water facilities loans	3,000,000	5,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	+1,000,000	−1,000,000	
Total, Farmers Home Administration	128,000,000	160,000,000	145,350,000	160,350,000	+32,350,000	+350,000	+15,000,000
Rural Electrification Administration:							
Rural electrification loans	350,000,000	400,000,000	[2] 350,000,000	[2] 350,000,000		−50,000,000	
Rural telephone loans	25,000,000	50,000,000	25,000,000	40,000,000	+15,000,000	−10,000,000	+15,000,000
Total, Rural Electrification Administration	375,000,000	450,000,000	375,000,000	390,000,000	+15,000,000	−60,000,000	+15,000,000
Total, loan authorization	503,000,000	610,000,000	520,350,000	550,350,000	+47,350,000	−59,650,000	+30,000,000

[1] Includes $1,350,000 transferred from direct appropriation for enlargement and development loans.
[2] In addition, $150,000,000 available upon certification of need.

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES OF GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS

Agency and item	Authorization, 1950	Estimates, 1951	House bill, 1951	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (−) Senate bill compared with—		
					Appropriations, 1950	Estimates, 1951	House bill
Commodity Credit Corporation	[1] $15,000,000	$16,750,000	$16,000,000	$16,350,000	+$1,350,000	−$400,000	+$350,000
Farm Credit Administration:							
Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation	1,500,000	1,280,000	1,280,000	1,280,000	−220,000		
Federal Intermediate Credit Banks	1,398,000	1,496,000	1,496,000	1,496,000	+98,000		
Production Credit Corporation	1,328,000	1,358,000	1,358,000	1,358,000	+30,000		
Total, administrative expense limitations	19,226,000	20,884,000	20,134,000	20,484,000	+1,258,000	−400,000	+350,000

[1] Does not include $350,000 in Deficiency Appropriation, 1950.

69452—50——8

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT SHOWING THE APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1950, THE ESTIMATES FOR 1951, THE BILL AS PASSED THE HOUSE, THE SENATE RECOMMENDATIONS IN ACCOMPANYING BILL, THE INCREASES OR DECREASES PROPOSED IN SENATE BILL AS COMPARED WITH THE CURRENT APPROPRIATIONS AND THE INCREASES OR DECREASES PROPOSED IN THE BILL COMPARED WITH THE BUDGET ESTIMATES, AND THE HOUSE BILL

Agency and item	Appropriation, 1950	Estimates, 1951	House bill, 1951	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (−) Senate bill compared with—		
					Appropriations, 1950	Estimates, 1951	House bill
Research and Marketing Act of 1946:							
Title I:							
Sec. 9 (payments to land-grant colleges)	$$5,000,000	$5,000,000	$5,000,000	(4)	−$5,000,000	−$5,000,000	−$5,000,000
Sec. 10a (utilization research)	(1)						
Sec. 10b (cooperative research other than utilization)	(2)						
Title II (improvement and development of marketing and distribution)	6,000,000	6,102,000	6,000,000	$6,000,000		−102,000	
Total, Research and Marketing Act of 1946	11,000,000	11,102,000	11,000,000	6,000,000	−5,000,000	−5,102,000	−5,000,000
Bureau of Agricultural Economics:							
Economic investigations	2,621,000	2,915,600	2,600,000	2,720,000	+99,000	−195,600	+120,000
Crop and livestock estimates	2,817,900	3,377,800	2,725,000	2,904,000	+86,100	−473,800	+179,000
Total, Bureau of Agricultural Economics	5,438,900	6,293,400	5,325,000	5,624,000	+185,100	−669,400	+299,000
Agricultural Research Administration:							
Office of Administrator	773,400	692,200	600,000	600,000	−173,400	−92,200	
Working capital fund, Agricultural Research Center		400,000	300,000			−400,000	−300,000
Special research fund	(3)						
Research on strategic and critical agricultural materials	349,000	515,500	399,000	399,000	+50,000	−116,500	

Research on agricultural problems of Alaska	675,000	316,200	260,000	280,000	−395,000	−36,200	+20,000
Office of Experiment Stations:							
Payments to States	7,406,208	7,416,208	7,406,208	[4] 12,416,208	+5,010,000	+5,000,000	+5,010,000
Salaries and expenses	256,450	263,650	237,500	252,500	−3,950	−11,150	+15,000
Federal Experiment Station, Puerto Rico	170,400	185,350	175,000	175,000	+4,600	−10,350	----------
Total, Office of Experimental Stations	7,833,058	7,865,208	7,818,708	12,843,708	+5,010,650	+4,978,500	+5,025,000
Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics	1,749,200	2,217,200	1,500,000	1,763,200	+14,000	−454,000	+263,200
Bureau of Animal Industry:							
Salaries and expenses:							
Animal husbandry	2,248,200	2,519,700	2,250,000	2,319,000	+70,800	−200,700	+69,000
Diseases of animals	1,295,600	1,498,100	1,300,000	1,350,000	+54,400	−148,100	+50,000
Animal disease control and eradication	7,837,000	8,104,000	7,950,000	7,950,000	+113,000	−154,000	----------
Meat inspection	12,577,000	12,959,000	12,800,000	12,800,000	+223,000	−159,000	----------
Total, salaries and expenses	23,957,800	25,080,800	24,300,000	24,419,000	+461,200	−661,800	+119,000
Market agreements, hog cholera virus and serum	[48,800]	[49,300]	[49,300]	[49,300]	+[500]	----------	----------
Eradication of foot-and-mouth and other contagious diseases of animals	[5]	[5]	[5]	[5]	----------	----------	----------
Total, Bureau of Animal Industry	23,957,800	25,080,800	24,300,000	24,419,000	+461,200	−661,800	+119,000

[1] Activities previously carried under this title have been transferred to and consolidated with: "Insect investigation, Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine," "Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry," "Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics," "Forest products, Forest Service," "Office of the Secretary," "Office of the Solicitor," "Office of Information," "Economic investigation, Bureau of Agricultural Economics," "Office of administrator, Agricultural Research Administration," "Animal husbandry, Bureau of Animal Industry," "Bureau of Dairy Industry" and "Field crops," "Fruit, vegetable, and specialty crops," "Forest diseases," "Agricultural engineering, Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering."

[2] Activities previously carried under this title have been transferred to and consolidated with: "Insect investigation, Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine," "Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry," "Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics," "Forest and range management investigation, Forest Service," "Soil conservation research, Soil Conservation Service," "Marketing farm products, Production and Marketing Administration," "Salaries and expenses, Farm Credit Administration," "Office of the Secretary," "Office of Information," "Economic investigations, Bureau of Agricultural Economics," "Office of administrator, Agricultural Research Administration," "Administration of grants, etc., Office of Experiment Stations," "Animal husbandry and diseases of animals, Bureau of Animal Industry," "Bureau of Dairy Industry" and "Field crops," "Fruit, vegetable and specialty crops." "Soils, fertilizers, and irrigation," "Agricultural engineering, Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering."

[3] Activities previously carried under this title have been transferred to and consolidated with: "Insect control, Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine," "Bureau of Agriculture and Industrial Chemistry," "Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics." "Economic investigations and crop and livestock, Bureau of Agricultural Economics," "Administration of grants, Office of Experiment Stations," "Animal husbandry and disease of animals, Bureau of Animal Industry," "Bureau of Dairy Industry," and "Field crops," "Fruit, vegetable, and specialty crops," "Agricultural engineering, Bureau of Plant Industry, Soil and Agricultural Engineering."

[4] Senate amendment transfers to "Office of Experiment Stations."

[5] Estimates for 1950 and 1951 deferred pending availability of information.

Comparative statement showing the appropriations for 1950, the estimates for 1951, the bill as passed the House, the Senate recommendations in accompanying bill, the increases or decreases proposed in Senate bill as compared with the current appropriations and the increases or decreases proposed in the bill compared with the budget estimates, and the House bill—Continued

Agency and item	Appropriation, 1950	Estimates, 1951	House bill, 1951	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (−) Senate bill compared with—		
					Authorization, 1950	Estimates, 1951	House bill
Agricultural Research Administration—Continued							
Bureau of Dairy Industry	$1,613,300	$1,899,300	$1,600,000	$1,735,000	+$121,700	−$164,300	+$135,000
Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry	8,395,625	8,818,800	7,750,000	8,500,000	+104,375	−318,800	+750,000
Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils and Agricultural Engineering:							
Field crops	3,446,800	3,638,300	3,400,000	3,475,000	+28,200	−163,300	+75,000
Fruit, vegetable, and specialty crops	2,956,700	3,328,900	2,950,000	3,075,000	+118,300	−253,900	+125,000
Forest diseases	443,740	501,500	450,000	455,000	+11,260	−46,500	+5,000
Soils, fertilizers, and irrigation	2,576,400	3,014,200	2,680,000	2,767,500	+191,100	−246,700	+87,500
Agricultural engineering	1,153,000	1,349,500	1,120,000	1,140,000	−13,000	−209,500	+20,000
National Arboretum	170,000	152,700	152,700	152,700	−17,300		
Total, Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils and Agricultural Engineering	10,746,640	11,985,100	10,752,700	11,065,200	+318,560	−919,900	+312,500
Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine:							
Salaries and expenses:							
Insect investigations	4,111,300	4,551,700	4,100,000	4,165,000	+53,700	−386,700	+65,000
Insect and plant-disease control	4,651,000	4,752,000	4,185,900	4,651,000		−101,000	+465,100
Foreign plant quarantines	2,325,000	2,618,000	2,325,000	2,384,400	+59,400	−233,600	+59,400
Total salaries and expenses	11,087,300	11,921,700	10,610,900	11,200,400	+113,100	−721,300	+589,500

Control of emergency outbreaks of insect and plant diseases	2,253,000	[6] 4,855,000	850,000	[7] 2,350,000	+97,000	−2,505,000	+1,500,000
Total, Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine	13,340,300	16,776,700	11,460,900	13,550,400	+210,100	−3,226,300	+2,089,500
Total, Agricultural Research Administration	69,433,323	76,567,008	66,741,308	75,155,508	+5,722,185	−1,411,500	+8,414,200
Control of Forest Pests:							
Gypsy and brown-tail moths	575,000	613,500	539,500	590,000	+15,000	−23,500	+50,500
Forest Pest Control Act	[a] 1,000,000	[8] 3,000,000	900,000	[9] 1,900,000	+900,000	−1,100,000	+1,000,000
White-pine blister rust	3,645,000	4,600,000	3,280,000	3,700,000	+55,000	−900,000	+420,000
Total, control of forest pests	5,220,000	8,213,500	4,719,500	6,190,000	+970,000	−2,023,500	+1,470,500
Forest Service:							
Salaries and expenses:							
General administrative expenses	$655,000	$676,500	$665,000	$665,000	+$10,000	−$11,500	
National forest protection and management	26,300,000	30,270,500	26,890,000	29,320,500	+3,020,500	−950,000	+$2,430,500
Cooperative range improvements		[10]		750,000	+750,000	+750,000	+750,000
Fighting forest fires	[13] 6,777,000	[11] 6,500,000	[12] 6,000,000	6,000,000	−777,000	−500,000	
Forest and range management investigations	2,893,100	3,067,000	2,995,000	2,995,000	+101,900	−72,000	
Forest products	1,372,000	1,359,400	1,300,000	1,300,000	−72,000	−59,400	
Forest resources investigations	866,000	1,293,500	880,000	1,000,000	+134,000	−293,500	+120,000
Total, salaries and expenses	38,863,100	43,166,900	38,730,000	42,030,500	+3,167,400	−1,136,400	+3,300,500
Forest development roads and trails	10,348,000	12,465,000	10,348,000	12,000,000	+1,652,000	−465,000	+1,652,000
Acquisition of lands for national forests:							
Weeks Act	401,000	700,000	100,000	401,000		−299,000	+301,000
Superior National Forest	75,000	200,000	150,000	150,000	+75,000	−50,000	

[6] Includes budget amendment in H. Doc. 495 of $2,355,000, with provision for $3,000,000 contingency fund.
[7] Of this amount, $1,500,000 constitutes a contingency fund.
[8] Includes budget amendment in H. Doc. 495 of $1,993,500, with provision for $2,000,000 contingency fund.
[9] Of this amount, $1,000,000 constitutes a contingency fund.
[10] Estimated as an indefinite amount in S. Doc. 170.
[11] Includes budget amendment in H. Doc. 495 of $6,400,000, with provision for $2,500,000 contingency fund.
[12] Of this amount, $2,500,000, constitutes a contingency fund.
[13] Includes $100,000 regular appropriation plus $6,677,000 estimated supplemental, provided in Deficiency Appropriation Act of 1950.
[a] Does not include $2,000,000 in Deficiency Appropriation Act of 1950.

Comparative statement showing the appropriations for 1950, the estimates for 1951, the bill as passed the House, the Senate recommendations in accompanying bill, the increases or decreases proposed in Senate bill as compared with the current appropriations and the increases or decreases proposed in the bill compared with the budget estimates, and the House bill—Continued

Agency and item	Appropriation, 1950	Estimates, 1951	House bill, 1951	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (−) Senate bill compared with—		
					Authorization, 1950	Estimates, 1951	House bill
Forest Service—Continued							
Special acts	$142,000	$142,000	$142,000	$142,000			
Forest-fire cooperation	9,000,000	10,000,000	9,500,000	9,500,000	+$500,000	−$500,000	
Farm and other private forestry cooperation	1,075,400	2,075,400	1,300,000	1,300,000	+224,600	−775,400	
Total, Forest Service	59,904,500	68,749,300	60,270,000	65,523,500	+5,619,000	−3,225,800	+$5,253,500
Flood control	[14] 9,500,000	11,700,000	10,750,000	9,880,000	+380,000	−1,820,000	−870,000
Soil Conservation Service:							
Salaries and expenses:							
Soil conservation research	1,496,000	1,542,100	1,500,000	1,500,000	+4,000	−42,100	
Soil conservation operations	50,572,300	52,047,000	52,900,000	52,400,000	+1,827,700	+353,000	−500,000
Total, salaries and expenses	52,068,300	53,589,100	54,400,000	53,900,000	+1,831,700	+310,900	−500,000
Land utilization and retirement of submarginal land	1,225,000	1,893,100	1,490,000	1,665,175	+440,175	−227,925	+175,175
Water conservation and utilization projects	([15])	969,900	400,000	500,000	+500,000	−469,900	+100,000
Total, Soil Conservation Service	53,293,300	56,452,100	56,290,000	56,065,175	+2,771,875	−386,925	−224,825
Production and Marketing Administration:							
Conservation and use of agricultural land resources	257,043,439	285,000,000	282,500,000	283,000,000	+25,956,561	−2,000,000	+500,000
Acreage allotments and marketing quotas	30,150,774	34,000,000	32,300,000	32,300,000	+2,149,226	−1,700,000	
Sugar Act	60,000,000	67,500,000	60,000,000	63,750,000	+3,750,000	−3,750,000	+3,750,000
National School Lunch Act	83,500,000	83,500,000	83,500,000	83,500,000			

Marketing services:							
Market news service	1,900,000	2,274,300	2,050,000	2,187,000	+287,000	−87,300	+137,000
Market inspection of farm products	758,000	782,800	780,000	780,000	+22,000	−2,800	
Marketing farm products	1,209,500	1,274,000	1,260,000	1,260,000	+50,500	−14,000	
Tobacco acts	1,602,000	1,682,100	1,660,500	1,660,500	+58,500	−21,600	
Cotton statistics, classing, standards, and futures acts	1,656,000	1,726,200	1,675,000	1,675,000	+19,000	−51,200	
Marketing regulatory acts	3,400,000	3,747,600	3,550,000	3,495,000	+95,000	−252,600	−55,000
Total, marketing services	10,525,500	11,487,000	10,975,500	11,057,500	+532,000	−429,500	+82,000
Total, Production and Marketing Administration	441,219,713	481,487,000	469,275,500	473,607,500	+32,387,787	−7,879,500	+4,332,000
Commodity Exchange Authority	558,200	675,000	650,000	650,000	+91,800	−25,000	
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation	5,054,000	7,450,000	6,854,000	7,204,000	+2,150,000	−246,000	+350,000
Rural Electrification Administration (salaries and expenses)	[b] 6,963,000	9,525,000	8,150,000	8,750,000	+1,787,000	−775,000	+600,000
Farmers Home Administration:							
Grants	2,000,000	5,000,000	650,000	650,000	−1,350,000	−4,350,000	
Salaries and expenses	26,149,000	30,000,000	27,700,000	29,000,000	+2,851,000	−1,000,000	+1,300,000
Total	28,149,000	35,000,000	28,350,000	29,650,000	+1,501,000	−5,350,000	+1,300,000
Farm Credit Administration:							
Salaries and expenses:							
Assessments against member banks	[2,281,800]	[2,327,000]	[2,325,000]	[2,325,000]	[+43,200]	[−2,000]	
Direct appropriation	531,000	592,000	585,000	585,000	+54,000	−7,000	
Extension Service:							
Payments to States:							
Capper-Ketcham Act	1,480,000	1,480,000	1,480,000	1,480,000			
Bankhead-Jones Act, title II:							
Sec. 21	12,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000			
Sec. 23	12,500,000	12,500,000	12,500,000	12,500,000			

[14] In addition prior year balance of $1,250,400 available.
[15] Prior year balance of $678,011 available.
[b] Does not include $165,000 in Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1950.

Comparative statement showing the appropriations for 1950, the estimates for 1951, the bill as passed the House, the Senate recommendations in accompanying bill, the increases or decreases proposed in Senate bill as compared with the current appropriations and the increases or decreases proposed in the bill compared with the budget estimates, and the House bill—Continued

Agency and item	Appropriation, 1950	Estimates, 1951	House bill, 1951	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (−) Senate bill compared with—		
					Authorization, 1950	Estimates, 1951	House bill
Extension Service—Continued							
Payments to States—Continued							
Additional extension work	$555,000	$555,000	$555,000	$555,000	----------	----------	----------
Alaska	23,950	56,100	23,950	56,100	+$32,150	----------	+$32,150
Puerto Rico	408,000	540,438	408,000	479,348	+71,348	−$61,090	+71,348
Housing Act of 1949	122,000	725,000	33,050	33,050	−88,950	−691,950	----------
Total, payments to States	27,088,950	27,856,538	27,000,000	27,103,498	+14,548	−753,040	+103,498
Salaries and expenses	913,500	958,200	900,000	915,000	+1,500	−43,200	+15,000
Total, Extension Service	28,002,450	28,814,738	27,900,000	28,018,498	+16,048	−796,240	+118,498
Office of the Secretary	2,151,300	2,275,300	2,143,300	2,179,300	+28,000	−96,000	+36,000
Office of Solicitor	2,364,000	3,070,000	2,450,000	2,675,000	+311,000	−395,000	+225,000
Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations	576,400	623,400	600,000	600,000	+23,600	−23,400	----------
Office of Information	1,256,228	1,297,200	1,265,800	1,265,800	+9,572	−31,400	----------
Library	713,293	740,000	713,293	713,293	----------	−26,707	----------
Total direct annual appropriations	[*] 731,328,607	810,626,946	[16] 764,032,701	[17] 780,336,574	+49,007,967	−30,290,377	+16,303,873

[16] Includes $645,496 for travel which amount is to be impounded and returned to the Treasury.
[17] Includes $791,888 for travel, to be returned to the Treasury by Aug. 1, 1950, with credit of such amount toward other reductions in travel expenses.
[*] Does not include increased pay and travel costs or other funds provided in Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1950.

Pay, Marine Corps	185,818,000				−185,818,000		
General expenses, Marine Corps	121,182,000				−121,182,000		
Salaries, Marine Corps	2,475,000				−2,475,000		
Total, title IV—Department of the Navy, general	[1] 4,328,382,200	[2] $4,121,667,000	[2] $4,026,897,000	[2] $4,103,258,300	−225,123,900	−$18,408,700	+$76,361,300

[1] In addition $643,546,000 contract authority.
[2] In addition $575,496,000 contract authority.

TITLE V—DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

Construction of aircraft and related procurement	$1,100,000,000	$1,700,000,000	$1,700,000,000	$1,700,000,000	+$600,000,000		
Special procurement	125,797,000	147,900,000	147,900,000	147,900,000	+22,103,000		
Acquisition and construction of real property	36,445,000	164,784,000	25,000,000	164,784,000	+128,339,000		+$139,784,000
Maintenance and operations	1,143,858,000	1,041,662,000	1,010,000,000	1,027,662,000	−116,196,000	−$14,000,000	+17,662,000
Military personnel requirement	1,201,000,000	1,254,375,000	1,245,000,000	1,245,000,000	+44,000,000	−9,375,000	
Claims	2,847,000				−2,847,000		
Research and development	233,000,000	182,611,000	182,611,000	182,611,000	−50,389,000		
Air Force Reserve	77,630,000	73,235,000	73,235,000	73,235,000	−4,395,000		
Air Reserve Officers Training Corps	11,677,000	10,600,000	10,600,000	10,600,000	−1,077,000		
Air National Guard	114,690,000	103,935,000	103,935,000	103,935,000	−10,755,000		
Salaries and expenses, administration	57,242,000	58,545,000	55,620,000	58,545,000	+1,303,000		+2,925,000
Contingencies	15,200,000	26,714,000	26,714,000	26,714,000	+11,514,000		
Total, Title V, Department of the Air Force, general	[1] 4,119,386,000	[2] 4,764,361,000	[2] 4,580,615,000	[2] 4,740,986,000	+621,600,000	−23,375,000	+160,371,000
Total, regular annual appropriation, titles I, II, III, IV, V	13,055,562,498	13,376,865,000	12,910,702,300	13,294,581,821	+239,019,323	−82,283,179	+383,879,521

[1] In addition $1,992,755,000 contract authority.
[2] In addition $810,289,000 contract authority.

CHAPTER X–A

GENERAL REDUCTIONS IN APPROPRIATIONS AND CONTRACT AUTHORIZATIONS

The committee recommends that the following chapter, which was inserted in the bill on the floor of the House, be deleted from the bill:

CHAPTER X–A—GENERAL REDUCTIONS IN APPROPRIATIONS AND CONTRACT AUTHORIZATIONS

Reductions in appropriations and contract authorizations contained in this Act are hereby made in the sum of $600,000,000.

Not more than the following sums may be obligated by any agency or department provided for in this Act, viz:

(1) For civilian personnel, not more than an amount 10 per centum below the amount proposed in the President's budget estimates for fiscal year 1951, except that in the Department of Defense where no more than the amount of the President's budget estimate minus 2 per centum shall be obligated. This paragraph shall not apply to nurses, doctors, or other medical personnel, including orderlies, in the Public Health Service and the Veterans' Administration.

(2) For travel, not more than a total for all departments and agencies of $319,000,000, and not more than 5 per centum less than the estimates provided for military personnel travel and not more than 20 per centum less than the amount provided for civilian personnel travel, than the estimates therefor contained in the President's budget message for the fiscal year 1951.

(3) For transportation of things, for all departments and agencies, not more than $720,000,000: *Provided further,* That in no case shall the amount obligated exceed a figure 10 per centum below the estimates submitted by the President in his budget message for 1951 for each item for all agencies except the Department of Defense, and for the Department of Defense not more than 5 per centum less than the estimates of the President, transmitted in said budget message.

(4) For communications services, not more than $59,000,000, and not more for any department other than the Department of Defense than the amount of the President's budget estimates for 1951 minus 10 per centum, and for the Department of Defense not more than a figure 5 per centum below the President's budget estimates for 1951.

(5) For rents and utilities, not more than $205,000,000, and for all establishments other than the Department of Defense not more than the President's budget estimates for fiscal year 1951 minus 10 per centum.

(6) For printing and reproduction, not more than $52,000,000, and not more in any case than the President's budget estimates for 1951 minus 10 per centum.

(7) For other contractual services, not more than $1,301,000,000, and for all departments other than the Department of Defense not more than the President's budget estimates for 1951 minus 10 per centum.

(8) For supplies and materials, not more than $3,888,000,000, and for all departments of the Government except the Department of Defense and the Veterans' hospitals not more than the President's budget estimates for 1951 minus 10 per centum.

(9) For equipment, not more than $3,577,000,000, and for all departments other than the Department of Defense, not more than the President's budget estimates for 1951 minus 10 per centum.

(10) For lands and structures, for all departments of the Government, except the Department of Defense not more than the President's budget estimates for 1951 minus 5 per centum.

CHAPTER XI

GENERAL PROVISIONS

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

KENNETH McKELLAR, Tennessee, *Chairman*

CARL HAYDEN, Arizona
ELMER THOMAS, Oklahoma
RICHARD B. RUSSELL, Georgia
PAT McCARRAN, Nevada
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, Wyoming
DENNIS CHAVEZ, New Mexico
BURNET R. MAYBANK, South Carolina
ALLEN J. ELLENDER, Louisiana
LISTER HILL, Alabama
HARLEY M. KILGORE, West Virginia
JOHN L. McCLELLAN, Arkansas
A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, Virginia

STYLES BRIDGES, New Hampshire
CHAN GURNEY, South Dakota
HOMER FERGUSON, Michigan
KENNETH S. WHERRY, Nebraska
GUY CORDON, Oregon
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, Massachusetts
MILTON R. YOUNG, North Dakota
WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, California

The last chapter of the appropriation bill is entitled "General Provisions" and carries those provisions which have been made applicable to all appropriations carried in this bill. There are other general provisions carried in the individual chapters of the bill which are applicable only to the chapter in which they appear. The changes recommended by the committee in this chapter of the House bill are as follows:

Section 1110—Working Funds

Section 1110 inserted in the bill by the House requires that all transfers from one appropriation to another be made by check, thus substituting one method for the several procedures currently in use. The section would also limit the availability for obligation of funds transferred from one agency to another for the furnishing of supplies or the rendering of services to the same limitations, conditions, and restrictions as provided by the act appropriating the funds. Under existing law, annual appropriations which are transferred are available to the performing agency for obligation for two full years after the year for which the appropriation is made. Under the House provision, the performing agency will be in the same position as the ordering agency. The committee was advised by several agencies that it was not clear whether the new provision applied to the appropriations heretofore made by Congress. Representatives of the General Accounting Office advised the committee that under their interpretation of the provision it would not apply retroactively to appropriations made by Congress. With this interpretation of the provision, the committee is in agreement and recommends that the provision be enacted into law.

Section 1111—Antideficiency Provision

The committee recommends that the following provision which was inserted in the bill by the House be amended as indicated:

Sec. 1111. Section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U. S. C. 665), is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 3679. (a) No officer or employee of the United States shall make or authorize an expenditure from or create or authorize an obligation under any appropriation or fund in excess of the amount available therein; nor shall any such officer or employee involve the Government in any contract or other obligation, for the payment of money for any purpose, in advance of appropriations made for such purpose, unless such contract or obligation is authorized by law.

"(b) No officer or employee of the United States shall accept voluntary service for the United States or employ personal service in excess of that authorized by law, except in cases of emergency involving the safety of human life or the protection of property.

"(c) (1) Except as otherwise provided in this section, all appropriations or funds available for obligation for a definite period of time shall be so apportioned as to prevent obligation *or expenditure* thereof in a manner which would indicate a necessity for deficiency or supplemental appropriations for such period; and all appropriations or funds not limited to a definite period of time, and all authorizations to create obligations by contract in advance of appropriations, shall be so apportioned as to achieve the most effective and economical use thereof. As used hereafter in this section, the term 'appropriation' means appropriations, funds, and authorizations to create obligations by contract in advance of appropriations.

"(2) In apportioning any appropriation, reserves may be established to provide for contingencies, or to effect savings whenever savings are made possible by or through changes in ~~requirements,~~ *requirements or* greater efficiency of operations, ~~or other developments~~ subsequent to the date on which such appropriation was made available. Whenever it is determined by an officer designated in subsection (d) of this section to make apportionments and reapportionments that any amount so reserved will not be required to carry out the purposes of the appropriation concerned, he shall recommend the rescission of such amount in the manner provided in the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, for estimates of appropriations.

"(3) Any appropriation subject to apportionment shall be distributed by months, calendar quarters, operating seasons, or other time periods, or by activities, functions, projects, or objects, or by a combination thereof, as may be deemed appropriate by the officers designated in subsection (d) of this section to make apportionments and reapportionments. Except as otherwise specified by the officer making the apportionment, amounts so apportioned shall remain available for obligation, in accordance with the terms of the appropriation, on a cumulative basis unless reapportioned.

"(4) Apportionments shall be reviewed at least four times each year by the officers designated in subsection (d) of this section to make apportionments and reapportionments, and such reapportionments made or such reserves established, modified, or released as may be necessary to further the effective use of the appropriation concerned, in accordance with the purposes stated in paragraph (1) of this subsection.

"(d) (1) Any appropriation available to the legislative branch, the judiciary, or the District of Columbia, which is required to be apportioned under subsection (c) of this section, shall be apportioned or reapportioned in writing by the officer having administrative control of such appropriation. Each such appropriation shall be apportioned not later than thirty days before the beginning of the fiscal year for which the appropriation is available, or not more than thirty days after approval of the Act by which the appropriation is made available, whichever is later.

"(2) Any appropriation available to an agency, which is required to be apportioned under subsection (c) of this section, shall be apportioned or reapportioned in writing by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. The head of each agency to which any such appropriation is available shall submit to the Bureau of the Budget information, in such form and manner and at such time or times as the Director may prescribe, as may be required for the apportionment of such appropriation. Such information shall be submitted not later than forty days before the beginning of any fiscal year for which the appropriation is available, or not

more than fifteen days after approval of the Act by which such appropriation is made available, whichever is later. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall apportion each such appropriation and shall notify the agency concerned of his action not later than twenty days before the beginning of the fiscal year for which the appropriation is available, or not more than thirty days after the approval of the Act by which such appropriation is made available, whichever is later. When used in this section, the term 'agency' means any executive department, agency, commission, authority, administration, board, or other independent establishment in the executive branch of the Government, including any corporation wholly or partly owned by the United States which is an instrumentality of the United States. Nothing in this subsection shall be so construed as to interfere with the initiation, operation, and administration of agricultural price support programs. The provisions of this section shall not apply to any corporation which obtains funds for making loans, other than paid in capital funds, without legal liability on the part of the United States.

"(e) (1) No apportionment or reapportionment which, in the judgment of the officer making such apportionment or reapportionment, would indicate a necessity for a deficiency or supplemental estimate shall be made except upon a determination by such officer that such action is required because of (A) any laws enacted subsequent to the transmission to the Congress of the estimates for an appropriation which require expenditures beyond administrative control; or (B) emergencies involving the safety of human life, the protection of property, or the immediate welfare of individuals in cases where an appropriation has been made to enable the United States to make payment of, or contributions toward, sums which are required to be paid to individuals either in specific amounts fixed by law or in accordance with formulae prescribed by law.

"(2) In each case of an apportionment or a reapportionment which, in the judgment of the officer making such apportionment or reapportionment, would indicate a necessity for a deficiency or supplemental estimate, such officer shall immediately submit a detailed report of the facts of the case to the Congress. In transmitting any deficiency or supplemental estimates required on account of any such apportionment or reapportionment, reference shall be made to such report.

"(f) *(1)* The officers designated in subsection (d) of this section to make apportionments and reapportionments may exempt from apportionments *trust funds and working funds expenditures from which have no significant effect on the financial operations of the Government, working capital and revolving funds established for intra-governmental operations,* receipts from industrial and power operations available under law and any appropriation made specifically for—

"(1) interest on, or retirement of, the public debt;

"(2) payment of claims, judgments, refunds, and draw-backs;

"(3) any item determined by the President to be of a confidential nature;

"(4) payment under private relief Acts or other laws requiring payments to designated payees in the total amount of such appropriation;

~~"(5) contingent expenses of the Senate or of the House of Representatives.~~

"*(2) The provisions of subsection (c) of this section shall not apply to appropriations to the Senate or House of Representatives or to any Member, committee, Office (including the office of the Architect of the Capitol), officer, or employee thereof.*

"(g) Any appropriation which is apportioned or reapportioned pursuant to this section may be divided and subdivided administratively within the limits of such apportionments or reapportionments. The officer having administrative control of any such appropriation available to the legislative branch, the judiciary, or the District of Columbia, and the head of each agency, subject to the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, shall prescribe, by regulation, a system of administrative control (not inconsistent with any ~~other~~ accounting procedures prescribed by or pursuant to law) which shall be designed to (A) restrict obligations *or expenditures* against each appropriation to the amount of apportionments or reapportionments made for each such appropriation, and (B) enable such officer or agency head to fix responsibility for the creation of any obligation *or the making of any expenditure* in excess of an apportionment or reapportionment.

"(h) No officer or employee of the United States shall authorize or create any obligation *or make any expenditure* (A) in excess of an apportionment or reapportionment, or (B) in excess of the amount permitted by regulations prescribed pursuant to subsection (g) of this section.

"(i) (1) In addition to any penalty or liability under other law, any officer or employee of the United States who shall violate subsection (a), (b), or (h) of this section shall be subjected to appropriate administrative discipline, including, when circumstances warrant, suspension from duty without pay or removal from office;

and any officer or employee of the United States who shall knowingly and willfully violate subsection (a), (b), or (h) of this section shall, upon convinction, be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned for not more than two years, or both.

"(2) In the case of a violation of subsection (a), (b), or (h) of this section by an officer or employee of an agency, or of the District of Columbia, the head of the agency concerned or the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, shall immediately report to the President, through the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and to the Congress all pertinent facts together with a statement of the action taken thereon."

Section 1112—Annual Leave

The committee recommends that the following provision inserted in the bill by the House be amended as indicated:

Sec. 1112. No part of the funds of, or available for expenditure by any corporation or agency included in this Act, *including the government of the District of Columbia*, shall be available to pay for annual leave accumulated by any officer or employee during the calendar year 1950 and unused at the close of business on ~~December 31, 1950~~ *June 30, 1951*: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to officers and employees whose post of duty is outside the continental United States.

Section 1114—Filling of Vacancies

The committee recommends that the following section which was inserted in the bill on the floor of the House be deleted from the bill:

Sec. 1114. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or position under the United States Government which may become vacant during the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1950: *Provided*, That this inhibition shall not apply—

(a) to not to exceed 10 per centum of all such vacancies in any agency caused by separation from such agency,

(b) to positions filled from within the agency,

(c) to offices or positions required by law to be filled by appointment of the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate,

(d) to scientific and technical positions in the Atomic Energy Commission and the Armed Services,

(e) to nurses, doctors, or other medical personnel, including orderlies, in the Public Health Service and the Veterans' Administration,

(f) to law enforcement officers,

(g) to temporary, emergency, seasonal, or cooperative positions,

(h) to commissioned, commissioned warrant, warrant, and enlisted personnel, and cadets of the Coast Guard, and the undergraduates of the United States Military and Naval Academies, or

(i) to any agency in the legislative or judicial branches of the Government, or the municipal government of the District of Columbia.

New Section 1114—Purchase of Typewriters

The following provision was inserted by the House under the heading "General Services Administration" in chapter VIII of the bill. The committee recommends that the provision be deleted from chapter VIII of the bill and be inserted as section 1114 under "General provisions":

Sec. 1114. During the current fiscal year, no part of any money appropriated in this or any other Act shall be used during any quarter of such fiscal year to purchase typewriting machines (except bookkeeping and billing machines) at a price which exceeds 90 per centum of the lowest net cash price, plus applicable Federal excise taxes, accorded the most-favored customer (other than the Government, the American National Red Cross, and the purchasers of typewriting machines for educational purposes only) of the manufacturer of such machines during the six-month period immediately preceding such quarter.

Section 1115—Employment of Retired Officers

The following provision which was inserted in the bill by the House as section 626 under chapter X has been deleted from the bill:

Sec. 626. No payment shall be made from appropriations in this chapter to any officer on the retired lists of the Regular Army, Regular Navy, Regular Marine Corps, or Regular Air Force, who for himself, or for others, is engaged in the selling of, or contracting for the sale of, or negotiating for the sale of, to any agency of the Department of Defense, any war materials or supplies.

In lieu thereof, the committee recommends the following section as a new section 1115 under "General provisions":

Sec. 1115. No payment shall be made from appropriations in this Act to any officer on the retired lists of the Regular Army, Regular Navy, Regular Marine Corps, Regular Air Force, Regular Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service for a period of two years after retirement who for himself or for others is engaged in the selling of or contracting for the sale of or negotiating for the sale of to any agency of the Department of Defense, the Coast Guard, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Public Health Service any supplies or war materials.

○

Calendar No. 1944

81ST CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 7786

[Report No. 1941]

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MAY 11 (legislative day, MARCH 29), 1950
Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

JULY 8, 1950
Reported, under authority of the order of the Senate of July 6 (legislative day, July 1), 1950, by Mr. MCKELLAR, with amendments

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the support of the Government, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, namely:

CHAPTER I—DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

For the general fund of the District of Columbia, ~~$9,800,000~~ *$11,000,000*, and for the water fund, established by law (D. C. Code, title 43, ch. 15), $1,000,000, both amounts to be advanced July 1, 1950.

Act, 1947 (29 U. S. C. 176–180, 182), including printing and binding; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); and rent in the District of Columbia, $50,000.

This title may be cited as the "Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service Appropriation Act, 1951".

This chapter may be cited as the "Labor-Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1951".

CHAPTER VI—DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

TITLE I

RESEARCH AND MARKETING ACT OF 1946

To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of section 9 of title I and title II of the Act of August 14, 1946, as amended (7 U. S. C. 427, 427h, 427j, 1621–1629), as follows:

For payments to States, Territories, and Puerto Rico for agricultural experiment stations pursuant to section 9 of the Bankhead-Jones Act approved June 29, 1935, as amended by the Act of August 14, 1946, $5,000,000;

For the improvement and development, independently or through cooperation among Federal and State agencies, and others, of a sound and efficient system for the distribution and marketing of agricultural products pursuant to the "Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946" (title II of the Act of August 14, 1946, as amended), including the objects for which funds are available for titles II and III of such Act of August

14, 1946, $6,000,000: *Provided,* That not less than $650,000 of this amount shall be available for contracts in accordance with the provisions of section 205 of said Act: *Provided further,* That the Secretary may make available to any bureau, office, or agency of the Department such amounts from this appropriation as may be necessary to carry out the functions for which it is made (but amounts made available to the Office of the Secretary, Office of the Solicitor, and Office of Information, shall not exceed those which the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives of the Department, shall determine), and any such amounts shall be in addition to amounts transferred or otherwise made available to other appropriation items of the Department: *Provided further,* That no part of this appropriation shall be available for work relating to fish or shellfish or any product thereof, except for the support of equitable transportation rates before Federal agencies concerned with such rates and for development of foreign markets.

In all, $11,000,000: *Provided,* That no part of this appropriation shall be used for beginning construction of any building costing in excess of $15,000, except that a poultry breeding house may be constructed at Purdue University at a cost to this appropriation of not to exceed $29,000.

To enable the Secretary to improve and develop, inde-

pendently or through cooperation among Federal and State agencies, and others, a sound and efficient system for the distribution and marketing of agricultural products under the provisions of title II of the Act of August 14, 1946, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1621–1629), including the objects for which funds are available for titles II and III of such Act of August 14, 1946, $6,000,000: Provided, That not less than $650,000 of this amount shall be available for contracts in accordance with the provisions of section 205 of said Act: Provided further, That the Secretary may make available to any bureau, office, or agency of the Department such amounts from this appropriation as may be necessary to carry out the functions for which it is made (but amounts made available to the Office of the Secretary, Office of the Solicitor, and Office of Information, shall not exceed those which the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives of the Department, shall determine), and any such amounts shall be in addition to amounts transferred or otherwise made available to other appropriation items of the Department: Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for work relating to fish or shellfish or any product thereof, except for the support of equitable transportation rates before Federal agencies concerned with such rates and for development of foreign markets.

BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

For necessary expenses in carrying out the provisions of the Act establishing the Bureau of Agricultural Economics (5 U. S. C. 673) and related Acts, as follows:

Economic investigations: For conducting investigations and for acquiring and diffusing useful information among the people of the United States, relative to agricultural production, distribution, land utilization, and conservation in their broadest aspects, including farm management and practice, utilization of farm and food products, purchasing of farm supplies, farm population and rural life, farm labor, farm finance, insurance and taxation, adjustments in production to probable demand for the different farm and food products; land ownership and values, farm structures, costs, prices and income in their relation to agriculture, including causes for their variations and trends, ~~$2,600,000~~ *$2,720,000*: *Provided,* That no part of the funds herein appropriated or made available to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics under the heading "Economic investigations" shall be used for State and county land-use planning, for conducting cultural surveys, or for the maintenance of regional offices.

Crop and livestock estimates: For collecting, compiling, abstracting, analyzing, summarizing, interpreting, and publishing data relating to agriculture, including crop and livestock estimates, acreage, yield, grades, staples of cotton,

stocks, and value of farm crops and numbers, grades, and value of livestock and livestock products on farms, production, distribution, and consumption of turpentine and rosin pursuant to the Act of August 15, 1935 (5 U. S. C. 556b), and for the collection and publication of statistics of peanuts as provided by the Act approved June 24, 1936, as amended May 12, 1938 (7 U. S. C. 951–957), ~~and data on farm construction as provided by title V of the Housing Act of 1949 (Public Law 171),~~ ~~$2,725,000~~ *$2,904,000*: *Provided*, That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be available for any expense incident to ascertaining, collating, or publishing a report stating the intention of farmers as to the acreage to be planted in cotton, or for estimates of apple production for other than the commercial crop.

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR

For necessary expenses of the Office of Administrator, including the purchase of one passenger motor vehicle, travel and subsistence expenses of ~~Advisory Committee~~ *advisory committees* authorized by title III of the Act of August 14, 1946 (7 U. S. C. 1628–1629), and the maintenance, operation, and furnishing of facilities and services at the Agricultural Research Center, $600,000: *Provided*, That the appropriation current at the time services are rendered may be reimbursed (by advance credits or reimbursements

based on estimated or actual charges) from applicable appropriations, to cover the charges, including handling and other related services, for equipment rentals (including depreciation, maintenance, and repairs); for services, supplies, equipment, and material furnished: *Provided further*, That of the several appropriations of the Agricultural Research Administration, not to exceed $15,000 shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706 (a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as amended by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a): *Provided further*, That the several appropriations of the Agricultural Research Administration shall be available for the construction, alteration, and repair of buildings and improvements: *Provided, however*, That unless otherwise provided, the cost of constructing any one building (excepting headhouses connecting greenhouses) shall not exceed $5,000, the total amount for construction of buildings costing more than $2,500 each shall be within the limits of the estimates submitted and approved therefor, and the cost of altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed $2,500 or 2 per centum of the cost of the building as certified by the Research Administrator, whichever is greater.

~~WORKING CAPITAL FUND, AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH CENTER~~

~~For the establishment of a working capital fund, to be available without fiscal year limitation, for expenses necessary for furnishing facilities and services by the Agricultural Research Center to Government agencies, $300,000. Said fund shall be reimbursed from applicable appropriations or other funds to cover the charges for such facilities and services, including handling and related charges, for equipment rentals (including depreciation, maintenance, and repairs), for supplies, equipment and materials, stores of which may be maintained at the Center, and for building construction, alterations, and repair, and applicable appropriations or other funds may also be charged their proportionate share of the necessary general expenses of the Center not covered by the annual appropriation.~~

RESEARCH ON STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL AGRICULTURAL MATERIALS

For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to carry out his responsibilities under section 7 (b) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act of July 23, 1946 (50 U. S. C. 98f), $399,000, including not to exceed $30,000 for alterations at the Eastern Regional Research

Laboratory, Wyndmoor, Pennsylvania, to provide pilot plant facilities for tannin extraction, and such amount shall be in addition to amounts otherwise available for alterations.

RESEARCH ON AGRICULTURAL PROBLEMS OF ALASKA

For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to conduct research into the basic agricultural needs and problems of the Territory of Alaska, through such agencies of the Department as he may designate, independently or in cooperation with appropriate agencies of the Territory of Alaska, ~~$260,000~~ *$280,000.*

OFFICE OF EXPERIMENT STATIONS

Payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico

For payments to the States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico to be paid quarterly in advance *where applicable,* to carry into effect the provisions of the following Acts relating to agricultural experiment stations:

Hatch, Adams, Purnell, Bankhead-Jones, and related Acts: Hatch Act, the Act approved March 2, 1887 (7 U. S. C. 362, 363, 365, 368, 377–379), $720,000; Adams Act, the Act approved March 16, 1906 (7 U. S. C. 369), $720,000; Purnell Act, the Act approved February 24, 1925 (7 U. S. C. 361, 366, 370, 371, 373–376, 380, 382), $2,880,000; Bankhead-Jones Act, title I of the Act approved June 29, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 427–427g), ~~$2,863,708~~ *Sections 3 and 5, $2,863,708, and sections 9 and 11*

of said Act as added by the Act of August 14, 1946 (7 U. S. C. 427h, 427j), including administration by the Office of Experiment Stations in the United States Department of Agriculture, $5,000,000, no part of which latter amount shall be used for beginning construction of any building costing in excess of $15,000, except that a poultry breeding house may be constructed at Purdue University at a cost to this appropriation of not to exceed $29,000; Hawaii, the Act approved May 16, 1928 (7 U. S. C. 386–386b), extending the benefits of certain Acts of Congress to the Territory of Hawaii, $90,000; Alaska, the Act approved February 23, 1929 (7 U. S. C. 386c), extending the benefits of the Hatch Act to the Territory of Alaska, $15,000, and the provisions of section 2 of the Act approved June 20, 1936 (7 U. S. C. 369a), extending the benefits of the Adams and Purnell Acts to the Territory of Alaska, ~~$27,500~~ *$37,500*; Puerto Rico, the Act approved March 4, 1931, as amended (7 U. S. C. 386d–386f), extending the benefits of certain Acts of Congress to Puerto Rico, $90,000; in all, payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico, ~~$7,406,208~~ *$12,416,208*.

Salaries and Expenses

For necessary expenses in connection with administration of grants and coordination of research with States, to carry out the provisions of the Acts approved March 2,

1887, March 16, 1906, February 24, 1925, May 16, 1928, February 23, 1929, March 4, 1931, and June 20, 1936, and Acts amendatory thereto (7 U. S. C. 361–363, 365–383, 386–386f), and title I of the Act approved June 29, 1935, as amended by the Act of ~~December~~ *September* 21, 1944 (7 U. S. C. 427–427g), relative to their administration and for the administration of an agricultural experiment station in Puerto Rico, ~~$237,500~~ *$252,500*; and the Secretary shall prescribe the form of the annual financial statement required under the above Acts, ascertain whether the expenditures are in accordance with their provisions, coordinate the research work of the State agricultural colleges and experiment stations in the lines authorized in said Acts with research of the Department in similar lines, and make report thereon to Congress.

Federal Experiment Station, Puerto Rico

For expenses necessary to establish and maintain an agricultural experiment station in Puerto Rico, including the preparation, illustration, and distribution of reports and bulletins, and not to exceed $24,950 to replace water supply line and increase capacity of reservoir, $175,000.

BUREAU OF HUMAN NUTRITION AND HOME ECONOMICS

For necessary expenses in connection with conducting investigations of the relative utility and economy of agricul-

tural products for food, clothing, and other uses in the home, with special suggestions of plans and methods for the more effective utilization of such products for these purposes, and such economic investigations, including housing and household buying, as have for their purpose the improvement of the rural home, for coordinating nutrition services made available by Federal, State, and other agencies, and for disseminating useful information on these subjects, ~~$1,500,000~~ *$1,763,200.*

BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY

Salaries and Expenses

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Act, as amended, establishing a Bureau of Animal Industry, and related Acts, and for investigations concerned with the livestock and meat industries and the domestic raising of fur-bearing animals, as follows:

Animal husbandry: For investigations and experiments in animal husbandry and animal and poultry feeding and breeding, and for carrying out the purposes of section 101 (b) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U. S. C. 429) authorizing cooperation with State authorities in the administration of regulations for the improvement of poultry, poultry products, and hatcheries, ~~$2,250,000~~ *$2,319,000.*

Diseases of animals: For scientific investigations of diseases of animals, and for investigations of tuberculin,

serums, antitoxins, and analogous products, ~~$1,300,000~~ *$1,350,000*, including not to exceed $8,000 for the purchase of land and appurtenances near Ames, Iowa, for continuation of a hog cholera experiment station.

Animal disease control and eradication: For the control and eradication, including inspections and quarantines, of tuberculosis and paratuberculosis of animals, avian tuberculosis, Bang's disease of cattle, scabies in sheep and cattle, southern cattle ticks, hog cholera and related swine diseases, and dourine in horses, and inspection and quarantine work; for supervision of the transportation of livestock, including administration of the twenty-eight-hour law; for inspection of vessels; and for carrying out the provisions of the Act of March 4, 1913 (21 U. S. C. 151–158), relating to veterinary biological products, $7,950,000~~, including not to exceed $30,000 for the acquisition of land and construction of four buildings for inspection of livestock at Canadian border ports of entry~~: *Provided*, That no payment hereunder as compensation for any cattle condemned for slaughter for tuberculosis, paratuberculosis, or Bang's disease shall exceed (1) $25 for any grade animal or $50 for any purebred animal, (2) one-third of the difference between the appraised value and the value of salvage thereof, or (3) the amount paid or to be paid by the State or other cooperating agency, and no payment hereunder shall be made for any animal if

at the time of test or condemnation it shall belong to or be upon the premises of any person, firm, or corporation to which it has been sold, shipped, or delivered for slaughter: *Provided further,* That inspection service shall be maintained at all stockyards having such service during the current fiscal year.

Meat inspection: For carrying out the provisions of laws relating to Federal inspection of meat and meat-food products, $12,800,000.

Marketing Agreements, Hog Cholera Virus and Serum

The sum of $49,300 of the appropriation made by section 12 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, approved May 12, 1933 (7 U. S. C. 612), is hereby made available during the fiscal year for which appropriations are herein made to carry into effect sections 56 to 60, inclusive, of the Act approved August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 851–855).

Eradication of Foot-and-Mouth and Other Contagious Diseases of Animals

For expenses necessary in the arrest and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, rinderpest, contagious pleuropneumonia, or other contagious or infectious diseases of animals, or European fowl pest and similar diseases in poultry, including the payment of claims growing out of past and future purchases and destruction of animals (including poultry) affected by or exposed to, or of materials contami-

nated by or exposed to, any such disease, wherever found and irrespective of ownership, under like or substantially similar circumstances, when such owner has complied with all lawful quarantine regulations; and for foot-and-mouth disease and rinderpest programs undertaken pursuant to the provisions of the Act of February 28, 1947 (21 U. S. C. Supp. II, 114b–114d), and the Act of May 29, 1884, as amended (7 U. S. C., 391; 21 U. S. C., 111–122), including expenses in accordance with section 2 of said Act of February 28, 1947, the Secretary may transfer from other appropriations or funds available to the bureaus, corporations, or agencies of the Department such sums as he may deem necessary, to be available only in an emergency which threatens the livestock or poultry industry of the country, and any unexpended balances of funds transferred under this head in the next preceding fiscal year shall be merged with such transferred amounts: *Provided*, That, except for payments made pursuant to said Act of February 28, 1947, the payment for such animals hereafter purchased may be made on appraisement based on the meat, egg-production, dairy, or breeding value, but in case of appraisement based on breeding value no appraisement of any such animal shall exceed three times its meat, egg-production, or dairy value, and, except in case of an extraordinary emergency, to be determined by the Secretary, the payment by the United

States Government for any such animals shall not exceed one-half of any such appraisements: *Provided further,* That poultry may be appraised in groups when the basis for appraisal is the same for each bird.

BUREAU OF DAIRY INDUSTRY

For necessary expenses in carrying out the provisions of the Act of May 29, 1924 (7 U. S. C. 401–404), including investigations, experiments, and demonstrations in dairy industry, for carrying out the applicable provisions of the Act of May 9, 1902 (26 U. S. C. 2325, 2326 (c)), relating to process or renovated butter, as amended, and the Act of May 23, 1908 (21 U. S. C. 94 (a)), insofar as it relates to the exportation of process or renovated butter, *not to exceed $100,000 for construction of ten or more housing units for employees,* ~~$1,600,000~~ *$1,735,000.*

BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL AND INDUSTRIAL CHEMISTRY

For expenses necessary for investigations, experiments, and demonstrations established under the provisions of section 202 (a) to 202 (e), inclusive, of title II of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U. S. C. 1292); for the development of new and extended food, feed, and industrial uses for agricultural commodities, both plant and animal, and potential replacement crops, and processing, biological, chemical, physical, pharmacological, toxicological, and technological investigation thereof, ~~$7,750,000~~

$8,500,000: Provided, That not to exceed $20,000 shall be available for the alteration to buildings of the Naval Stores Station at Olustee, Florida.

BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY, SOILS, AND AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING

For expenses necessary for investigations, experiments, and demonstrations in connection with the production and improvement of farm crops and other plants and plant industries; soils and soil-plant relationships, and the application of engineering principles to agriculture; plant diseases, including nematodes, and methods for their prevention and control; plant and plant-disease collections, and surveys; the distribution of weeds and means for their control; methods of handling, processing, transportation, and storage of agricultural products; and plants in foreign countries and our possessions for introduction into the United States, including explorations and surveys, and propagation and testing in this country; and for the operation and maintenance of airplanes, as follows:

Field crops: For investigations on the production, improvement, and diseases of alfalfa, barley, clover, corn, cotton, flax, grasses, oats, rice, rubber crops, sorghums, soybeans, sugar beets, sugarcane, tobacco, wheat, and other field crops, ~~$3,400,000~~ *$3,475,000.*

Fruit, vegetable, and specialty crops: For investiga-

tions on the production, improvement, and diseases of fruit, vegetable, nut, ornamental, and related crops and plants, ~~$2,950,000~~ *$3,075,000*.

Forest diseases: For investigations of diseases of forest and shade trees and forest products, and methods for their control, ~~$450,000~~ *$455,000*.

Soils, fertilizers, and irrigation: For investigations of soil management methods to increase and maintain productivity, including fertilization, liming, crop rotations, tillage practices, and other means of improving soils; fertilizers, fertilizer ingredients, and their improvement for agricultural use; soil management and crop production on dry and irrigated lands, and the quality of irrigation water and its use by crops; and for the classification of soils in a national system and indication of their extent and distribution on maps, and determination of their potential productivity under adapted cropping and improved soil management, ~~$2,680,000~~ *$2,767,500*, including not to exceed $100,000 for construction or acquisition of buildings, facilities, and equipment for the station at Brawley, California.

Agricultural engineering: For investigations involving the application of engineering principles to agriculture, including farm power and equipment, rural water supply and sanitation, and rural electrification; farm buildings and

their appurtenances and buildings for processing and storing farm products, and the preparation and distribution of building plans and specifications; cotton ginning, and other engineering problems relating to the production, processing, transportation, and storage of agricultural products; ~~$1,120,000~~ *$1,140,000*.

National Arboretum: For the maintenance and development of the National Arboretum established under the provisions of the Act approved March 4, 1927 (20 U. S. C. 191–194), $152,700.

BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY AND PLANT QUARANTINE

Salaries and Expenses

For expenses necessary for investigations, experiments, demonstrations, and surveys for the promotion of economic entomology, for investigating and ascertaining the best means of destroying insects and related pests injurious to agriculture, for importing useful and beneficial insects and bacterial, fungal, and other diseases of insects and related pests, for investigating and ascertaining the best means of destroying insects affecting man and animals, and the best ways of utilizing beneficial insects, for carrying into effect the provisions of the Plant Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912, as amended (7 U. S. C. 151–167), the Honey Bee Act (7 U. S. C. 281–283), the Insect Pest Act (7 U. S. C. 141–144), the Mexican Border Act (7 U. S. C. 149),

and the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U. S. C. 147a), as amended, authorizing the eradication, control, and prevention of spread of injurious insects and plant pests; including the operation and maintenance of airplanes and the purchase of not to exceed two, as follows:

Insect investigations: For the investigation of insects affecting fruits, grapes, nuts, trees, shrubs, forests and forest products, truck and garden crops, cereal, forage and range crops, cotton, tobacco, sugar plants, ornamental and other plants and agricultural products, household possessions, and man and animals; for bee culture and apiary management; for classifying, identifying, and collecting information to determine the distribution and abundance of insects; for investigations in connection with introduction of natural enemies of injurious insects and related pests and for the exchange with other countries of useful and beneficial insects and other arthropods; for developing methods, equipment, and apparatus to aid in enforcing plant quarantines and in the eradication and control of insect pests and plant diseases; and for investigations of insecticides and fungicides, including methods of their manufacture and use and the effects of their application, ~~$4,100,000~~ *$4,165,000*: *Provided*, That of the amount allotted for oriental fruitfly, not to exceed $250,000 may be used for contracts with public or private agencies for research without regard to provisions of

existing law, and the amounts obligated for contract research shall remain available until expended~~: *Provided further, That* $50,000 shall be transferred to applicable appropriations of the Public Health Service for investigations and studies of effects of insecticidal and fungicidal residue on human health~~.

Insect and plant-disease control: For carrying out operations or measures to eradicate, suppress, control, or to prevent or retard the spread of Japanese beetle, sweetpotato weevil, Mexican fruitflies, phony peach and peach mosaic, cereal rusts, pink bollworm and Thurberia weevil, golden nematode, citrus blackfly, white-fringed beetle, and the Hall scale, including the enforcement of quarantine regulations and cooperation with States to enforce plant quarantines as authorized by the Plant Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912, as amended (7 U. S. C. 151–167), and including the establishment of such cotton-free areas as may be necessary to stamp out any infestation of the pink bollworm as authorized by the Act of February 8, 1930 (46 Stat. 67), and for cooperation with States in the compensation of growers for losses resulting from the destruction of or for not planting potatoes and tomatoes on lands infested or exposed to infestations of the golden nematode for the purpose authorized by the Golden Nematode Act (Public Law 645, approved June 15, 1948), and for the enforcement

of domestic plant quarantines through inspection in transit, including the interception and disposition of materials found to have been transported interstate in violation of Federal plant quarantine laws or regulations, and operations under the Terminal Inspection Act (7 U. S. C. 166), ~~$4,185,900~~ *$4,651,000*: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay the cost or value of trees, farm animals, farm crops, or other property injured or destroyed, except potatoes and tomatoes as authorized under the Golden Nematode Act: *Provided further*, That, in the discretion of the Secretary, no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the control of sweetpotato weevil in any State until such State has provided cooperation necessary to accomplish this purpose, or for barberry eradication until a sum or sums at least equal to such expenditures shall have been appropriated, subscribed, or contributed by States, counties, or local authorities, or by individuals or organizations for the accomplishment of this purpose, or with respect to the golden nematode except as prescribed in section 4 of the Golden Nematode Act.

Foreign plant quarantines: For operations against the introduction of insect pests or plant diseases into the United States, including the enforcement of foreign-plant quarantines and regulations promulgated under sections 5 and 7 of the Plant Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912, as amended

(7 U. S. C. 151–167), the Insect Pest Act of 1905 (7 U. S. C. 141–144), and the Mexican Border Act of 1942 (7 U. S. C. 149), for enforcement of domestic-plant quarantines as they pertain to Territories of the United States and enforcement of regulations governing the movement of plants into and from the District of Columbia promulgated under section 15 of the Plant Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912, as amended, and for inspection and certification of plants and plant products to meet the sanitary requirements of foreign countries, as authorized in section 102 of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U. S. C. 147a), ~~$2,325,000~~ *$2,384,400.*

Control of Emergency Outbreaks of Insects and Plant Diseases

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the joint resolution approved May 9, 1938 (7 U. S. C. 148–148e), including the operation and maintenance of airplanes and the purchase of not to exceed two, and surveys and control operations in Canada in cooperation with the Canadian Government or local Canadian authorities, and the employment of Canadian citizens, ~~$850,000~~ *$2,350,000, of which $1,500,000 shall be apportioned for use pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes for the purposes of said joint resolution only to the extent that the Secretary, with the*

approval of the Bureau of the Budget, finds necessary to meet emergency conditions.

CONTROL OF FOREST PESTS

For expenses necessary for carrying out operations, measures, or surveys necessary to eradicate, suppress, control, or to prevent or retard the spread of insects or diseases which endanger forest trees on any lands in the United States, and for such quarantine measures relating thereto as may be necessary pursuant to the Plant Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912, as amended (7 U. S. C. 151–167), including the purchase (not to exceed three) and operation and maintenance of airplanes, construction and alteration of necessary buildings, not to exceed $23,500 for the purchase of one building at Greenfield, Massachusetts: *Provided,* That the cost of constructing or altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed $2,500, as follows:

Gypsy and brown-tail moths: Gypsy and brown-tail moths, pursuant to section 102 of the Act of September 21, 1944 (7 U. C. C. 147a), ~~$539,500~~ *$590,000.*

Forest Pest Control Act: For carrying out the provisions of the Act approved June 25, 1947 (16 U. S. C., Supp. I, 594–1—594–5), ~~$900,000~~ *$1,900,000, of which $1,000,000 shall be apportioned for use pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes for the purposes of said Act*

only to the extent that the Secretary, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, finds necessary to meet emergency conditions.

White pine blister rust: White pine blister rust, pursuant to the Act of April 26, 1940 (16 U. S. C. 594a), ~~$3,280,000~~ *$3,700,000*, of which amount ~~$508,750~~ *$565,350* shall be available to the Department of the Interior for the control of white pine blister rust on or endangering Federal lands under the jurisdiction of that Department or lands of Indian tribes which are under the jurisdiction of or retained under restrictions of the United States; ~~$1,727,800~~ *$1,947,150* of said amount to the Forest Service for the control of white pine blister rust on or endangering lands under its jurisdiction; and ~~$1,043,450~~ *$1,187,500* of said amount to the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine for leadership and general coordination of the entire program, method development, and for operations conducted under its direction for such control, including, but not confined to, the control of white pine blister rust on or endangering State and privately owned lands.

FOREST SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary including not to exceed $10,000 for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706 (a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as

amended by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); to experiment and make investigations and report on forestry, national forests, forest fires, and lumbering, but no part of this appropriation shall be used for any experiment or test made outside the jurisdiction of the United States; to advise the owners of woodlands as to the proper care of the same; to investigate and test American timber and timber trees and their uses, and methods for the preservative treatment of timber; to seek, through investigations and the planting of native and foreign species, suitable trees for the treeless regions; to erect necessary buildings: *Provided*, That the cost of any building purchased, erected, or as improved, exclusive of the cost (not to exceed $1,000) of constructing a water-supply shall be placed in reserve pending determination by the Sec- such building, and exclusive of the cost of any tower upon which a lookout house may be erected, shall not exceed $15,000, with the exception that any building erected, purchased, or acquired, the cost of which was $15,000 or more, may be improved out of the appropriations made under this chapter for the Forest Service by an amount not to exceed 2 per centum of the cost of such building as certified by the Chief of the Forest Service, and that not to exceed $8,000 may be expended for the installation of an elevator in the Yeon Avenue warehouse in Port-

land, Oregon; to protect, administer, and improve the national forests, including tree planting and other measures to prevent erosion, drift, surface wash, soil waste, and the formation of floods, and to conserve water; to ascertain the natural conditions upon and utilize the national forests, to transport and care for fish and game supplied to stock the national forests or the waters therein; to collate, digest, report, and illustrate the results of experiments and investigations made by the Forest Service, as follows:

General administrative expenses: For general administration, including expenses of the National Forest Reservation Commission as authorized by section 14 of the Act of March 1, 1911 (16 U. S. C. 514), $665,000.

National forest protection and management: For the administration, protection, use, maintenance, improvement, and development of the national forests, including the establishment and maintenance of forest tree nurseries, including the procurement of tree seed and nursery stock by purchase, production, or otherwise, seeding and tree planting and the care of plantations and young growth; the operation and maintenance of aircraft and the purchase of not to exceed three; the maintenance of roads and trails and the construction and maintenance of all other improvements necessary for the proper and economical administration, pro-

tection, development, and use of the national forests, including experimental areas under Forest Service administration, except that where direct purchases will be more economical than construction, improvements may be purchased; the construction (not to exceed $15,000 for any one structure), equipment, and maintenance of sanitary and recreational facilities; timber cultural operations; development and application of fish and game management plans; propagation and transplanting of plants suitable for planting on semiarid portions of the national forests; estimating and appraising of timber and other resources and development and application of plans for their effective management, sale, and use; examination, classification, surveying, and appraisal of land incident to effecting exchanges authorized by law and of lands within the boundaries of the national forests that may be opened to homestead settlement and entry under the Act of June 11, 1906, and the Act of August 10, 1912 (16 U. S. C. 506–509), as provided by the Act of March 4, 1913 (16 U. S. C. 512); investigation and establishment of water rights, including the purchase thereof or of lands or interests in lands or rights-of-way for use and protection of water rights necessary or beneficial in connection with the administration and public use of the national forests; and all expenses necessary for the use, maintenance, improvement, protection, and general administration of the national

forests, ~~$26,890,000~~ *$29,320,500*, of which not to exceed $75,000 shall be available for the purchase of three nursery sites, and not to exceed $5,000 shall be available for the purchase of administrative sites.

Cooperative range improvements: For artificial revegetation, construction, and maintenance of range improvements, control of rodents, and eradication of poisonous and noxious plants on national forest lands, pursuant to section 12 of the Act of April 24, 1950 (Public Law Numbered 478), $750,000, to remain available until expended.

Fighting forest fires: For fighting and preventing forest fires on or threatening lands under Forest Service administration, including lands under contract for purchase or in process of condemnation for Forest Service purposes, and for liquidation of obligations incurred in the preceding fiscal year for such purpose, $6,000,000, of which $2,500,000 shall be apportioned for use, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, only to the extent that the Secretary, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, finds necessary to meet emergency conditions.

Forest research: For forest research in accordance with the provisions of sections 1, 2, 7, 8, 9, and 10 of the Act approved May 22, 1928, as amended (16 U. S. C. 581, 581a, 581f–581i), including the construction and maintenance of improvements, as follows:

Forest and range management investigations: Fire, silvicultural, watershed, and other forest investigations and experiments under said section 2, as amended, and investigations and experiments to develop improved methods of management of forest and other ranges under section 7, at forest or range experiment stations or elsewhere, $2,995,000.

Forest products: Experiments, investigations, and tests of forest products under section 8, at the Forest Products Laboratory, or elsewhere, $1,300,000, *of which $30,000 shall be made available for the establishment of a forest utilization service unit in the Southwest.*

Forest resources investigations: A comprehensive forest survey under section 9, and investigations in forest economics under section 10, ~~$880,000~~ *$1,000,000.*

FOREST DEVELOPMENT ROADS AND TRAILS

For expenses necessary for carrying out the provisions of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act approved November 9, 1921, as amended (23 U. S. C. 23, 23a), relating to forest development roads and trails, including the construction, reconstruction, and maintenance of roads and trails on experimental areas under Forest Service administration, ~~$10,348,000~~ *$12,000,000,* which sum is authorized to be appropriated by the Act of June 29, 1948 (Public Law 834), to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That this appropriation shall be available for the rental, purchase,

construction, or alteration of buildings necessary for the storage and repair of equipment and supplies used for road and trail construction and maintenance, but the total cost of any such building purchased, altered, or constructed under this authorization shall not exceed $15,000 with the exception that any building erected, purchased, or acquired, the cost of which was $15,000 or more, may be improved within any fiscal year by an amount not to exceed 2 per centum of the cost of such buildings certified by the Chief of the Forest Service.

ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR NATIONAL FORESTS

Weeks Act: For the acquisition of forest lands under the provisions of the Act approved March 1, 1911, as amended (16 U. S. C. 513–519, 521), ~~$100,000~~ *$401,000*, to be available only for payment toward the purchase price of any lands acquired, including the cost of surveys in connection with such acquisition: *Provided*, That no part of such funds shall be used for the purchase of lands in the counties of Adair, Cherokee, and Sequoyah, in the State of Oklahoma, without the specific approval of the Board of County Commissioners of the county in which such lands are situated.

Superior National Forest: For the acquisition of forest land within the Superior National Forest, Minnesota, under the provisions of the Act approved June 22, 1948 (Public Law 733), $150,000, to remain available until expended.

Special Acts: For the acquisition of land to facilitate the control of soil erosion and flood damage originating within the exterior boundaries of the following national forests, in accordance with the provisions of the following Acts authorizing annual appropriations of forest receipts for such purposes, and in not to exceed the following amounts from such receipts: Uinta and Wasatch National Forests, Utah, Act of August 26, 1935 (Public Law 337), as amended, $40,000; Cache National Forest, Utah, Act of May 11, 1938 (Public Law 505), as amended, $10,000; San Bernardino and Cleveland National Forests, Riverside County, California, Act of June 15, 1938 (Public Law 634), as amended, $22,000; Nevada and Toiyabe National Forests, Nevada, Act of June 25, 1938 (Public Law 748), as amended, $10,000; Angeles National Forest, California, Act of June 11, 1940 (Public Law 591), $20,000; Cleveland National Forest, San Diego County, California, Act of June 11, 1940 (Public Law 589), $5,000; Sequoia National Forest, California, Act of June 17, 1940 (Public Law 637), $35,000; in all $142,000.

FOREST-FIRE COOPERATION

For cooperation with the various States or other appropriate agencies in forest-fire prevention and suppression and the protection of timbered and cut-over lands in accordance with the provisions of sections 1, 2, and 3 of the Act ap-

proved June 7, 1924, as amended (16 U. S. C. 564–566), $9,500,000.

FARM AND OTHER PRIVATE FORESTRY COOPERATION

To enable the Secretary through the Forest Service to advise timberland owners and associations, wood-using industries or other appropriate agencies in the application of forest management principles to federally owned lands leased to States and to private forest lands, so as to attain sustained-yield management, the conservation of the timber resources, the productivity of forest lands, and the stabilization of employment and economic continuance of forest industries, and to carry into effect, through such agencies of the Department as he may designate, the provisions of the Cooperative Farm Forestry Act, approved May 18, 1937 (16 U. S. C. 568b), (not to exceed ~~$490,382~~ *$785,034*) and the provisions of sections 4 (not to exceed ~~$671,392~~ *$449,200*) and 5 (not to exceed ~~$138,226~~ *$65,766*) of the Act approved June 7, 1924 (16 U. S. C. 567–568), and Acts supplementary thereto; $1,300,000.

FLOOD CONTROL

For expenses necessary, in accordance with the Flood Control Act, approved June 22, 1936 (Public Law 738), as amended and supplemented, to make preliminary examinations and surveys, and to perform works of improvement, and to plan the agricultural phases of the development of

the Columbia Basin area in accordance with the provisions of laws relating to the activities of the Department, to remain available until expended, ~~$10,750,000~~ *$9,880,000*, with which shall be merged the unexpended balances of funds heretofore appropriated or transferred to the Department for flood-control purposes: *Provided*, That no part of such funds shall be used for the purchase of lands in the Yazoo and Little Tallahatchie watersheds without specific approval of the county board of supervisors of the county in which such lands are situated, nor shall any part of such funds be used for the purchase of lands in the counties of Adair, Cherokee, and Sequoyah, in the State of Oklahoma, without the specific approval of the Board of County Commissioners of the county in which such lands are situated.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Act approved April 27, 1935 (16 U. S. C. 590a–590f), which provides for a national program of erosion control and soil and water conservation, furnishing of subsistence to employees, operation and maintenance of aircraft, and the purchase and erection or alteration of permanent buildings: *Provided*, That the cost of any building purchased, erected, or as improved, exclusive of the cost of constructing a water supply or sanitary system and connecting the same with

any such building, shall not exceed $2,500 except where buildings are acquired in conjunction with land being purchased for other purposes and except for eight buildings to be constructed at a cost not to exceed $15,000 per building: *Provided further*, That no money appropriated in this chapter shall be available for the construction of any such building on land not owned by the Government: *Provided further*, That in the State of Missouri where the State has established a central State agency authorized to enter into agreements with the United States or any of its agencies on policies and general programs for the saving of its soil by the extension of Federal aid to any soil conservation district in such State, the agreements made by or on behalf of the United States with any such soil conservation district shall have the prior approval of such central State agency before they shall become effective as to such district, as follows:

~~SALARIES AND EXPENSES~~

Soil conservation research: For research and investigations into the character, cause, extent, history, and effects of erosion, soil and moisture depletion and methods of soil and water conservation (including the construction and hydrologic phases of farm irrigation and land drainage, and water regulation to conserve the soil and reduce fire hazards in the Everglades region of Florida, except that expenditures for all

work in the Everglades region shall be limited to a sum not in excess of funds made available for such work by the State of Florida, or political subdivisions thereof); and for construction, operation, and maintenance of experimental watersheds, stations, laboratories, plots, and installations, $1,500,000.

Soil conservation operations: For carrying out preventive measures to conserve soil and water, including such special measures as may be necessary to prevent floods and the siltation of reservoirs, and including the improvement of farm irrigation and land drainage, the establishment and operation of conservation nurseries, the making of conservation plans and surveys, and the dissemination of information, ~~$52,900,000~~ *$52,400,000*: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation may be expended for soil and water conservation operations in demonstration projects: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $5,000 may be used for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706 (a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as amended by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a).

LAND UTILIZATION AND RETIREMENT OF SUBMARGINAL LAND

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1010–1012), and the provisions

of the Act approved August 11, 1945 (7 U. S. C. 1011 note), ~~$1,490,000~~ *$1,665,175.*

WATER CONSERVATION AND UTILIZATION PROJECTS

For expenses necessary to carry into effect the functions of the Department under the Acts of May 10, 1939 (53 Stat. 685, 719), October 14, 1940 (16 U. S. C. 590y–z–10), as amended and supplemented, and June 28, 1949 (Public Law 132), relating to the construction, operation, and maintenance of water conservation and utilization projects, to remain available until expended, ~~$400,000~~ *$500,000*, which sum shall be merged with the unexpended balances of funds heretofore appropriated or transferred to said Department for the purposes of said Act.

PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION

CONSERVATION AND USE OF AGRICULTURAL LAND RESOURCES

To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, approved February 29, 1936, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590g–590q), including not to exceed $6,000 for the preparation and display of exhibits, including such displays at State, interstate, and international fairs within the United States; ~~$282,500,000~~ *$283,000,000*, to remain available until December 31 of the next succeeding fiscal year for compliance with the program of soil-building

practices and soil- and water-conserving practices authorized under this head in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1950, carried out during the period July 1, 1949, to December 31, 1950, inclusive: *Provided*, That not to exceed $25,500,000 of the total sum provided under this head shall be available during the current fiscal year for salaries and other administrative expenses for carrying out such program, the cost of aerial photographs, however, not to be charged to such limitation; but not more than $5,000,000 shall be transferred to the appropriation account, "Administrative expenses, section 392, Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938": *Provided further*, That payments to claimants hereunder may be made upon the certificate of the claimant, which certificate shall be in such form as the Secretary may prescribe, that he has carried out the conservation practice or practices and has complied with all other requirements as conditions for such payments and that the statements and information contained in the application for payment are correct and true, to the best of his knowledge and belief, under the penalties of title 18, United States Code: *Provided further*, That none of the funds herein appropriated or made available for the functions assigned to the Agricultural Adjustment Agency pursuant to the Executive Order Numbered 9069, of February 23, 1942, shall be used to pay the salaries or expenses of any regional

information employees or any State information employees, but this shall not preclude the answering of inquiries or supplying of information at the county level to individual farmers: *Provided further*, That such amount shall be available for salaries and other administrative expenses in connection with the formulation and administration of the 1951 program of soil-building practices and soil- and water-conserving practices, under the Act of February 29, 1936, as amended (amounting to $285,000,000, including administration, and formulated on the basis of a distribution of the funds available for payments and grants among the several States in accordance with their conservation needs as determined by the Secretary, except that the proportion allocated to any State shall not be reduced more than 15 per centum from the distribution for the next preceding program year, and no participant shall receive more than $2,500); but the payments or grants under such programs shall be conditioned upon the utilization of land with respect to which such payments or grants are to be made in conformity with farming practices which will encourage and provide for soil-building and soil- and water-conserving practices in the most practical and effective manner and adapted to conditions in the several States, as determined and approved by the State committees appointed pursuant to section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic

Allotment Act, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590h (b)), for the respective States~~: *Provided further,* That not to exceed 5 per centum of the allocation for the agricultural conservation program for any county may be allotted to the Soil Conservation Service for services of its technicians in formulating and carrying out the agricultural conservation program and the funds so allotted shall not be utilized by the Soil Conservation Service for any purpose other than technical and other assistance in such county~~: *Provided further,* That such amounts shall be available for the purchase of seeds, fertilizers, lime, trees, or any other farming materials, or any soil-terracing services, and making grants thereof to agricultural producers to aid them in carrying out farming practices approved by the Secretary under programs provided for herein: *Provided further,* That no part of any funds available to the Department, or any bureau, office, corporation, or other agency constituting a part of such Department, shall be used in the current fiscal year for the payment of salary or travel expenses of any person who has been convicted of violating the Act entitled "An Act to prevent pernicious political activities", approved August 2, 1939, as amended, or who has been found in accordance with the provisions of title 18, United States Code, section 1913, to have violated or attempted to violate such section which prohibits the use of Federal appropria-

tions for the payment of personal services or other expenses designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress to favor or oppose any legislation or appropriation by Congress except upon request of any Member or through the proper official channels.

ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS AND MARKETING QUOTAS

To enable the Secretary to formulate and carry out acreage allotment and marketing quota programs pursuant to the provisions of title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1301–1393), $32,300,000, of which not more than $5,500,000 shall be transferred to the appropriation account "Administrative expenses, section 392, Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938": *Provided,* That $4,000,000 of this appropriation shall be placed in reserve pending determination by the Secretary as to necessity of marketing quotas on the 1951 crops of wheat, corn, and rice, to be released in such amounts and at such times as determined by the Bureau of the Budget to be necessary in connection with such marketing quotas.

SUGAR ACT

To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948 (7 U. S. C. 1101–1160), ~~$60,000,000~~ *$63,750,000,* to remain available until June 30 of the next succeeding fiscal year: *Provided,* That expenditures (including transfers) from this appropriation for other

than payments to sugar producers shall not exceed $1,500,000.

NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT

To enable the Secretary to carry out the provisions of the National School Lunch Act (42 U. S. C. 1751–1760), $83,500,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for nonfood assistance under section 5 of said Act.

MARKETING SERVICES

For expenses necessary in conducting investigations, experiments, and demonstrations, as follows:

Market news service: For collecting, publishing, and distributing, by telegraph, mail, or otherwise, timely information on the market supply and demand, commercial movement, location, disposition, quality, condition, and market prices of livestock, meats, fish, and animal products, dairy and poultry products (including broilers), fruits and vegetables, peanuts and their products, grain, hay, feeds, cottonseed, and seeds, and other agricultural products, ~~$2,050,000~~ *$2,187,000*.

Market inspection of farm products: For the investigation and certification, in one or more jurisdictions, to shippers and other interested parties of the class, quality, and condition of any agricultural commodity or food product, whether raw, dried, canned, or otherwise processed, and any

product containing an agricultural commodity or derivative thereof when offered for interstate shipment or when received at such important central markets as the Secretary may from time to time designate, or at points which may be conveniently reached therefrom under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, including payment of such fees as will be reasonable and as nearly as may be to cover the cost for the service rendered, $780,000.

Marketing farm products: For acquiring and diffusing among the people of the United States useful information relative to the needed supplies, standardization, classification, grading, preparation for market, handling, transportation, storage, and marketing of farm and food products, including the demonstration and promotion of the use of uniform standards of classification of American farm and food products throughout the world, for making analyses of cotton fiber as provided by the Act of April 7, 1941 (7 U. S. C. 473d), for carrying out the provisions of section 201 (a) to 201 (d), inclusive, of title II of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U. S. C. 1291), including not to exceed $25,000 for employment at rates not to exceed $100 per diem, pursuant to the second sentence of section 706 (a), of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as amended by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), and not to exceed $20,000 for transportation and other

necessary expenses including not to exceed $10 per diem of persons serving without compensation while away from their homes or regular places of business, $1,260,000: *Provided,* That the Secretary may make available to any bureau, office, or agency of the Department such amounts from this appropriation as may be necessary to carry out the functions for which this appropriation is made, and any such amounts shall be in addition to amounts transferred or otherwise made available to appropriation items in this Act.

Tobacco Acts: To carry into effect the provisions of the Act to establish and promote the use of standards of classification for tobacco, to provide and maintain an official tobacco-inspection service, approved August 23, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 511–511q), the Act to provide for the collection and publication of statistics of tobacco by the Department, approved January 14, 1929 (7 U. S. C. 501–508), as amended, and the Act to prohibit the exportation of tobacco seed and plants, approved June 5, 1940 (7 U. S. C. 516), $1,660,500.

Cotton Statistics, Classing, Standards and Futures Acts: To carry into effect the provisions of the Act authorizing the Secretary to collect and publish statistics of the grade and staple length of cotton, approved March 3, 1927, as amended by the Act of April 13, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 471–

476), and to perform the duties imposed upon him by chapter 14 of the Internal Revenue Code relating to cotton futures (26 U. S. C. 1920–1935), and to carry into effect the provisions of the United States Cotton Standards Act, approved March 4, 1923, as amended (7 U. S. C. 51–65), $1,675,000.

Marketing regulatory Acts: For expenses necessary to carry into effect the provisions of the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, as amended (7 U. S. C. 499a–499r), the Act to prevent the destruction or dumping of farm produce (7 U. S. C. 491–497), the Act to provide standards for baskets and containers for fruits and vegetables, as amended (15 U. S. C. 251–256), the Act to fix standards for hampers, round stave baskets, and splint baskets for fruits and vegetables (15 U. S. C. 257–257i), the Act to provide export standards for apples and pears (7 U. S. C. 581–589), the United States Grain Standards Act (7 U. S. C. 71–87), the United States Warehouse Act (7 U. S. C. 241–273), the Federal Seed Act (7 U. S. C. 1551–1610), the Packers and Stockyards Act, as amended (7 U. S. C. 181–229), the Naval Stores Act (7 U. S. C. 91–99), and the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U. S. C. 135–135k), ~~$3,550,000~~ *$3,495,000*.

COMMODITY EXCHANGE AUTHORITY

To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1–17a), $650,000.

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION

For operating and administrative expenses, ~~$6,854,000~~ *$7,204,000.*

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

To carry into effect the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended (7 U. S. C. 901–915), as follows:

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For administrative expenses, including not to exceed $500 for financial and credit reports, ~~$8,150,000,~~ *$8,750,000.*

LOAN AUTHORIZATION

For loans in accordance with said Act, and for carrying out the provisions of section 7 thereof, to be borrowed from the Secretary of the Treasury in accordance with the provisions of section 3 (a) of said Act as follows: Rural electrification program, $350,000,000; and rural telephone program, ~~$25,000,000~~ *$40,000,000*; and additional amounts, not to exceed a total of $150,000,000 (including the uncommitted balance available as a carry-over from the fiscal year 1950),

may be borrowed for the rural electrification program under the same terms and conditions if and to the extent that the Secretary of Agriculture shall certify, from time to time, to the Secretary of the Treasury that such additional amounts are required during the fiscal year 1951, under the then existing conditions, for the expeditious and orderly development of the program.

FARMERS' HOME ADMINISTRATION

To carry into effect the provisions of titles I, II, and the related provisions of title IV of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1000–1031), the Farmers' Home Administration Act of 1946 (7 U. S. C. 1001, note; 31 U. S. C. 82h; 12 U. S. C. 371; 35 D. C. Code 535; 60 Stat. 1062–1080); the Act of July 30, 1946 (40 U. S. C. 436–439); the Act of October 19, 1949 (Public Law 361); the Act of August 28, 1937, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590r–590x, 590z–5), for the development of facilities for water storage and utilization in the arid and semiarid areas of the United States; and the provisions of title V of the Housing Act of 1949 relating to financial assistance for farm housing (Public Law 171, approved July 15, 1949), as follows:

LOAN AUTHORIZATION

For loans (including payments in lieu of taxes and taxes under section 50 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant

Act, as amended, and advances incident to the acquisition and preservation of security of obligations under the foregoing several authorities): Title I and section 43 of title IV of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended and title V of the Housing Act of 1949 (except grants under 504 (a)) ~~$56,350,000~~ *$71,350,000, of which not to exceed $3,500,000 of the amount available for the purposes of title I and section 43 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, may be distributed to States and Territories without regard to farm population and prevalence of tenancy, in addition to the amount otherwise distributed thereto, for loans in reclamation projects and to entrymen on unpatented public land* (sums available for loans under title V of the Housing Act of 1949 to remain available until expended); title II of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, $85,000,000; the Act of August 28, 1937, as amended, $4,000,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed the foregoing several amounts shall be borrowed in one account from the Secretary of the Treasury on the request of the Secretary of Agriculture at such rate of interest as may be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, but not in excess of 3 per centum per annum; and the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to lend such sums to the Secretary upon the security of any obligations of borrowers from the Secre-

tary under the provisions of said Acts: *Provided further,* That the Secretary may utilize proceeds from payments of principal and interest under such Acts to repay the Secretary of the Treasury the amounts borrowed therefrom for the purposes of such Acts: *Provided further, That for the purpose of making loans pursuant to the foregoing authority, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public-debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under that Act are extended to include such loans to the Secretary: Provided further, That repayments to the Secretary of the Treasury on such loans shall be treated as a public-debt transaction.*

GRANTS

For grants and for the grant portion of combination loans and grants for the purpose of section 504 (a) of the Housing Act of 1949, $650,000, to remain available until expended.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For the making, servicing, and collecting of loans and insured mortgages, the servicing and collecting of loans made under prior authority, the liquidation of assets transferred to Farmers Home Administration pursuant to the Farmers Home Administration Act of 1946, and the extension of

financial assistance under the Housing Act of 1949, ~~$27,700,000~~ *$29,000,000*, together with a transfer to this appropriation item of not to exceed $80,000 of the fees and administrative expense charges made available by subsections (d) and (e) of section 12 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended.

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses, including not to exceed $5,000 for attendance at meetings or conventions of members of organizations at which matters of importance to the work of the Farm Credit Administration are to be discussed or transacted; library membership fees or dues in organizations which issue publications to members only or to members at a lower price than to others, payment for which may be made in advance; not to exceed $20,000 for expenditures authorized by section 602 of the Organic Act of 1944 (12 U. S. C. 833); purchase of one passenger motor vehicle (for replacement only) for use in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; garage rental in the District of Columbia; payment of actual transportation and other necessary expenses and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of subsistence of persons serving, while away from their homes, without other compensation from the United States, in an advisory capacity to the Farm Credit Administration, except that such expenditures shall not exceed $10,000; examination of corporations,

banks, associations, and institutions operated, supervised, or regulated by the Farm Credit Administration $585,000, together with not to exceed $2,325,000 of collections from Federal Farm Credit agencies of assessments and charges, to be advanced by transfer and counter warrant to this appropriation, to cover the cost of Farm Credit Administration facilities, examinations, and other services rendered to such agencies; $2,910,000.

Extension Service

payments to states, hawaii, alaska, and puerto rico

For payments to the States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico, for cooperative agricultural extension work as follows:

Capper-Ketcham, Bankhead-Jones, and related Acts: Capper-Ketcham Act, the Act approved May 22, 1928 (7 U. S. C. 343a, 343b), $1,480,000; Bankhead-Jones Act, section 21, title II, of the Act approved June 29, 1935, (7 U. S. C. 343c), $12,000,000; Bankhead-Jones Act, section 23, title II, of the Act approved June 29, 1935, as amended by the Act of June 6, 1945 (7 U. S. C. 343d–1), $12,500,000; additional extension work, the Act approved April 24, 1939, as amended (7 U. S. C. 343c-1), $555,000; Alaska, the Act approved February 23, 1929 (7 U. S. C. 386c), extending the benefits of the Smith-Lever Act to the Territory of Alaska, $13,950, and ~~section~~

~~3 of the Act approved June 20, 1936 (7 U. S. C. 343e),~~ extending ~~the benefits of the Capper-Ketcham Act to the Territory of Alaska, $10,000~~ *the Act approved October 27, 1949 (Public Law 417), extending to the Territory of Alaska the benefits of the Capper-Ketcham Act and sections 21 and 23 of title II of the Bankhead-Jones Act, $42,150; Puerto Rico, section 3 of the Act of March 4, 1931 (7 U. S. C. 386f), authorizing extension of the Capper-Ketcham Act to Puerto Rico, $31,348*; the Act approved August 28, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 343f–343g), extending the benefits of section 21 of the Bankhead-Jones Act to Puerto Rico, $408,000, *and the Act approved October 26, 1949 (Public Law 406), extending the benefits of section 23 of title II of the Bankhead-Jones Act to Puerto Rico, $40,000*; and section 506a of title V of the Housing Act of 1949 (Public Law 171), $33,050; in all, payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico, ~~$27,000,000~~ *$27,103,498.*

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary to administer the provisions of the Smith-Lever Act, approved May 8, 1914 (7 U. S. C. 341–348), and Acts amendatory or supplementary thereto, and to coordinate the extension work of the Department and the several States, Territories, and insular possessions, ~~$900,000~~ *$915,000.*

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

For expenses of the Office of the Secretary of Agriculture, including the purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only; travel expenses, including examination of estimates for appropriations in the field; stationery, supplies, materials, and equipment; freight, express, and drayage charges; advertising, communication service, postage, washing towels, repairs and alterations, and other miscellaneous supplies and expenses not otherwise provided for and necessary for the practical and efficient work of the Department of Agriculture, ~~$2,143,300~~ *$2,179,300*, together with such amounts from other appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules in the Budget for the current fiscal year for such services and expenses, which several amounts or portions thereof as may be determined by the Secretary not exceeding a total of $109,280, shall be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation: *Provided, however,* That if the total amounts of such appropriations or authorizations for the current fiscal year shall at any time exceed or fall below the amounts estimated, respectively, therefor in the Budget for such year, the amounts transferred or to be transferred therefrom to this appropriation shall be increased or decreased in such amounts as the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives of the Department, shall determine are

appropriate to the requirements as changed by such reductions or increases in such appropriations or authorizations.

OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

For necessary expenses, including payment of fees or dues for the use of law libraries by attorneys in the field service, ~~$2,450,000~~ *$2,675,000, together with such amounts from other appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules in the budget for the current fiscal year for such expenses which several amounts not exceeding a total of $207,000 shall be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation.*

OFFICE OF FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL RELATIONS

For necessary expenses for the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations and for enabling the Secretary to coordinate and integrate activities of the Department in connection with foreign agricultural work, $600,000.

OFFICE OF INFORMATION

For necessary expenses in connection with the publication, indexing, illustration, and distribution of bulletins, documents, and reports, the preparation, distribution, and display of agricultural motion and sound pictures, and exhibits, and the coordination of informational work in the Department, $1,265,800, together with such amounts from other appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules in the Budget for the current fiscal year for such

expenses, which several amounts or portions thereof, as may be determined by the Secretary, not exceeding a total of $16,200, shall be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation, of which total appropriation amounts not exceeding those specified may be used for the purposes enumerated as follows: For preparation and display of exhibits, $109,959; for preparation, distribution, and display of motion and sound pictures, $58,700; for farmers' bulletins, which shall be adapted to the interests of the people of the different sections of the country, an equal proportion of four-fifths of which shall be delivered to or sent out under the addressed franks furnished by the Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress, as they shall direct (7 U. S. C. 417) and not less than two hundred thirty thousand eight hundred and fifty copies for the use of the Senate and House of Representatives of part 2 of the annual report of the Secretary (known as the Yearbook of Agriculture), as authorized by section 73 of the Act of January 12, 1895 (44 U. S. C. 241), $611,128: *Provided, That when and to the extent that in the judgment of the Secretary agricultural exhibits and motion and sound pictures relating to the authorized programs of the various agencies of the Department can be more advantageously prepared, displayed, or distributed by the Office of Information, as the central agency of the Department therefor, additional funds not*

exceeding $300,000 for these purposes may be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation, from the funds applicable, and shall be available for the objects specified herein: *Provided further,* That in the preparation of motion pictures or exhibits by the Department, not exceeding a total of $10,000 may be used for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706 (a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as amended by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a): *Provided further,* That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the establishment or maintenance of regional or State field offices, or for the compensation of employees in such offices except that not to exceed $10,000 may be used to maintain the San Francisco radio office.

LIBRARY

For necessary expenses, including dues, for library membership in societies or associations which issue publications to members only or at a price to members lower than to subscribers who are not members; $713,293.

~~Not to exceed $12,000,000 of the funds appropriated in this title shall be available for travel expenses. Amounts available from appropriations contained in this title are hereby reduced by the total sum of $645,496, such amount to be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury immediately upon approval of this chapter.~~

TITLE II—CORPORATIONS

The following corporations and agencies are hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to each such corporation or agency and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the Budget for the fiscal year 1951 for such corporation or agency, except as hereinafter provided:

Federal Crop Insurance Corporation.

Commodity Credit Corporation: Nothing in this chapter shall be so construed as to prevent the Commodity Credit Corporation from carrying out any activity or any program authorized by law: *Provided*, That not to exceed ~~$16,000,000~~ *$16,350,000* shall be available for administrative expenses of the Corporation: *Provided further*, That all necessary expenses (including legal and special services performed on a contract or fee basis, but not including other personal services) in connection with the acquisition, operation, maintenance, improvement, or disposition of any real or personal property belonging to the Corporation or in which it has an interest, including expenses of collections of pledged collateral, shall be considered as nonadministrative

expenses for the purposes hereof: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to discharge ~~$170,515,131~~ *$66,698,457* of the indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation to the Secretary of the Treasury by canceling notes in such amount issued by the Corporation to the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to section 4 of the Act of March 8, 1938, as amended (15 U. S. C. 713a–4).

Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation: Not to exceed $1,280,000 (to be computed on an accrual basis) of the funds of the Corporation shall be available for administrative expenses, including employment on a contract or fee basis of persons, firms, and corporations for the performance of special services, including legal services, and the use of the services and facilities of Federal land banks, national farm loan associations, Federal Reserve banks, and agencies of the Government as authorized by the Act of January 31, 1934 (12 U. S. C. 1020–1020h); and said total sum shall be exclusive of services and facilities furnished and examinations made by the Farm Credit Administration central office, interest expense, and expenses in connection with the acquisition, operation, maintenance, improvement, protection, or disposition of real or personal property belonging to the Corporation or in which it has an interest: *Provided*, That promptly after June 30 of each fiscal year

all cash funds in excess of the estimated operating requirements for the current fiscal year shall be declared as dividends and paid into the general fund of the Treasury: *Provided further*, That the aggregate amount of bonds the Corporation may issue and have outstanding at any one time shall not exceed $500,000,000.

Federal intermediate credit banks: Not to exceed $1,496,000 (to be computed on an accrual basis) of the funds of the banks shall be available for administrative expenses and services performed for the banks by other Government agencies (except services and facilities furnished and examinations made by the Farm Credit Administration central office, and services performed by any Federal Reserve bank and by the United States Treasury in connection with the financial transactions of the banks); and said total sum shall be exclusive of interest expense, legal and special services performed on a contract or fee basis, and expenses in connection with the acquisition, operation, maintenance, improvement, protection, or disposition of real or personal property belonging to the banks or in which they have an interest.

Production credit corporations: Not to exceed $1,358,000 (to be computed on an accrual basis) of the funds of the corporations shall be available for administrative expenses and services performed for the corporations by other Govern-

ment agencies (except services and facilities furnished and examinations made by the Farm Credit Administration central office); and said total sum shall be exclusive of interest expense, legal and special services performed on a contract or fee basis, and expenses in connection with the acquisition, operation, maintenance, improvement, protection, or disposition of real or personal property belonging to the corporations or in which they have an interest.

TITLE III—REDUCTIONS IN APPROPRIATIONS

Amounts available from appropriations are hereby reduced in the sums hereinafter set forth, such sums to be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury immediately upon the approval of this Chapter:

An amount of $199,990,000 in the revolving fund held in the Treasury available to the Governor, Farm Credit Administration, as authorized by the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act, as amended (12 U. S. C. 1020b), for resubscriptions to the capital stock of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation.

The total amount of $125,000,000 in the revolving fund appropriated to the Office of the Secretary, Treasury Department, as authorized by the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended (12 U. S. C. 698), for subscriptions to the capital stock of the Federal land banks.

TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. Within the unit limit of cost fixed by law, the lump-sum appropriations and authorizations made for the Department under this chapter shall be available for the purchase of not to exceed 497 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, and for the hire of such vehicles, necessary in the conduct of the work of the Department outside the District of Columbia.

SEC. 402. Provisions of law prohibiting or restricting the employment of aliens shall not apply to (1) the temporary employment of translators when competent citizen translators are not available; (2) employment in cases of emergency of persons in the field service of the Department for periods of not more than sixty days; and (3) employment under the appropriation for the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations.

SEC. 403. Appropriations and authorizations made in this chapter shall be available for health service programs as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150).

SEC. 404. Funds available to the Department during the current fiscal year shall be available for the payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672).

SEC. 405. Funds available to the Department of Agriculture during the current fiscal year may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

SEC. 406. Funds available to the Department of Agriculture may be used for printing and binding, including the purchase of reprints of scientific and technical articles.

SEC. 407. Of appropriations herein made which are available for the purchase of lands, not to exceed $1 may be expended for each option to purchase any particular tract or tracts of land.

SEC. 408. No part of the funds appropriated by this chapter shall be used for the payment of any officer or employee of the Department who, as such officer or employee, or on behalf of the Department or any division, commission, or bureau thereof, issues, or causes to be issued, any prediction, oral or written, or forecast, except as to damage threatened or caused by insects and pests, with respect to future prices of cotton or the trend of same.

SEC. 409. Except to provide materials required in or incident to research or experimental work where no suitable domestic product is available, no part of the funds appropriated by this chapter shall be expended in the purchase of twine manufactured from commodities or materials produced outside of the United States.

SEC. 410. Not less than $575,000 shall be available for contracts in accordance with section 10 (a) of the Act of August 14, 1946 (7 U. S. C. 427i) from appropriations herein made for the Bureau of Agricultural Economics;

Bureau of Animal Industry; Bureau of Dairy Industry; Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering; Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine; Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry; Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics; and the Forest Service.

SEC. 411. Of the funds appropriated in this chapter for travel expenses, $791,888 shall be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury on or before August 1, 1950; but such amount shall be credited toward any other reduction in amounts available for such travel expenses resulting from decreases in appropriations made by this Act below the budget estimates.

This chapter may be cited as the "Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1951".

CHAPTER VII—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

TITLE I

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary of the Interior (hereafter in this chapter referred to as the Secretary), including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; for purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only at not to exceed $4,500; printing and binding; employment of a Director of the Oil and Gas Division without regard to the civil service laws; and teletype rentals and service; ~~$2,315,000~~ *$2,100,000.*

STANDARDIZATION OF GEOGRAPHIC NAMES

For expenses necessary for carrying out the provisions of the Act of July 25, 1947 (43 U. S. C. 364), including personal services in the District of Columbia and printing and binding, $14,000.

ENFORCEMENT OF THE CONNALLY HOT OIL ACT

For expenses necessary for controlling the interstate shipment of contraband oil as required by law (15 U. S. C.

year 1950 and the current fiscal year, upon certification by the appropriate agency of the department concerned.

SEC. ~~630~~ *629*. Not more than $15,000,000 of the amounts received during the current fiscal year by each of the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force as proceeds from the sale of scrap or salvage material, shall be available during the current fiscal year for expenses of transportation, demilitarization, and other preparation for sale or salvage of military supplies, equipment, and matériel: *Provided,* That a report of receipts and disbursements under this limitation shall be made quarterly to the Appropriation Committees of the Congress.

TITLE VII—REDUCTION IN APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 701. The contract authorization granted under the head "Ordnance for New Construction," in title IV of the "National Military Establishment Appropriation Act, 1950," is reduced by the sum of $31,460,000 and the amount of the limitation imposed by the proviso under said head on the total obligations to be incurred for armor, armament, and ammunition, for construction, conversion, or replacement approved during the fiscal year 1950, is also reduced by the sum of $31,460,000.

This chapter may be cited as the "Defense Appropriation Act, 1951".

CHAPTER X A—GENERAL REDUCTIONS IN APPROPRIATIONS AND CONTRACT AUTHORIZATIONS

Reductions in appropriations and contract authorizations contained in this Act are hereby made in the sum of $600,000,000.

Not more than the following sums may be obligated by any agency or department provided for in this Act, viz:

(1) For civilian personnel, not more than an amount 10 per centum below the amount proposed in the President's budget estimates for fiscal year 1951, except that in the Department of Defense where no more than the amount of the President's budget estimate minus 2 per centum shall be obligated. This paragraph shall not apply to nurses, doctors, or other medical personnel, including orderlies, in the Public Health Service and the Veterans' Administration.

(2) For travel, not more than a total for all departments and agencies of $319,000,000, and not more than 5 per centum less than the estimates provided for military personnel travel and not more than 20 per centum less than the amount provided for civilian personnel travel, than the estimates therefor contained in the President's budget message for the fiscal year 1951.

(3) For transportation of things, for all departments and agencies, not more than $720,000,000: *Provided further*, That in no case shall the amount obligated exceed a figure 10 per centum below the estimates submitted by the President in his budget message for 1951 for each item for all agencies except the Department of Defense, and for the Department of Defense not more than 5 per centum less than the estimates of the President, transmitted in said budget message.

(4) For communications services, not more than $59,000,000, and not more for any department other than the Department of Defense than the amount of the President's budget estimates for 1951 minus 10 per centum, and for the Department of Defense not more than a figure 5 per centum below the President's budget estimates for 1951.

(5) For rents and utilities, not more than $205,000,000, and for all establishments other than the Department of Defense not more than the President's budget estimates for fiscal year 1951 minus 10 per centum.

(6) For printing and reproduction, not more than $52,000,000, and not more in any case than the President's budget estimates for 1951 minus 10 per centum.

(7) For other contractual services, not more than $1,301,000,000, and for all departments other than the

Department of Defense not more than the President's budget estimates for 1951 minus 10 per centum.

(8) For supplies and materials, not more than $3,888,000,000, and for all departments of the Government except the Department of Defense and the Veterans' hospitals not more than the President's budget estimates for 1951 minus 10 per centum.

(9) For equipment, not more than $3,577,000,000, and for all departments other than the Department of Defense, not more than the President's budget estimates for 1951 minus 10 per centum.

(10) For lands and structures, for all departments of the Government, except the Department of Defense not more than the President's budget estimates for 1951 minus 5 per centum.

regard to the four-year limitation contained in section 522 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946: Provided further, That in the event the President assigns to the Department of State responsibilities and obligations of the United States in connection with the government, occupation, or control of foreign areas in addition to Germany, the authorities contained in this appropriation may be utilized by the Department of State in connection with such government, occupation, or control of such foreign areas: Provided further, That when the Department of the Army, under the authority of the Act of March 3, 1911, as amended (10 U. S. C. 1253), furnishes subsistence supplies to personnel of civilian agencies of the United States Government serving in Germany, payment therefor by such personnel shall be made at the same rate as is paid by civilian personnel of the Department of the Army serving in Germany.

AID TO PALESTINE REFUGEES

For contributions by the United States to the United Nations for the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, as authorized by title III of the Foreign Economic Assistance Act of 1950 (Public Law 535, approved June 5, 1950), $24,705,000.

This chapter may be cited as the "Foreign Aid Appropriation Act, 1951".

CHAPTER XI—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Departments and Agencies

SEC. 1101. Unless otherwise specifically provided, the maximum amount allowable during the current fiscal year, in accordance with section 16 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 78), for the purchase of any passenger motor vehicle (exclusive of busses, ambulances, and station wagons), is hereby fixed at $1,400.

SEC. 1102. Unless otherwise specified and during the current fiscal year, no part of any appropriation contained in this or any other Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any officer or employee of the Government of the United States (including any agency the majority of the stock of which is owned by the Government of the United States) whose post of duty is in continental United States unless such person (1) is a citizen of the United States, (2) is a person in the service of the United States on the date of enactment of this Act who, being eligible for citizenship, had filed a declaration of intention to become a citizen of the United States prior to such date, or (3) is a person who owes allegiance to the United States: *Provided,* That for the purpose of this section, an affidavit signed by any such person shall be considered prima facie

evidence that the requirements of this section with respect to his status have been complied with: *Provided further,* That any person making a false affidavit shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $4,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both: *Provided further,* That the above penal clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law: *Provided further,* That any payment made to any officer or employee contrary to the provisions of this section shall be recoverable in action by the Federal Government. This section shall not apply to citizens of the Republic of the Philippines or to nationals of those countries allied with the United States in the prosecution of the war.

SEC. 1103. Appropriations of the executive departments and independent establishments for the current fiscal year, available for expenses of travel or for the expenses of the activity concerned, are hereby made available for living quarters allowances in accordance with the Act of June 26, 1930 (5 U. S. C. 118a), and regulations prescribed thereunder, and cost-of-living allowances similar to those allowed under section 901 (2) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, in accordance with and to the extent prescribed by regulations of the President, for all civilian officers and employees of the Government permanently stationed in foreign coun-

tries: *Provided,* That the availability of appropriations made to the Department of State for carrying out the provisions of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 shall not be affected hereby.

SEC. 1104. No part of any appropriation for the current fiscal year contained in this or any other Act shall be paid to any person for the filling of any position for which he or she has been nominated after the Senate has voted not to approve of the nomination of said person.

SEC. 1105. No part of any appropriation contained in this or any other Act shall be used to pay in excess of $4 per volume for the current and future volumes of the United States Code Annotated and such volumes shall be purchased on condition and with the understanding that latest published cumulative annual pocket parts issued prior to the date of purchase shall be furnished free of charge, or in excess of $4.25 per volume for the current or future volumes of the Lifetime Federal Digest.

SEC. 1106. Funds made available by this or any other Act for administrative expenses in the current fiscal year of the corporations and agencies subject to the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended (31 U. S. C. 841), shall be available, in addition to objects for which such funds are otherwise available, for personal services and rent in the District of Columbia; printing and binding; examination of budgets and estimates of appropriations in the field;

services in accordance with section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); and the objects specified in the sections of this title under the head "Departments and agencies", all the provisions of which shall be applicable to the expenditure of such funds unless otherwise specified in the Act by which they are made available: *Provided,* That in the event any functions budgeted as administrative expenses are subsequently transferred to or paid from other funds, the limitations on administrative expenses shall be correspondingly reduced.

SEC. 1107. No part of any funds of or available to any wholly owned Government corporation shall be used for the purchase or construction, or in making loans for the purchase or construction of any office building at the seat of government primarily for occupancy by any department or agency of the United States Government or by any corporation owned by the United States Government.

SEC. 1108. Funds of corporations and agencies, subject to the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, covered by the provisions of this or any other Act shall be available during the current fiscal year for payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672).

SEC. 1109. No part of any appropriation contained in this

or any other Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation included in this or any other Act, shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of the United States, is not a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary

or wages for which are paid from any appropriation or fund contained in this or any other Act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law: *Provided further*, That, as applicable to the Departments of Agriculture and Interior, nothing in this section shall be construed to require an affidavit from any person employed for less than sixty days for sudden emergency work involving the loss of human life or destruction of property, and the payment of salary or wages may be made to such persons from applicable appropriations for services rendered in such emergency without execution of the affidavit contemplated by this section.

SEC. 1110. No funds made available by this or any other Act shall be withdrawn from one appropriation account for credit to another, or to a working fund, except as authorized by law: *Provided*, That, except as otherwise specifically provided by law, any funds so withdrawn and credited shall be available for the same purposes, and subject to the same limitations, conditions, and restrictions, as provided by the Act appropriating such funds: *Provided further*, That any such withdrawal and credit shall be made, without warrant action, by check: *Provided further*, That no funds withdrawn

and credited pursuant to section 601 of the Act of June 30, 1932, as amended (47 Stat. 417; 31 U. S. C. 686), shall be available for any period beyond that provided by the Act appropriating such funds.

SEC. 1111. Section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U. S. C. 665), is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3679. (a) No officer or employee of the United States shall make or authorize an expenditure from or create or authorize an obligation under any appropriation or fund in excess of the amount available therein; nor shall any such officer or employee involve the Government in any contract or other obligation, for the payment of money for any purpose, in advance of appropriations made for such purpose, unless such contract or obligation is authorized by law.

"(b) No officer or employee of the United States shall accept voluntary service for the United States or employ personal service in excess of that authorized by law, except in cases of emergency involving the safety of human life or the protection of property.

"(c) (1) Except as otherwise provided in this section, all appropriations or funds available for obligation for a definite period of time shall be so apportioned as to prevent obligation *or expenditure* thereof in a manner which would

indicate a necessity for deficiency or supplemental appropriations for such period; and all appropriations or funds not limited to a definite period of time, and all authorizations to create obligations by contract in advance of appropriations, shall be so apportioned as to achieve the most effective and economical use thereof. As used hereafter in this section, the term 'appropriation' means appropriations, funds, and authorizations to create obligations by contract in advance of appropriations.

"(2) In apportioning any appropriation, reserves may be established to provide for contingencies, or to effect savings whenever savings are made possible by or through changes in ~~requirements,~~ *requirements or* greater efficiency of operations~~, or other developments~~ subsequent to the date on which such appropriation was made available. Whenever it is determined by an officer designated in subsection (d) of this section to make apportionments and reapportionments that any amount so reserved will not be required to carry out the purposes of the appropriation concerned, he shall recommend the rescission of such amount in the manner provided in the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, for estimates of appropriations.

"(3) Any appropriation subject to apportionment shall be distributed by months, calendar quarters, operating seasons, or other time periods, or by activities, functions, proj-

ects, or objects, or by a combination thereof, as may be deemed appropriate by the officers designated in subsection (d) of this section to make apportionments and reapportionments. Except as otherwise specified by the officer making the apportionment, amounts so apportioned shall remain available for obligation, in accordance with the terms of the appropriation, on a cumulative basis unless reapportioned.

"(4) Apportionments shall be reviewed at least four times each year by the officers designated in subsection (d) of this section to make apportionments and reapportionments, and such reapportionments made or such reserves established, modified, or released as may be necessary to further the effective use of the appropriation concerned, in accordance with the purposes stated in paragraph (1) of this subsection.

"(d) (1) Any appropriation available to the legislative branch, the judiciary, or the District of Columbia, which is required to be apportioned under subsection (c) of this section, shall be apportioned or reapportioned in writing by the officer having administrative control of such appropriation. Each such appropriation shall be apportioned not later than thirty days before the beginning of the fiscal year for which the appropriation is available, or not more than thirty days after approval of the Act by which the appropriation is made available, whichever is later.

"(2) Any appropriation available to an agency, which is required to be apportioned under subsection (c) of this section, shall be apportioned or reapportioned in writing by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. The head of each agency to which any such appropriation is available shall submit to the Bureau of the Budget information, in such form and manner and at such time or times as the Director may prescribe, as may be required for the apportionment of such appropriation. Such information shall be submitted not later than forty days before the beginning of any fiscal year for which the appropriation is available, or not more than fifteen days after approval of the Act by which such appropriation is made available, whichever is later. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall apportion each such appropriation and shall notify the agency concerned of his action not later than twenty days before the beginning of the fiscal year for which the appropriation is available, or not more than thirty days after the approval of the Act by which such appropriation is made available, whichever is later. When used in this section, the term 'agency' means any executive department, agency, commission, authority, administration, board, or other independent establishment in the executive branch of the Government, including any corporation wholly or partly owned by the United States which is an instrumentality of the United

States. Nothing in this subsection shall be so construed as to interfere with the initiation, operation, and administration of agricultural price support programs. The provisions of this section shall not apply to any corporation which obtains funds for making loans, other than paid in capital funds, without legal liability on the part of the United States.

"(e) (1) No apportionment or reapportionment which, in the judgment of the officer making such apportionment or reapportionment, would indicate a necessity for a deficiency or supplemental estimate shall be made except upon a determination by such officer that such action is required because of (A) any laws enacted subsequent to the transmission to the Congress of the estimates for an appropriation which require expenditures beyond administrative control; or (B) emergencies involving the safety of human life, the protection of property, or the immediate welfare of individuals in cases where an appropriation has been made to enable the United States to make payment of, or contributions toward, sums which are required to be paid to individuals either in specific amounts fixed by law or in accordance with formulae prescribed by law.

"(2) In each case of an apportionment or a reapportionment which, in the judgment of the officer making such apportionment or reapportionment, would indicate a neces-

sity for a deficiency or supplemental estimate, such officer shall immediately submit a detailed report of the facts of the case to the Congress. In transmitting any deficiency or supplemental estimates required on account of any such apportionment or reapportionment, reference shall be made to such report.

"(f) *(1)* The officers designated in subsection (d) of this section to make apportionments and reapportionments may exempt from apportionments *trust funds and working funds expenditures from which have no significant effect on the financial operations of the Government, working capital and revolving funds established for intra-governmental operations*, receipts from industrial and power operations available under law and any appropriation made specifically for—

"(1) interest on, or retirement of, the public debt;

"(2) payment of claims, judgments, refunds, and draw-backs;

"(3) any item determined by the President to be of a confidential nature;

"(4) payment under private relief Acts or other laws requiring payments to designated payees in the total amount of such appropriation;

~~"(5) contingent expenses of the Senate or of the House of Representatives.~~

"*(2) The provisions of subsection (c) of this section shall not apply to appropriations to the Senate or House of Representatives or to any Member, committee, Office (including the office of the Architect of the Capitol), officer, or employee thereof.*

"(g) Any appropriation which is apportioned or reapportioned pursuant to this section may be divided and subdivided administratively within the limits of such apportionments or reapportionments. The officer having administrative control of any such appropriation available to the legislative branch, the judiciary, or the District of Columbia, and the head of each agency, subject to the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, shall prescribe, by regulation, a system of administrative control (not inconsistent with any ~~other~~ accounting procedures prescribed by or pursuant to law) which shall be designed to (A) restrict obligations *or expenditures* against each appropriation to the amount of apportionments or reapportionments made for each such appropriation, and (B) enable such officer or agency head to fix responsibility for the creation of any obligation *or the making of any expenditure* in excess of an apportionment or reapportionment.

"(h) No officer or employee of the United States shall authorize or create any obligation *or make any expenditure* (A) in excess of an apportionment or reapportionment, or

(B) in excess of the amount permitted by regulations prescribed pursuant to subsection (g) of this section.

"(i) (1) In addition to any penalty or liability under other law, any officer or employee of the United States who shall violate subsection (a), (b), or (h) of this section shall be subjected to appropriate administrative discipline, including, when circumstances warrant, suspension from duty without pay or removal from office; and any officer or employee of the United States who shall knowingly and willfully violate subsection (a), (b), or (h) of this section shall, upon conviction, be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned for not more than two years, or both.

"(2) In the case of a violation of subsection (a), (b), or (h) of this section by an officer or employee of an agency, or of the District of Columbia, the head of the agency concerned or the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, shall immediately report to the President, through the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and to the Congress all pertinent facts together with a statement of the action taken thereon."

SEC. 1112. No part of the funds of, or available for expenditure by any corporation or agency included in this Act, *including the government of the District of Columbia,* shall be available to pay for annual leave accumulated by any officer or employee during the calendar year 1950 and

unused at the close of business on ~~December 31, 1950~~ *June 30, 1951*: *Provided,* That this section shall not apply to officers and employees whose post of duty is outside the continental United States.

SEC. 1113. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 6 of the Act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 555), or the provisions of any other law, the Secretary of State may, in his absolute discretion, during the current fiscal year, terminate the employment of any officer or employee of the Department of State or of the Foreign Service of the United States whenever he shall deem such termination necessary or advisable in the interests of the United States.

Notwithstanding the provisions of section 6 of the Act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 555), or the provisions of any other law, the Secretary of Commerce may, in his absolute discretion, during the current fiscal year, terminate the employment of any officer or employee of the Department of Commerce whenever he shall deem such termination necessary or advisable in the best interests of the United States.

~~SEC. 1114. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or position under the United States Government which may become vacant during the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1950: *Provided,* That this inhibition shall not apply—~~

~~(a) to not to exceed 10 per centum of all such vacancies in any agency caused by separation from such agency;~~

~~(b) to positions filled from within the agency;~~

~~(c) to offices or positions required by law to be filled by appointment of the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;~~

~~(d) to scientific and technical positions in the Atomic Energy Commission and the Armed Services;~~

~~(e) to nurses, doctors, or other medical personnel, including orderlies, in the Public Health Service and the Veterans' Administration;~~

~~(f) to law enforcement officers;~~

~~(g) to temporary, emergency, seasonal, or cooperative positions;~~

~~(h) to commissioned, commissioned warrant, warrant, and enlisted personnel, and cadets of the Coast Guard, and the undergraduates of the United States Military and Naval Academies, or~~

~~(i) to any agency in the legislative or judicial branches of the Government, or the municipal government of the District of Columbia.~~

SEC. 1114. During the current fiscal year, no part of any money appropriated in this or any other Act shall be used during any quarter of such fiscal year to purchase typewriting machines (except bookkeeping and billing ma-

chines) at a price which exceeds 90 per centum of the lowest net cash price, plus applicable Federal excise taxes, accorded the most-favored customer (other than the Government, the American National Red Cross, and the purchasers of typewriting machines for educational purposse only) of the manufacturer of such machines during the six-month period immediately preceding such quarter.

SEC. 1115. No payment shall be made from appropriations in this Act to any officer on the retired lists of the Regular Army, Regular Navy, Regular Marine Corps, Regular Air Force, Regular Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service for a period of two years after retirement who for himself or for others is engaged in the selling of or contracting for the sale of or negotiating for the sale of to any agency of the Department of Defense, the Coast Guard, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Public Health Service any supplies or war materials.

This Act may be cited as the "General Appropriation Act, 1951".

Passed the House of Representatives May 10, 1950.

Attest: RALPH R. ROBERTS,

Clerk.

Calendar No. 1944

81ST CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 7786

[Report No. 1941]

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

MAY 11 (legislative day, MARCH 29), 1950
Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

JULY 8, 1950
Reported with amendments

Senate

TUESDAY, JULY 11, 1950

(Legislative day of Saturday, July 1, 1950)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, who committest to us the swift and solemn trust of life, so teach us to number our days that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom. In all the perplexities of these confused times may we not lose our perspective. In these fateful days, lead us to right decisions and to that wisdom which is from above. As we remember here those of our own fellow countrymen who, in far places, are laying down their lives for the preservation of our heritage of freedom, save us from lowering the shield of national solidarity, just as the air is filled with the poisoned arrows of determined foes. In these days of crisis and alarm, help us to play the man and so help others to face with good cheer and courage whatever tomorrow may bring. We ask it in the name of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, July 10, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, Mr. TOBEY was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate today and the remainder of this week.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, a subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor was authorized to sit during the session of the Senate today.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Chavez	Frear
Anderson	Connally	Fulbright
Benton	Cordon	George
Brewster	Donnell	Gillette
Bricker	Douglas	Graham
Bridges	Dworshak	Green
Butler	Eastland	Gurney
Byrd	Ecton	Hayden
Cain	Ellender	Hendrickson
Capehart	Ferguson	Hickenlooper
Chapman	Flanders	Hill
Hoey	McCarran	Saltonstall
Holland	McCarthy	Schoeppel
Humphrey	McClellan	Smith, Maine
Hunt	McFarland	Smith, N. J.
Ives	McKellar	Sparkman
Johnson, Colo.	McMahon	Stennis
Johnson, Tex.	Magnuson	Taft
Kefauver	Malone	Thomas, Okla.
Kem	Martin	Thomas, Utah
Kerr	Millikin	Thye
Kilgore	Morse	Tydings
Knowland	Mundt	Watkins
Langer	Murray	Wherry
Leahy	Myers	Wiley
Lehman	Neely	Williams
Lodge	O'Mahoney	Young
Lucas	Russell	

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senators from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON and Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, attending the sessions of the International Labor Organization at Geneva, Switzerland, as a delegate representing the United States.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent because of the death of Judge Curtis Waller, a close personal friend.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] is absent on Government business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. DARBY], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business, the motion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] to consider Senate bill 1728, be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to have the RECORD show that the unanimous-consent request was made immediately after a quorum call.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The RECORD will show it.

Mr. WHERRY. I am in favor of the request made by the Senator from Tennessee. I believe the appropriation bill should be made the temporary business of the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator from Nebraska.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 180) to suspend until December 31, 1950, the application of certain Federal laws with respect to attorneys employed by the Subcommittee on Labor-Management Relations of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in connection with the study and investigation ordered by Senate Resolution 140, Eighty-first Congress.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 1049. An act for the relief of Amy Alexandrovna Taylor and Myrna Taylor;

S. 1792. An act for the relief of Thomas Nicholas Epiphaniades and Wanda Julia Epiphaniades; and

S. 2243. An act for the relief of Tevfik Kamil Kutay.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, severally with amendments, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 441. An act to redefine the units and establish the standards of electrical and photometric measurements;

S. 2046. An act to provide authority for certain functions and activities of the National Bureau of Standards, and for other purposes;

S. 2160. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize annual and sick leave with pay for commissioned officers of the Public Health Service, to authorize the payment of accumulated and accrued annual leave in excess of 60 days, and for other purposes;

S. 2201. An act amending section 2 of the act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1449), to provide basic authority for the performance of certain functions and activities of the National Bureau of Standards, and for other purposes;

S. 2507. An act to authorize the United States Maritime Commission to grant to the East Bay Municipal Utility District, an agency of the State of California, an easement for the construction and operation of an interceptor sewer pipe line in and under certain Government-owned lands comprising a part of the Maritime Alameda Shipyard, Alameda, Calif.;

S. 2591. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to support research and training in arthritis and rheumatism, multiple sclerosis, cerebral palsy, epilepsy, and blindness, and other diseases, and for other purposes; and

S. 2864. An act to authorize certain administrative expenses for the Department of Justice, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 91) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 649. An act for the relief of Mrs. Alice N. Kozma;

H. R. 661. An act for the relief of Thomas A. Trulove, postmaster, and Nolen J. Salyards, assistant postmaster, at Inglewood, Calif.;

H. R. 1130. An act for the relief of Hanna Mussbach;

H. R. 1500. An act for the relief of Mrs. Barbara Guanapoulos;

H. R. 1503. An act for the relief of George Washington;

H. R. 1585. An act for the relief of Leilah begum Alaoui Mullin;

H. R. 1586. An act for the relief of Harold E. Trantwein;

H. R. 1611. An act for the relief of Walter E. Miller;

H. R. 1616. An act for the relief of S. L. Ayres & Co., Inc.;

H. R. 1618. An act for the relief of Kenneth J. MacKenzie;

H. R. 1638. An act for the relief of Warren P. Hoover;

H. R. 1988. An act for the relief of Leslie A. Fry;

H. R. 2350. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marion M. Martin Jones;

H. R. 2805. An act for the relief of John F. Oettl;

H. R. 3132. An act for the relief of Sergio and Mara Lamberti;

H. R. 3304. An act for the relief of Jose Cotto Santiago;

H. R. 3412. An act for the relief of N. H. Kelley, Bernice Kelley, Clyde D. Farquhar, and Gladys Farquhar;

H. R. 3611. An act to provide for the preparation, printing, and distribution of a list of all persons who died at any time after May 26, 1941, and before December 31, 1946, while serving on active duty with the Armed Forces of the United States;

H. R. 3664. An act for the relief of Bruce M. Stern;

H. R. 3906. An act to amend the Federal Aid to Wildlife Restoration Act, as amended;

H. R. 3919. An act for the relief of John S. Steber;

H. R. 3921. An act for the relief of Nicholas C. Hadjipateras, Pipitsa N. Hadjipateras, and Costas N. Hadjipateras;

H. R. 4014. An act for the relief of Maria Hoffman;

H. R. 4045. An act for the relief of Katherine L. Anderson, a civil-service employee, permanently injured through negligent treatment at the Army Advisory Group Station Hospital in Nanking, China;

H. R. 4136. An act for the relief of Helen M. Booth;

H. R. 4142. An act for the relief of Ralph D. McKinney;

H. R. 4221. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Patricia Joyce Dunn, a minor;

H. R. 4542. An act to provide for the classification of the public lands in Alaska;

H. R. 4601. An act for the relief of Jeannette Passayanni-Capodistria;

H. R. 4657. An act for the relief of J. R. Fleming & Co.;

H. R. 4709. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts to hear, determine, and render judgment upon claims arising out of certain blasting operations on the Merrimack River;

H. R. 4775. An act for the relief of Harold L. Corzett, commander, United States Naval Reserve;

H. R. 4832. An act for the relief of Graphic Arts Corp., of Ohio;

H. R. 4954. An act for the relief of Jacob F. Hutt and Anderson E. Humphrey;

H. R. 4989. An act to provide for the payment of just compensation to John Ii Estate, Ltd., a Hawaiian corporation, for the taking by the United States of private fishery rights in Pearl Harbor, Island of Oahu, T. H.;

H. R. 5008. An act to provide for the exchange between the United States and the State of New York of certain lands and interests in lands at Manhattan Beach, Kings County, N. Y.;

H. R. 5507. An act to amend an act entitled "An act for the protection of the Bald Eagle," approved June 8, 1940;

H. R. 5981. An act for the relief of Claiborne V. Wagley;

H. R. 6020. An act for the relief of Richard H. Sears;

H. R. 6038. An act to provide for issuance of a supplemental patent to Charles A. Gann, patentee No. 152,419, for certain land in California;

H. R. 6052. An act for the relief of John M. Vick;

H. R. 6095. An act for the relief of Universal Corp., James Stewart Corp., and James Stewart & Co., Inc.;

H. R. 6312. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of Joseph Lundborg and others against the United States;

H. R. 6417. An act for the relief of Mrs. Frieda Gray (formerly Frieda Putman);

H. R. 6442. An act for the relief of Mrs. Martha Reid;

H. R. 6463. An act for the relief of Mrs. Shikaju Nakashima;

H. R. 6533. An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in fish restoration and management projects, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6578. An act for the relief of Mrs. Gunnbord Janzon Hamilton;

H. R. 6586. An act for the relief of Stamatie Amersonis;

H. R. 6606. An act to provide that the district judge of the eastern, middle, and western districts of Pennsylvania shall become a district judge for the middle district of Pennsylvania alone when the first vacancy occurs in that district;

H. R. 6657. An act for the relief of Georges Jules Louis Sauvage;

H. R. 6707. An act for the relief of Sirius Proestopoulos;

H. R. 6750. An act for the relief of Achileus Maroulis;

H. R. 6804. An act for the relief of certain Italian aliens;

H. R. 6861. An act to repeal certain laws relating to timber and stone on the public domain;

H. R. 6885. An act for the relief of E. Elmer Mynatt;

H. R. 7012. An act for the relief of Anna Ellero and Clara Ellero;

H. R. 7043. An act to provide for the granting of an easement for a public road or public toll road through the wildlife refuge located in Princess Anne County, Va.;

H. R. 7146. An act to amend section 3 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the disposal of materials on the public lands of the United States," so as to provide that moneys received from the disposal of material from reserved school section lands in Alaska shall be credited to the Territory;

H. R. 7192. An act to provide benefits for the widows of certain persons who were retired or are eligible for retirement under section 6 of the act entitled "An act to authorize aids to navigation and for other works in the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1918, as amended;

H. R. 7202. An act for the relief of Alexander Newman;

H. R. 7209. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to undertake continuing studies of Atlantic coast fish species for the purpose of developing and protecting fish resources;

H. R. 7268. An act to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act so as to provide a more effective distribution of mortgage loans insured under title I, to give holders of such mortgage loans preference in the refinancing of loans on a noninsured basis, to adjust the loan limitations governing title II loans so as to provide more effective assistance to production and subsistence loan borrowers, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7282. An act for the relief of Cornelius Ver Sluis;

H. R. 7297. An act for the relief of Ignas Malcius;

H. R. 7364. An act for the relief of Jenny Irene Benson;

H. R. 7613. An act for the relief of Mrs. Miyako Horikoshi Spaulding and Mabel Miya Spaulding;

H. R. 7675. An act to authorize the addition of certain land to Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park, in the State of Tennessee;

H. R. 7689. An act to amend certain acts relating to the retired status of the Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey;

H. R. 7709. An act to provide for the acquisition, investigation, and preservation of lands to commemorate the historic Fort Caroline settlement, St. Johns Bluff, Fla.;

H. R. 7810. An act for the relief of M. S. Davis;

H. R. 7814. An act for the relief of Stella Matutina Kazuko Yamazaki;

H. R. 7887. An act granting the consent and approval of Congress to an amendment to the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Compact, and repealing the limitation on the life of such compact;

H. R. 7921. An act for the relief of Eva T. Ross;

H. R. 7954. An act to authorize the commercial operation of certain vessels on the Great Lakes;

H. R. 7977. An act to authorize the city of Buffalo, Wyo., to make additional uses of certain lands, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8009. An act for the relief of Enrica Gianoli;

H. R. 8028. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to dispose of the remaining Government lots in the town site of St. Marks, Fla.;

H. R. 8061. An act for the relief of Mrs. Yuki Sugimoto Murphy and David Murphy;

H. R. 8069. An act for the relief of Mrs. Michiki Kohga Brooks;

I hope that this information will be helpful to you in presenting the matter to the Senate.

Warm regards to you, and,

Always sincerely,

CLAUDE PEPPER.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES
IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS,
August 30, 1949.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR CHAVEZ: I will be very glad to advise you of my office facilities, in accordance with your letter of August 23.

I now have a three-room suite, which has proven entirely inadequate. Another room is needed to provide proper working space for my staff.

Sincerely yours,

GLEN H. TAYLOR.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES
IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS,
August 27, 1949.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Senate Office Building Commission, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CHAIRMAN: I agree completely with you on the need of more office space. I know that I certainly need at least one more room.

At the present time, I have five in one room and two in the reception room of my 3-room suite. I need one additional room, not only to ease the crowded condition in the room where there are five, but also to provide privacy that is sacrificed by placing my receptionist and executive assistant in the reception room. I've tried to meet this problem by installing a hush-a-phone on my assistant's phone, but it only partially meets the need of privacy.

Has any cosideration been given to extending the Senate wing of the Capitol or to adding floors to the top of the Senate Office Building? From the advantage of proximity to the Senate floor, I would think that these alternatives might be better.

Sincerely yours,

MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
United States Senator.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
August 25, 1949.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I have your letter of August 18 with reference to the proposed new Senate Office Building. In complying with the request set forth in your letter, I want to point out that when I took office in January, I was assigned a suite of three rooms at 231 Senate Office Building. At that time I had 16 people jammed into two rooms. It was an almost intolerable situation, and after several weeks Senator HAYDEN was kind enough to assign me another single detached room on a diffeernt floor which has relieved the situation somewhat.

My mail is extremely heavy, running about an average of 12,000 letters a month. As a result I have personally acquired two electric typewriters and robotype equipment for them in order to process my mail. My staff present consists of 17 people, and certainly even the space which I now have could hardly be called ample or even adequate for the efficient operation of my office. Unquestionably, any additional space which might be available to me would be most desirable and would most definitely increase the efficiency of my office.

Early in the session I had some hopes that we might have a new Senate Office Building for much less money than has been proposed that we spend on it. I have not gone into that, however, and do not feel that I am in a position to hazard a guess whether or not the necessary space desired could be acquired for less than the proposed cost.

I am hopeful that some arrangement can be made to provide additional space to the Senators.

With assurances of my highest regard, I am,

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE,
AND FOREIGN COMMERCE,
August 25, 1949.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR CHAVEZ: This is in reply to your letter of August 18 in which you ask about the space requirements of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The space facilities for this committee are far from adequate. I have tried for some time to secure additional space, and the Committee on Rules and Administration has tried to be of assistance, but apparently there is just no space available.

As you probably are aware, in addition to its regular committee work this committee was authorized and directed to make four very important and far-reaching studies and investigations. We have employed additional temporary personnel to assist with these studies, but because of the very unsatisfactory space situation these employees are located in three widely separated rooms in the Senate Office Building and a substantial part of the committee's files are located in the Capitol Building. Room 457 is assigned to this committee, but because of this space shortage we have had to convert it into a work room, consequently we cannot use it for hearings and have to hunt around for a room when hearings are held.

In connection with the four investigations I have mentioned above, I had hoped to set up a central stenographic pool, which would have cut down on the number of employees, but manifestly that is impossible when the committee staff is scattered all over the building.

The Rules Committee tells me that there is just no more space available. It would seem that the only answer is to enlarge the Senate Office Building or construct a new building.

Sincerely yours,

E. C. JOHNSON, *Chairman.*

I wish we might build an addition on the Capitol Building instead of spreading so far to the east as is contemplated in the proposed building.—E. C. J.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., August 26, 1949.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Thank you for your letter of August 18 in which you request information concerning my present office facilities.

The space is wholly inadequate for my present staff, which may be increased somewhat next year, and the small space now allotted me is such that proper arrangement, condusive to orderly staff functioning, is impossible.

With best wishes and kindest regards,

Sincerely,

HOMER CAPEHART.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE
AND FORESTRY,
August 26, 1949.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Public Works, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I thank you for your letter of August 18, 1949, and I am glad to have the information which you give with reference to the proposed new Senate Office Building. I shall be glad to consider this fully before the time comes to take it up in the second session of the Eighty-first Congress.

With best wishes always, I am

Yours very truly,

CLYDE R. HOEY.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., August 23, 1949.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: In your capacity as chairman of the Senate Office Building Commission, I should like you to know that it has been my experience that added space would be most helpful to promoting more efficient operation of the senatorial office.

Although I come from a small State and hence, do not have the demands of many of the larger ones, I too have had to face this problem. It would be my hope that before long, adequate facilities might be available.

With kindest personal regards,

Sincerely yours,

J. HOWARD MCGRATH,
United States Senator.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON BANKING
AND CURRENCY,
August 24, 1949.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have received your letter of August 18 referring to your continued efforts directed toward the construction of a new Senate Office Building.

In answer to your specific question, I believe that I could now use, and will in the future continue to need, more space than I am presently assigned. We are crowded now, and fully expect to be more crowded as time progresses.

Further I would appreciate having a more convenient office arrangement. At the present time, one of the rooms is entirely separate from the other three. It would be not only more convenient but more efficient to have the office suite in one unit.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. BRICKER.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
August 25, 1949.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Senate Office
Building Commission,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CHAVEZ: In response to yours of August 19, 1949, relative to office facilities will say that I incline to the opinion that my office staff is less in number than is that of the staff of most of the other Senators and particularly those Senators representing more populous States.

It is practically mandatory that a Senator have a room by himself in order that he may dictate and hold consultations without interruptions. His office should be so arranged that his administrative assistant and executive secretary should be in a position to attend to their duties and work without

the interruptions occasioned by visiting delegations and others during office hours. Such an arrangement cannot be had with the limited number of rooms apportioned to most of the Senators.

My opinion of the matter is that the office facilities of most of the Senators at least are inadequate and that, viewed from my experience with the staff I have, additional space would be very helpful.

With kindest personal regards, I am

Yours sincerely,

BERT H. MILLER.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
August 23, 1949.

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building.

DEAR SENATOR: This is to acknowledge your letter of August 19.

I do have inadequate office space but I am one of those who oppose the construction of the projected new Senate Office Building. I am advocating economy in government and am willing to practice it myself. If all the various agencies of government would follow our example we would have real economy.

Kind personal regards, I am

Sincerely,

HOMER FERGUSON.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON
INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE,
Dexter, Maine, August 22, 1949.

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building Committee,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DENNIS: I am heartily in favor of expanding the facilities for Congress to cope with the tremendous increased responsibilities of the Federal Government.

Congress is still trying to operate in the twentieth century with a nineteenth-century machine.

Cordially yours,

OWEN BREWSTER,
United States Senator.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON
AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY,
August 23, 1949.

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Senate Office Building Commission, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Replying to your courteous letter of August 20, I hasten to say that I appreciate the thoughtful inquiry and add that I have been especially cramped in office quarters since my return to the Senate in January of this year.

As one of the newer Senators, I have a three-room suite and space is so limited that for more than 6 months after coming to the Senate in January I was unable to appoint an administrative assistant because I had no place to put a desk for him. Through the kindness of Senator THOMAS, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, I was able to provide temporary space for an administrative assistant during the past 30 days in a room adjacent to the Agriculture Committee room. It is an imposition on Senator THOMAS and a tremendous inconvenience to me.

I am convinced that when I return to Washington at the beginning of the next congressional term that I shall have to dispense with an administrative assistant unless I can find some quarters for him to have desk room where I can contact him with reasonable facility.

Personal greetings.

Sincerely,

GUY M. GILLETTE.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON
LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE,
Washington, D. C., August 23, 1949.

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Senate Office Building Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CHAVEZ: Thank you for your very friendly note about the new Senate Office Building and inquiry about my conditions so far as space is concerned.

May I reply with equal frankness and friendliness.

Although my offices are probably more overcrowded than those of any other Senator, I do not favor spending the money which a new building would cost. I have only a three-room suite, plus a small room in the basement, to handle the affairs of a State with 8,500,000 people, with a correspondence that runs between 700 and 800 letters a day and with a swarm of visitors.

But the need for economy is, in my judgment, so great that I am willing to put up with this inconvenience in order to save the $20,000,000, plus upkeep, which a new building would entail.

Appreciating the sincerity of your motives and with best personal wishes,

Faithfully,

PAUL H. DOUGLAS.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, in the light of recent events the appropriation in this bill of $1,200,000,000 for armed aid to western Europe is woefully inadequate. This country is faced with a grave decision. We must build up the forces of western Europe. We must contribute, for our own welfare, vast amounts of equipment to our allies there. We must build up the Armed Forces of the United States to an extent to make it impracticable for the Soviet Union to launch a general war. We must at once mobilize American industry commensurate with the crisis. This is the best way to prevent general war.

Mr. President, the main thing that the events in Korea have shown is how woefully weak, how woefully unprepared we are in the face of the gravest threat ever faced by the American people. The lesson in Korea is valuable, but Korea, and all of Asia, for that matter, though extremely important to this country, are not the main show. Their conquest by communism is not the paramount danger to the United States. This country can live without Asia, but we cannot live without Europe. Do not misunderstand me. We must prevent Communist aggression in Korea. We must prevent by the use of Armed Forces Communist conquest of the Continent of Asia. Our Government is following the only course we can pursue in this matter.

Mr. President, be this as it may, there is no way that the United States can live if Europe is controlled by the Soviet Union. In my judgment, the very life of the United States—the lives, the welfare, the security of the American people—depend absolutely upon the prevention of the conquest of western Europe by the Soviet Union. To capture western Europe is the primary objective of the Soviet Union. The prevention of this conquest must be the primary objective of the United States. In fact, our frontier is not upon the Rhine, but it is the Oder-Neisse line.

Now, Mr. President, what are the facts? As a result of the war and of the devastation and chaos which ensued, a vast vacuum or void was created in western Europe. Today that vacuum has not been filled. It will be filled by some nation in time. It we do not act, it will be filled in time by the Soviet Union, and then all will be lost. The states of western Europe which comprise it are bitterly anti-Communist, but weak, helpless, and without armed resources because of the war. In western Germany we find the people are among the leading anti-Communist people of the world. They are a strong race. They are a people whose historic mission has been to prevent the expansion of the Mongol-Communist hordes into Europe. We have forbidden the people of western Germany, even though they desired to do so, to arm and defend themselves from communism. In Russian Germany and in the satellite states there are vast Communist armies, well trained, in the "pink" of condition, equipped with artillery, guns, tanks, planes—all of the latest design. In fact, this army is invincible in Europe today. Russia knows that no formidable force confronts it in Europe, and it knows that it could largely win its war and gravely weaken the United States by the occupation of western Europe.

Why does it not do so, Mr. President? The authorities, the experts, those high in Government who should know, say the following is the reason why Russia does not openly intervene in Korea and launch a general war at this time:

The atomic development of this country is far advanced over the atomic development of the Soviet Union. In fact, the atomic development of the Soviet Union is in its infancy. These authorities hold that Russia will not unleash a general war until her atomic development has progressed to a point where it can neutralize ours, and she could bomb American ports and cities and thus prevent our sending a military force for the reconquest of Europe and to repulse the Soviet Union.

Mr. President, the destruction of a very few American ports would make it impossible for this country to launch an offensive in Europe.

The main reason is, however, the authorities hold, the fear on the part of the Soviet Union that because of our atomic advances we could devastate the cities and industry of Russia with the atomic weapons which we possess. These same authorities hold, however—and my judgment is that they are correct—that given 2, 3, to 4 years, when Russia's atomic-war industry will be much further developed, she will have atomic weapons in such quantities as to neutralize the atomic weapons of the United States. We will be in a position with atomic weapons then as great nations now are with poison gas; it is too dangerous for each side to use atomic weapons as it now is to use poison gas. We will be in a position where the atomic weapons of each side will neutralize the other, and then, Mr. President, the Red army will march, provided the west is not

adequately defended. The Red army will march if we are weak. The Red army will march if the Atlantic community of nations cannot immediately defend themselves. The only reason that would make war inevitable is that the west is weak and Russia, a predatory aggressor, is strong. If France and Britain had not been militarily weak in 1939, there would have been no World War II. Aggressors do not march when their foes are equally as strong. Aggression breeds upon weakness, not strength. If it is too dangerous to do so, Russia will not march, as Hitler would not have done in 1939.

Unless we are adequately defended we are absolutely certain to have a general war with the Soviet Union. We have only 2 to 3 years at the most to accomplish this, and, Mr. President, we must build up the defenses of the country; we must rearm; and we must rearm our allies abroad.

It is senseless not to cooperate with the two strongest peoples on the continent of Europe, the people of Spain and Western Germany. These are the people with a will to fight communism. These are the people who will take up arms to prevent communist aggression. I say it does not make sense to the American people that we do not make use of the manpower and resources of these two countries in the defense of western civilization.

Observe what is happening in the Soviet zone of Germany today. Russia has built up a large force, and has facing us from 50 to 75,000 so-called German police, a force which is being rapidly expanded to 150,000 men. This force is similar to the communist puppets in Korea, is organized as they are, and is equipped with arms, tanks, and weapons similar to those used by them. Furthermore, they have built there a skeleton army of 50,000 from officer and nonofficer cadres around which a German army could be quickly built. In fact, she has created there a skeleton army which could quickly be expanded into a strong army for use against us.

While Russia does this, Mr. President, the United States will not take steps to build up an allied army in western Germany to enable the Germans to defend themselves, and thus increase our strength and lessen our responsibilities.

Our policy in refusing to use German and Spanish manpower and resources is to appease for political purposes certain left-wing and radical groups in the United States and abroad. This political appeasement, Mr. President, has jeopardized the defense of our country, and if not quickly changed will be paid for by the blood of thousands of American boys.

The United States, unless it is rearmed, mobilized and prepared for defense, faces defeat in war, or isolation in the world. Each of these means the death and destruction of the country. We do not have today as many men under arms as we had in 1940, and the dangers which face us are many times more serious and more deadly. This country must have industrial mobilization immediately on a scale commensurate with the crisis. We cannot rearm ourselves and help to rearm our allies, in the short time allotted by fate to us, on a policy of business as usual. The $1,200,000,000 requested in this bill is totally inadequate. Last year we appropriated $1,500,000,000 for armed aid to western Europe and to implement the North Atlantic Pact. This was all right as a starter, but it is suicide to continue at the present pace. The rate of rearmament must be greatly stepped up both at home and abroad. We must be fully rearmed within 2 to 3 years. This is the time that is allotted to us.

Mr. President, we should double the arms aid program for western Europe this year. We must immediately mobilize our industry, and build up the Armed Forces of the United States. Who says we have enough guns, enough planes, enough weapons of any kind? Who says we are not woefully weak? Who says we are not too weak for our own security? Who says we have armed forces capable of protecting us? We cannot speedily mop up the communist bandits in Korea.

Mr. President, this is an intolerable situation, with world conditions as they are today. In fact, strong American forces are the key to our security, the key to European security, the key to Asiatic security, the buffer to prevent Russian aggression. In 1939, when the danger to civilization was not as great as it is today, we became the arsenal of democracy. Today the cupboard is bare, and we are not taking steps sufficient in this emergency to protect this country. If we are to avoid war, we must make it too costly and too dangerous for predatory communism to attack.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the Federal Government has just ended another fiscal year in the red. This was the eighteenth Federal deficit during the 20 years since 1930, and 13 of these annual deficits have been in peacetime years. The deficit record, exclusive of the war years follows:

1931	$400,000,000
1932	2,500,000,000
1933	1,800,000,000
1934	2,900,000,000
1935	3,200,000,000
1936	4,500,000,000
1937	3,100,000,000
1938	1,400,000,000
1939	3,500,000,000
1940	3,600,000,000
1941	5,100,000,000
(1942–46, war years.)	
(1947–48, surpluses.)	
1949	1,800,000,000
1950	3,100,000,000

The 2 years in the black were in the period of the Eightieth Congress.

The total debt is now $257,220,328,000.

The $3,100,000,000 deficit for the year 1950 compares with the President's January estimate of $5,500,000,000.

The President arrived at this deficit estimate by calculating that receipts would be $37,800,000,000 and expenditures would total $43,300,000,000. Revenue fell $800,000,000 short of his estimate and be overestimated expenditures by more than $3,100,000,000. The result was a deficit of $3,100,000,000 instead of the estimated $5,500,000,000.

EXPENDITURE SLOW-DOWN

It would be a mistake to assume that all this $2,400,000,000 reduction in deficit spending represents a saving. In a large measure it merely represents a slow-down in the schedule of construction and procurement expenditures which probably will be made up in the fiscal years 1951 and 1952. The money is still appropriated and is still available for spending.

The President's estimates failed to materialize primarily for two reasons. One was uncalculated increases in employment generally which curtailed expenditures in the big veterans and social security programs, and simultaneously reduced the demand for Government loans and increased the market for paper held by Government lending agencies.

The second reason is to be found in a chain reaction which was set in motion by delay in the enactment of last year's appropriation bills. This delay in passage of appropriation bills slowed down expenditure schedules particularly in programs and agencies where funds in large measure were to be used for construction and procurement. And in some cases when these agencies appeared before the House Appropriations Committee with unexpectedly large balances in view the committee accordingly cut back the appropriations for fiscal year 1951. This committee action plus further reductions voted on the floor of the House and the tightening up of the antideficiency provisions had the effect of freezing, or at least further slowing down the rate of expenditures during the final quarter of fiscal year 1950, because the agencies did not choose to expand during the last few months of the past year in the face of an impending cut-back at the beginning of the new year.

Examples of expenditure schedules affected by increased general employment follow:

[In millions]

Agency	President's January estimates	Actual expenditure	Reduction
Social Security Administration	$1,212	$1,154	$58
Other Federal Security	333	277	56
Veterans (exclusive of national service life insurance fund)	6,280	6,044	236
Reconstruction Finance	1,000	589	411
Home Loan Bank Board (collections)	197	275	78

Mr. President, there is another list of examples of the expenditure schedules affected by slow-down in construction and procurement of supplies, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[In millions

Agency	President's January estimates	Actual expenditure	Reduction
Rural Electrification Administration	$362	$293	$69
Atomic Energy Commission	673	524	149
Civil Aeronautics Administration	188	166	22
Public Roads	507	486	21
Defense Establishment	14,500	13,500	1,000
Economic Cooperation Administration	4,100	3,500	600
Mutual defense assistance program	160	44	116
Bureau of Reclamation	334	300	34
Other Interior	304	276	28
Tennessee Valley Authority	52	18	34
General Services Administration	797	588	209

Other areas in which estimates exceeded actual expenditures included

[In millions]

Agency	President's January estimates	Actual expenditures	Reduction
Korean aid	$60	$40	$20
State Department	358	339	19
Maritime activities	162	94	68

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, among all these items, the curtailment by some $600,000,000 in expenditures for veterans and RFC programs represents the principal real savings. The other expenditures in a large measure represent deferments to some subsequent fiscal year—in most instances fiscal year 1951 or fiscal year 1952.

EXPENDITURES SPEED-UP

Offsetting these miscalculations in estimates on the reduction side there were some items where expenditures exceeded the estimates. Among these were:

[In millions]

Agency	President's January estimates	Actual expenditures	Increase
Farmers Home Administration	$26	$182	$156
Commodity Credit Corporation	1,556	1,713	157
Labor Department	157	258	101
Postal deficiency	573	593	20
Interest on the debt	5,725	5,750	25

Mr. President, I attempt by this to show the reasons why the actual deficit was less than the estimated deficit.

COMPARED WITH 1949

Despite this slow-down under the expenditure tempo as estimated by the President for fiscal year 1950, we still exceeded 1949 expenditures by more than $100,000,000 and thus set a new peacetime record. While expenditures went up, receipts came down. They finally totaled $800,000,000 less than the President estimated and nearly $1,250,000,000 under 1949.

EFFECT ON 1951 EXPENDITURES

It is difficult, of course, at this time to estimate how much of the 1950 expenditure slow-down will be made up in increased expenditures in fiscal year 1951, but it is certain that the carry-overs are not likely to result in reductions in 1951 estimates. There are some which obviously are just the difference between obligations and expenditures such as the carry-over from 1950 expenditure estimates for public roads, airports, TVA steam plant, and General Services procurement.

There are others where more than 1 year may be required to make up for the slow-down, such as the REA's rural-telephone program, ECA commitments, Reclamation construction, procurement, and development, atomic-energy activities, and military construction and procurement.

The reductions in such veterans' programs as on-the-job training, which occurred when industry payrolls absorbed the veteran trainees during the year, and reductions resulting from the failure of demand for Government loans to materialize, and the spurt in the market for Government loan paper, may definitely be regarded as a saving in 1950 budget estimates without qualification.

1951 REVENUE

There appears to be reason to expect that at least some of these carry-overs will result in increased spending in 1951. In this situation consideration should be given to the fact that the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, subject to revision if a new tax bill is passed, estimates that revenue this year will not exceed $35,100,000,000—a reduction of $2,000,000,000 under the year just ended. If this estimate were to be sustained, Federal revenue will have dropped $3,000,000,000 in 2 years. Of course, this estimate may be changed by the economic conditions of the country.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCLELLAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

My BYRD. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator is a member of the Senate Finance Committee. In view of the situation which seems to be developing in Korea, is it the view of the Senator that the committee should proceed with further consideration of the bill which the committee has been considering?

Mr. BYRD. In answer to the Senator from Connecticut I will say that it is my personal judgment, as a member of the Finance Committee and as a Member of the Senate, that no bill should be enacted which would bring about a net loss of revenue to the Federal Government. Because of the very serious conditions confronting the Nation and in view of the fact that we must look forward to increased expenditures for military purposes, I do not think we should reduce by even a small amount the net income we now derive under the present schedule of taxes. That is my feeling as a member of the committee. Of course, I cannot speak for the other members of the committee.

If we can arrive at a balanced bill whereby the loss of revenue on certain items can be made up by increasing the taxes on others, of course, that will present a different situation; but certainly, in my judgment, we should not decrease the present tax revenues.

The joint committee's revenue estimate for the year just ended was closer to the actual figure than the administration's forecast. By the administration's most optimistic estimate to date, revenue in the current fiscal year 1951 would be one-quarter of a billion dollars less than receipts for 1950, and this would be a full billion dollars under the 1949 revenue.

DEFICITS CONTINUE

If the joint committee's revenue estimate prevails, and if the President's expenditure requests should be granted in full, the deficit next June 30 would be $7,300,000,000, exclusive of expenditure increases resulting from the 1950 slow-down. Even if the revenue should exceed the administration's most optimistic estimate, the President's expenditure requests for fiscal year 1951, plus the uncalculated carry-over from the year just ended, would result in a deficit this year of more than $5,000,000,000.

Thus, in 3 years—based on the actual figures for 1949 and 1950 and on the President's estimates for the current year—we shall have indulged the people of this Nation in $10,000,000,000 of deficit spending. With no sense of pride, I recall my prediction a year ago, when, with no war in sight, it became evident that we were entering a prolonged orgy of deficit financing.

At that time I estimated the 1949 deficit at $800,000,000, and was a billion dollars too low. My estimate for the current year was a $3,400,000,000 deficit; and if it were not for the delay in construction and procurement expenditure schedules, I would have been more than $1,000,000,000 low again. My deficit forecast for the coming year was $6,500,000,000. I hope my 1951 estimate will be high for a change; but even excluding consideration of the effect on the budget of the aggravated foreign situation, there would be reason to expect it to be low again unless substantial reductions were made in the President's requests.

In any event, it is certain that there will be another big deficit in the fiscal year 1951, exclusive of the unestimated costs of the Korean outbreak. This will be the third deficit in successive years of peak employment and inflated income. These facts raise the question as to whether we shall ever again balance the Federal budget.

DESTRUCTION OF THE SYSTEM

It should be noted that all of these calculations are exclusive of the effects of the current international situation and the pending tax bill. Consideration of these factors will be reached later on.

Meanwhile, with or without a tax bill or the additional costs of an international crisis, the President does not give even lip-service sympathy to reductions in his proposals to spend $42,500,000,000 in the current fiscal year. This silence is despite the fact that his requests include demands for $12,200,000,000 in domestic programs, exclusive of defense, veterans, foreign assistance, and interest on the

debt—an increase of $5,300,000,000 since 1948.

When, in January, the President made these requests, on the basis of his own revenue estimates, he admittedly proposed deficit spending for fiscal year 1951 to the extent of $5,100,000,000, which was approximately the equivalent of the 2-year increase in domestic civilian spending. This could be regarded as evidence that we have been led into a fallacious policy of deficit financing to create inflation, which in turn would produce more synthetic revenue to justify more Federal spending.

How Government-fed inflation works is simply illustrated as follows:

Since 1939 population has increased 16 percent; Federal expenditures have increased 500 percent; personal income has increased 180 percent; the cost of living, exclusive of taxes, has increased 180 percent; Federal collection of taxes has increased 700 percent.

We have before us the pre-Korean crisis expert warning of Dr. Edwin G. Nourse that inflationary dangers are inherent in the current deficit-financing policy.

Since the appropriation bill has been before the Senate Appropriations Committee, Dr. Nourse has expressed apprehension that the rate of deficit spending by the executive branch, aggravated in the legislative process, may produce accelerated prices which might lead to a run-away boom. This, he said, could be followed by a genuine depression and brutal deflation that come with a sharp contraction of demand due to unemployment and drying up of active business investment.

The Federal Government is directly responsible for what Dr. Nourse described as credit expansion policies which have led not only to cashing in past savings but also drawing on future income, in contrast with the sound policy of finding a true market balance between full volume production and current consumer income.

Thus, he said, we have failed to conserve our market-supporting ammunition.

Mr. President, continuous deficit spending inevitably will destroy our form of government through confiscatory taxes, inflationary booms, complete regimentation or unmanageable debt, or the combination of one or more of these evil companions of continuing deficits.

In peace, nothing is more subversive to our form of government than unnecessary deficit financing.

Most of the deficit spending contemplated in the pending appropriation bill was conceived and proposed in the absence of any imminence of war or international crisis. The effect on the deficit of any additional requirement for expenditures resulting from recent incidents abroad will be only a matter of degree.

THE ALTERNATIVE

It may be said that our deficit-financing policies might readily be the most effective fifth column now at large in the United States. The alternative to destruction by deficit—in hot war or cold war, in peace or in conflict—is reduction of nonessential domestic-civilian expenditures. On the basis of the President's January requests, the budget would be balanced for fiscal year 1951 if Federal expenditures for strictly domestic-civilian activities—exclusive of defense, foreign assistance, veterans, interest—were on a level with such expenditures in 1948. In other words, if we were to spend for domestic-civilian activities, exclusive of defense, foreign assistance, veterans, and interest, the same amount we spent in 1948, the budget now would be balanced. It is my firm conviction that this retrenchment in these activities certainly would neither jeopardize the national welfare nor disturb the sound prosperity of the Nation. On the contrary, it would reenforce the moral fiber of our citizens for whatever tests may lie ahead, and would put us in a better position to develop an invincible military defense.

COMMITMENTS

I realize, of course, that some of the $12,250,000,000 which domestic-civilian programs would cost us under the President's requests is tied to long-term commitments now rooted in authorizations made by law. I take this occasion to repeat what I have been saying for years: We should proceed with caution toward the enactment of basic legislation which in effect commits the Federal Government to virtually permanent spending programs.

I went into this matter in great detail last December, before the President brought in his budget requests for fiscal year 1951, hoping that he would recommend basic legislative action curtailing these programs. We know from experience that reductions in the cost of Government involving entrenched long-term programs is next to impossible without the force of executive recommendation and attitude.

CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

The pending budget for fiscal year 1951 was submitted without either recommendation or sympathetic attitude with respect to retrenchment in domestic-civilian deficit spending. On the contrary, the President's budget document contained nearly two full pages of recommendations for new programs and extension of expiring programs; and the majority of these proposed legislation items fall into the strictly domestic category.

We must effect substantial reductions which would ease the fiscal strain to which the Federal Government is being subjected unnecessarily by nonessential expenditures—when I say "nonessential" I mean nonessential especially with respect to the national defense—for strictly domestic-civilian activities at a time when the need for additional military outlays appears to be imminent.

Fortunately, the Senate for the first time in modern history is considering the Federal expenditure budget in a single appropriation bill; and this makes it possible to apply reductions throughout the entire budget, with due consideration given to the merit of each and all items which are embraced by the measure.

Under the able leadership of the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, it has been demonstrated that such reductions can be made fairly, effectively, and orderly—without the meat-ax approach which was necessary when appropriations were considered in 12 or more separate and unrelated bills brought before Congress over a period of six or more months. Under the forthright leadership of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the Senate Committee, too, has done excellent work with this initial effort to bring out a single appropriation bill. Despite its size, we are still months ahead of the appropriation bill schedule of last year.

We should sustain the House reductions, Mr. President, and we should increase them in every possible way, as they relate to nondefense spending. Actually, a good part of the reductions accomplished under the President's estimates are in terms of legislation he requested, but which has not been enacted. There is on the statute books much legislation which can be cut without impairment of any essential function.

If we are not willing to give up nonessentials while Americans are being shot, we are not worthy of our position of world leadership.

Recent developments indicate that Russia is waging a war of economic attrition to destroy the solvency of the United States, which means the destruction of our private-enterprise system and the loss of our freedoms. First, we had the airlift incident in Berlin, which cost hundreds of millions. We now have the Korean incident, which will probably cost billions, with the loss of many American lives, and, if the 50,000 troops in North Korea are conquered—as, of course, I feel they will be, in time—this will lead to a long-time occupation of Korea, which will add still further to the cost. It is likely and probable that other such incidents will break out elsewhere on the globe in which our Nation will be involved.

These vast expenditures come at a time when the President and the Congress have deliberately neglected the opportunity to balance the budget, which can be done by economy and retrenchment in domestic spending. I repeat: In fiscal 1948 domestic spending, exclusive of veterans, national defense, foreign aid, and interest on the national debt, was $6,900,000,000. The President recommends in his budget for the pending fiscal year an expenditure for the same domestic purposes of $12,200,000,000, an increase of nearly 100 percent.

We must face the situation squarely. We must retrench at home or run the risk of weakening day by day our fiscal economy by adding to a public debt which is now more than a quarter of a trillion dollars.

If a war incident such as is now occurring in Korea should develop into a world conflict, we would incur a public indebtedness which would be so colossal and overwhelming that it would be impossible for us to maintain our free-enterprise system, which has been the foundation on which the progress and success of America has been built.

I emphasize again that every single dollar should be saved in all expenditures

not affecting our national defense and our security, because no one can foretell, in these difficult days, what demands may be made upon us in the days and years to come.

Mr. DOUGLAS and Mr. DONNELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, did the Chair recognize the Senator from Illinois?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognized the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say I should be very glad to yield to the Senator from Missouri for a question, or for an insertion in the RECORD.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I desire to obtain the floor in my own right. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I rise to oppose the Senate committee's amendment which is now the pending question before the Senate. This appropriates initially the sum of $10,000,000 to start a new and additional Senate Office Building. We have heard this morning that if the original plans are to go through, the ultimate cost of this new building will be approximately $21,000,000, and if abridged and simplified plans are put into effect, that the cost will be $16,000,000. I want to say I think the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is completely correct in objecting to this building, particularly at this time. The senior Senator from Virginia has just reminded us that the deficit for the fiscal year which we have just passed, ending the first of July, was $3,100,000,000. The deficit for the coming year, even according to the appropriation bill presented to us, and without allowance for further war emergency expenses, may run to $4,000,000,000 or $5,000,000,000. If we should become involved in large military expenses in Korea, in Asia, and in other portions of the world, the deficit will be much, much more than $4,000,000,000 or $5,000,000,000. Therefore, Mr. President, I submit that we should think very carefully before we commit ourselves to appropriating $10,000,000 for an office building this year, knowing that it will require the appropriation of additional sums of from $6,000,000 to $11,000,000 in future years, and knowing also that, as the senior Senator from Louisiana has pointed out, the costs of maintenance, exclusive of interest upon the building itself, will run between $500,000 and $600,000 a year.

Mr. President, I do not think we should make this expenditure. I want to say that I am aware of the fact that a good many Senators find themselves in crowded quarters. I happen to represent the fourth State in the Union from the standpoint of population. My mail is probably among the first 12, measured in volume, received. I am not as crowded and I do not have as large a volume of mail as the two Senators from New York, and probably not as large a volume of mail as the two Senators from Pennsylvania. But my mail runs well over a thousand letters a day, and we have a large volume of work to do.

Naturally, as a junior Senator, I am not entitled to very much office space. I am not entitled to the four-room suite of offices to which senior Senators are entitled. I was given a three-room suite, and I make no complaint about that whatever. I want to say that through the kindness of the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] I was given an additional room in the basement, to help handle some of my mass mail. But, nevertheless, even with four rooms, I suppose that, with the exception of the two Senators from New York, I am about as crowded as any Senator in this body. Naturally, we could use a little more space. But I do not think it is worth $20,000,000 to accommodate me and to accommodate other Senators who may be in the same position.

I intend to make no comments upon the allocation of such space as we have as between Senators, because that would be unseemly and unbecoming in a relatively junior Member. I would merely remark, however, that some Senators, because of their seniority, acquire the chairmanships of committees, and, at the same time, that they have a four-room suite, receive additional office space. I would suggest that a reallocation of existing office space would receive such needs for added rooms as may exist.

I want to say that I am not urging such reallocation; I am not asking for it. I am quite content to exist with the office space I have. I am far more content to remain in the small suite of offices I have than to agree to a bill which provides for spending $20,000,000 of the taxpayers' money for a new office building.

Mr. President, I think we have got into the habit, within the past 20 years, of building elaborate quarters here. The early buildings in Washington, to which we still point with pride, were simple in nature, but they have been relatively adequate. The very able Senator from New Mexico invoked the name of Thomas Jefferson. He was quite right. Thomas Jefferson was a great architect and a great landscape gardener, in addition to all his other qualities. If we visit Monticello, the University of Virginia, and the Capitol building in Richmond, it will be found that Jefferson got his results through a minimum of expense, and yet achieved dignity and simplicity.

The White House to which visitors go when they come to Washington, is an example of dignified simplicity. The Capitol is not excessively elaborate. The House and Senate Office Buildings are simple and dignified. But, beginning in approximately 1930, we moved into the Imperial Roman period of architecture wtih the erection of the Commerce Building. I went into the Commerce Building in the early 1930's. I was struck by the big offices and the elaborate space provided for the Secretary of Commerce and for the Under Secretaries of Commerce.

As other department buildings were erected on Constitution Avenue, every secretary, every assistant secretary, and every bureau chief demanded that his office should be as large as or larger than the comparable offices in the Department of Commerce, until finally, I am told, some secretaries would send men around with measuring tape to find out what was the actual size of the offices of other Cabinet officials and insist that in their new building they must have more square feet or more cubic feet of space.

Mr. President, I think we have now reached the point where the average American citizen feels very much embarrassed in going into the average governmental building, particularly the departmental buildings. He feels overawed by the architecture; he feels he is insignificant and that the people who dwell in these magnificent buildings and who have such large offices must be above and beyond him. In a democracy, Mr. President, every citizen should be able to go into a public building and not feel ashamed of himself and not feel insignificant. He should feel that he is on an equality with the persons who dwell therein. That is the characteristic of Monticello. The humblest and poorest American citizen can go to the hilltop of Monticello, look at the building, and feel that he is a part of it. He is not overawed by it. He can walk down the campus of the University of Virginia, down those declining terraces, see those brick buildings with colonnade pillars in front, and he can feel that this noble architectural work of beauty belongs to him and that he is a part of it. He is not overawed by it. But let the average American citizen go into the Department of Commerce, the Department of Labor, the Department of Justice, the Department of Agriculture, or the Post Office Department, and see the secretaries dwelling in marble halls, in offices so large that it is almost necessary to put on roller skates to go from one end to the other, with the carpet so thick and soft that snowshoes are needed in order to prevent falling through, and the average American citizen does feel overawed. We have given up democratic simplicity in most of our executive buildings and are going in for almost oriental magnificence.

This infection is spreading to Capitol Hill, Mr. President, because we look down Constitution Avenue and see the secretaries and assistant secretaries and bureau chiefs, who come before us for appropriations and for confirmation of their nomination—we see them driving up in automobiles as big as trucks, and we say to ourselves, "Are we not as important to the United States as are these men, and should we not have as elaborate buildings as they occupy? Build us more stately mansions, oh my soul; put up another office building so that we, too, may have large offices, so that people may walk before us in that air of hushed reverence with which people greet the functionaries downtown."

Mr. President, I think that is a false sense of values. We do not obtain dignity by the size of our offices, by the size of our buildings, or by the elaborateness of our quarters. We obtain dignity by our behavior as Senators, and not by the external accouterments of power with which we may surround ourselves.

Mr. President, I hope very much, therefore, that we will not put up any

way intend to rule upon the point raised by the Senator from Michigan that the Secretary of Agriculture might have violated section 201 of Title XVIII of the United States Code, but he expressed the belief that that was a matter which would properly come under the Department of Justice, rather than under the Comptroller General's Office.

He also makes it clear that in making a ruling that there was no provision of law which would enable him to disallow the expenses of those four thousand-odd committeement who had been invited to the meeting, "That does not necessarily mean, of course, that I approve of the meeting or the way in which it was conducted. As you know, I have no authority to disallow or withhold credit for payments because they may have been made extravagantly or unwisely."

He also holds that even though the Secretary of Agriculture may have violated the criminal code, the committeemen could not be held responsible for that.

In an effort finally to make this whole situation a bit clearer, I ask that these three letters be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, June 20, 1950.

Hon. GEORGE D. AIKEN,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR AIKEN: Reference is made to your letters of April 12 and May 19, 1950, relative to the meeting of the Production and Marketing Administration, Department of Agriculture, at St. Paul, Minn., on April 3 and 4, 1950.

There is attached for your information a copy of the report of investigation of the matter made by the General Accounting Office which, by Office letter of today, was furnished the chairman of the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities at his request. Also, attached is a copy of Secretary Brannan's address as made available by him and of his report to this Office relative to the said meeting.

With regard to whether the salary and expenses of the community committeemen attending the meeting may properly be allowed, the Secretary of Agriculture, by section 388 of the act of February 16, 1938, 52 Stat. 68, 7 U. S. C. 1388, is directed to utilize State, county, and local committees as established by 16 U. S. C. 590h (b), and the programs of the Production and Marketing Administration are largely administered through such committeemen. As you know the said committeemen are not regular Government employees but farmers elected to assist in carrying out the agricultural programs. To effectively carry out their duties, of course, they must be trained as to their functions and related problems and the regulations of the Department of Agriculture (par. 713.37, Regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture Governing PMA County and Community Committees) provide for meetings "when necessary to the successful administration of the program." The salary and travel expenses of the community committeemen appear to have been in accordance with rates duly established by competent authority under regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture. Also, the said salary and expenses appear to constitute administrative expenses incurred by the county committeemen in cooperating in the carrying out of the production-and-marketing program which the Secretary of Agriculture by section 388 (b) of the act of February 16, 1938, 7 U. S. C. 1388b, is authorized and directed to pay out of funds made available for such program. The meeting considered as a whole appears to have familiarized such committeemen with the workings of the program, and it is believed that the salary and expenses of the community committeemen are properly authorized to be paid as administrative expenses of the county committee under section 388 (b) of the said act. While the said section of law makes provision for payment of the administrative expenses of the county committee, the salary and expenses of the community committeemen who assist the county committees in carrying out the program appear properly to be for consideration as an administrative expense of the county committee which is payable in the same way as would other administrative expenses of this county committee such as stenographic services, their own compensation and expenses, and the like.

I trust that what is set forth above and the attached material will be of assistance to you.

Sincerely yours,
LINDSAY WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY,
July 6, 1950.

Hon. LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WARREN: I want to thank you for your letter of June 20 and also for the material enclosed relating to the meeting of the Production and Marketing Administration, Department of Agriculture, at St. Paul, Minn., on April 3 and 4, 1950.

However, I must say that I am pretty much disappointed and disturbed in your report as submitted. In effect, you almost give the PMA a clean bill of health in connection with this meeting.

The crux of the issue raised by me in connection with this meeting was whether or not the expenses and salary of community committeemen could be paid in connection with their attendance at the second day of St. Paul meeting for the purpose of hearing political speeches.

Senator FERGUSON made the point that Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan violated section 201 of title 18 of the United States Code by making a speech intended to influence legislation. In other words, instead of discussing the PMA program as now authorized by law, he made a plea for the adoption of the so-called Brannan plan. Certainly, this plea for the Brannan plan could have been made for no other purpose than the influencing of proposed legislation.

So far as I can see, you have not made any finding as to whether the Secretary violated section 201 of the law in making such a speech. Possibly you do not consider this as coming under your jurisdiction.

However, as to the specific point I made, you state that "said committeemen are not regular Government employees but farmers elected to assist in carrying out the agricultural programs. To effectively carry out their duties, of course, they must be trained as to their functions and related problems and the regulations of the Department of Agriculture (paragraph 713.37, 'Regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture Governing PMA County and Commodity Committees') provide for meetings 'when necessary to the successful administration of the program.'

"The salary and travel expenses of the community committeemen appear to have been in accordance with rates duly established by competent authority under regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture. Also, the said salary and expenses appear to constitute administrative expenses incurred by the county committeemen in cooperating in the carrying out of the Production and Marketing program which the Secretary of Agriculture by section 388 (b) of the act of February 16, 1938 (7 U. S. C. 1388b), is authorized and directed to pay out of funds made available for such program."

You have ignored the fact that the community committeemen were not even invited to attend the first day of the meeting on April 3 which was publicized by the PMA as the day on which county committeemen would "make plans for the year's conservation work and to consider administrative details of the price-support and crop-insurance programs."

It was made clear in the PMA news releases that the county committeemen would "be joined by community committeemen for the second day's session in the auditorium arena." I have searched the record carefully and I cannot find any statement or announcement whatsoever that the second day's meeting would be devoted to, or was actually devoted to, anything but speeches. These speeches were not billed as discussions of programs now on the statute books; they were listed in such vague terms as "messages of vital importance to people interested in agriculture."

Besides Secretary Brannan, other speakers at the second day of the conference mentioned were Dr. Dewey Anderson, executive director of Public Affairs Institute, who was there to discuss the President's point 4 program; and Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, who did not discuss the PMA program at all.

I cannot see how you can justify paying community committeemen for attending the second day of the St. Paul meeting on the ground that community committeemen can attend meetings "when necessary to the successful administration of the program." I don't see how even Secretary Brannan's discussion of the proposed Brannan plan has anything to do with the successful administration of the program now on the statute books, which is the only program community or county committeemen have any responsibility for administering.

You also hold that—

"The salary and expenses of the community committeemen who assist the county committees in carrying out the program appear properly to be for consideration as an administrative expense of the county committee which is payable in the same way as would other administrative expenses of this county committee such as stenographic services, their own compensation and expenses and the like."

According to this interpretation, the county committee can hire anyone to attend any meeting for any purpose. I am sure most county committees would not willingly and knowingly do this, but this, nevertheless, is the import of your interpretation.

I want to make it clear that I am not blaming the committeemen for what took place in connection with the St. Paul meeting. It is their superiors whom I hold responsible.

I am keenly disturbed by your report which so obviously evaded the points raised by Senator FERGUSON and myself.

By determining that the 4,256 community committeemen could legally be paid salary and expenses to the second day of the St. Paul conference, I fear you have cleared the way for the expenditure of large sums of PMA funds for political purposes.

Sincerely yours,
GEORGE D. AIKEN,
United States Senator.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, July 7, 1950.

Hon. GEORGE D. AIKEN,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR AIKEN: I have received your letter of July 6, 1950, with further reference to the meeting of the Production and Marketing Administration, Department of Agriculture, at St. Paul, Minn., on April 3 and 4, 1950.

It was somewhat distressing to me to learn that you did not consider my letter of June 20, 1950, as completely responsive to your letters of April 12 and May 19 and I wish to assure you there was certainly no intention on my part to be evasive or to indicate any personal approval of the meeting. My effective jurisdiction in the matter was considered to relate solely to the bare legal question involved—the availability of appropriated funds for the payments to community committeemen—and it was thought that the conclusion that the appropriation was available sufficiently answered your letters to the extent it was within my authority to do so.

For the reasons stated in my letter of June 20, 1950, there appears to be no proper legal basis for the General Accounting Office to disallow credit for the payments made to community committeemen for attendance at the second day of the meeting. Community committeemen are provided for by law, they are authorized to participate in the agricultural programs, they are authorized to attend meetings in relation thereto, and appropriated funds are vailable for expenses incurred in that connection. That does not necessarily mean, of course, that I approve of the meeting or the way in which it was conducted. As you know, I have no authority to disallow or withhold credit for payments because they may have been made extravagantly or unwisely or because the benefits received may not have been as great as might be expected or desired. I have no authority to administer the agricultural programs or to substitute my judgment for the judgment of the officials charged with such responsibility.

The conclusion that community committeemen may be paid in connection with attendance at meetings was not intended to convey the impression that county committees "can hire anyone to attend any meeting for any purpose," and I assure you that the county committees have no such authority and the said conclusion will not be so applied in the audit here of accounts and claims.

It will be noted that section 201 of title 18, United States Code (now sec. 1913, title 18) contains penal provisions for violations thereof which are not within my authority to enforce. The fine and imprisonment provisions thereof are criminal in nature and could be enforced only through judicial action. And should that take place, it probably would afford no basis for disallowing credit for the payments made to the community committeemen. They were paid for attending the meeting and not for attempting to influence anyone.

It is hoped that the foregoing will satisfactorily explain the position of the General Accounting Office in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, in discussing the appropriation bill I do not desire to take very much time, but I discover in the Department of Agriculture appropriation covered in the report on page 90, a provision for the activities under the Research and Marketing Act, 1946. In the House bill an appropriation of $11,000,000 was made, but the Senate committee recommended that $6,000,000 be allowed, and that $5,000,000 be taken from this item and transferred to the Office of Experiment Stations.

I have tried to find in the statements or in the bill or somewhere else an explanation as to why that should have been done. On page 97 I find the very brief statement given there from which I read:

The increase recommended by the committee in this item is to conform to the distribution of section 9 funds from the item for Research and Marketing Act of 1946 in the amount of $5,000,000—

And so forth. That is about the only explanation given.

I turn then to page 106, and I find under the heading "Decreases" that appropriation for the Research and Marketing Act has been decreased $5,000,000, and a statement as to why it is made.

Mr. President, I hope the Committee on Appropriations is prepared to withstand a point of order against this item, because in my opinion it represents an attempt on the part of the Appropriations Committee to change and to repeal by its action portions of the Research and Marketing Act of 1946.

I think I understand the reason for it, but I believe it is nonetheless regretable. I hope the Members of the Senate, before they vote on this item, if they have a chance to vote on it, if the point of order is not found to be good, will read Public Law 733 of the Seventy-fifth Congress again. This is the law known as the Hope-Flannagan Act, or the Flannagan-Hope Act—it has been labeled both ways—named for the majority and minority ranking members of the House Committee on Agriculture in 1946. They both introduced individual bills, and those two bills were consolidated, and the bill passed providing for research and marketing in the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. President, I ask at this point that section 1 of that act may be printed in the RECORD because it states the purpose of the legislation.

There being no objection, section 1 of the act was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECTION 1. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to promote the efficient production and utilization of products of the soil as essential to the health and welfare of our people and to promote a sound and prosperous agriculture and rural life as indispensable to the maintenance of maximum employment and national prosperity. It is also the intent of Congress to assure agriculture a position in research equal to that of industry which will aid in maintaining an equitable balance between agriculture and other sections of our economy. For the attainment of these objectives, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to conduct and to stimulate research into the laws and principles underlying the basic problems of agriculture in its broadest aspects, including but not limited to: Research relating to the improvement of the quality of, and the development of new and improved methods of the production, marketing, distribution, processing, and utilization of plant and animal commodities at all stages from the original producer through to the ultimate consumer; research into the problems of human nutrition and the nutritive value of agricultural commodities, with particular reference to their content of vitamins, minerals, amino and fatty acids, and all other constituents that may be found necessary for the health of the consumer and to the gains or losses in nutritive value that may take place at any stage in their production, distribution, processing, and preparation for use by the consumer; research relating to the development of present, new, and extended uses and markets for agricultural commodities and byproducts as food or in commerce, manufacture, or trade, both at home and abroad, with particular reference to those foods and fibers for which our capacity to produce exceeds or may exceed existing economic demand; research to encourage the discovery, introduction, and breeding of new and useful agricultural crops, plants, and animals, both foreign and native, particularly for those crops and plants which may be adapted to utilization in chemical and manufacturing industries; research relating to new and more profitable uses for our resources of agricultural manpower, soils, plants, animals, and equipment than those to which they are now, or may hereafter be, devoted; research relating to the conservation, development, and use of land, forest, and water resources for agricultural purposes; research relating to the design, development, and the more efficient and satisfactory use of farm buildings, farm homes, farm machinery, including the application of electricity and other forms of power; research relating to the diversification of farm enterprises, both as to the type of commodities produced, and as to the types of operations performed, on the individual farm; research relating to any other laws and principles that many contribute to the establishment and maintenance of a permanent and effective agricultural industry including such investigations as have for their purpose the development and improvement of the rural home and rural life, and the maximum contribution by agriculture to the welfare of the consumer and the maintenance of maximum employment and national prosperity; and such other researches or experiments bearing on the agricultural industry or on rural homes of the United States as may in each case be deemed advisable, having due regard to the varying conditions and needs of Puerto Rico, the respective States, and Territories. In effectuating the purposes of this section, maximum use shall be made of existing research facilities owned or controlled by the Federal Government or by State agricultural experiment stations and of the facilties of the Federal and State extension services. Research authorized under this section shall be in additon to research provided for under existing law (but both activities shall be coordinated so far as practicable).

Mr. ANDERSON. In that connection, section 9 and section 10 were changed in the bill to give additional sums for new types of studies looking toward the better marketing of agricultural products and toward the utilization of farm crops. This had been the subject of long, long study. It was not something which was hastily drawn out of a hat and presented to the Congress. As a matter of fact the Department of Agriculture had caused a survey to be made of every type of agricultural experimental work, research work, that was going on in the whole United States, and after that survey was completed, it required months of time of an entire staff even to correlate all

the facts brought to light as to the type of research being done by private and public institutions in the United States. When all that work was done and when the results of the correlation were apparent to the Department of Agriculture, it was seen that there was need for a tremendous amount of work by the Department of Agriculture itself both by experimentation which it might carry on and by experimentation which it might farm out to the agricultural colleges and to private research organizations if agricultural crops were properly to be utilized. As I said, that was not hastily done. It required months of work. Then finally upon the basis of all that research a bill was prepared and presented to the Congress.

Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the Senate to a pamphlet entitled "The Agricultural Research and Marketing Act of 1946—A Consideration of Basic Objectives and Procedures," which was issued by the Agricultural Committee on National Policy of the National Planning Association. It is strange that a publication of this nature could be issued and the act praised highly by everyone in the United States who was concerned with the Department of Agriculture, and that then a committee of the Congress should wipe out that work in a moment by a provision in the agricultural appropriation bill. It was not done solely by the Senate committee. The House committee took care of the changes in section 10 (a) and (b). Then the Senate committee took care of the provisions in section 9. I submit that those two things added together have pretty effectively scuttled the research provisions of the Research and Marketing Act of 1946.

It seems to me it would have been much better if it was desired to repeal the act, to have raised the question on the floor by submitting a bill for that purpose and having it referred to the Committee on Agriculture in the House or the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in the Senate. I hope at this stage, instead of reading it, because the hour is already late, that I may have permission to insert in the RECORD at this point a statement on the act itself, its purposes and provisions, not prepared by me, but prepared by the Agricultural Committee on National Policy of the National Planning Association.. I ask unanimous consent that that may be done.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The agricultural colleges have been engaged in research almost since their beginning some 85 years ago. Much of their study has been on technological problems such as the improvement of varieties, animal breeding and feeding, soil management, disease and pest control and so on—in other words, on ways of improving and cheapening production.

The results achieved have been enormous, though for the most part not sensational. Since agriculture is a competitive industry, a good part of the benefits has been widely diffused among the Nation's population in the form of more abundant, cheaper, and better products.

In recent decades, however, farming has become more highly commercial. It requires larger investments, borrows more money, ships its products greater distances, and produces more specialties. It is concerned with a vast array of economic relationships many of which involve closely related technological problems. This shift from relative self-sufficiency and largely local markets to broad national and international markets has made necessary more study of market organization, of problems of packing, storing, shipping, and selling, and of competitive relations with other areas.

New uses of agricultural products and new outlets for them have also become more important, and the problems of oversupply and undersupply and of stabilizing prices and incomes have come into prominence. There is, furthermore, a growing recognition of the importance to agriculture of nonfarm incomes and buying power and of general national policies relating to credit, taxation, transportation, labor, and international trade.

The act of 1946 is clearly intended as a major step in the evolutionary process of providing for agriculture a research arm comparable to those available to many nonagricultural industries. This process began with the Hatch Act of 1887 and was extended by the Adams Act of 1906. In 1925, through the Purnell Act, and again in 1935, through the Bankhead-Jones Act, the Congress not only increased the funds for agricultural research but broadened the directives under which it was to be carried on. The act of 1946 represents a more vigorous and comprehensive attempt to create a larger and better balanced program of agricultural research. Its major emphasis is on economic problems, particularly those relating to marketing. There is clear recognition, however, of the need for continuing and strengthening the work on technological problems. The specific directives for research on marketing and economic problems should not be interpreted as deemphasis on technological research, but rather as an effort to strengthen an underdeveloped phase of the research program.

No industry, of course, can afford to ignore researches looking to improved and more efficient production, to the maintenance of its basic resources, and to the elimination of physical losses and wastages. Agriculture's efforts to solve problems of these types should be continued vigorously and effectively.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I do not desire to detain the Senate long. I merely have made this statement on the floor today because the matter referred to will come up tomorrow, I assume, when the item in question is reached. I think it is extremely unfortunate that there is not a better explanation for the action of the committee. I called officials of the Department of Agriculture and tried to find out what the reason was for the change, and the answer I received was that it was proposed to simplify the appropriation structure. That is a simple explanation, but it actually is a device whereby the Research and Marketing Act of 1946 is repealed without a moment's hearing, without an opportunity for anyone who worked for its enactment to appear before a committee and discuss it. I hope that something better than that will be presented as a reason for the action which has been taken by the committee.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to his colleague for a question?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield for a question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I was going to suggest to my colleague that the chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture of the Appropriations Committee dealing with this matter is the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. I am sorry that he was not present at the moment my colleague made his remarks. I am sure the Senator from Georgia will be able to explain to my colleague and to the Senate the provisions to which my colleague has referred to. I see the Senator from Georgia has now come onto the floor.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator from Georgia is now on the floor. I may say that I recognize the section in question was handled by the distinguished Senator from Georgia, and I can testify from my experience that the Department of Agriculture has no greater friend in the Congress than the Senator from Georgia. I do not believe that he is quite sure as to why the change is being made. I think it is somewhat important that we take a very good look at it. It is easy to say that we simply take the money from one place and transfer it to the same group without it going through the Research and Marketing Administration. But the very reason why it was given to the Research and Marketing Administration was that it was determined that there might be projects which the country at large decided were necessary for an over-all study of the problem and that the work should be planned in the Department of Agriculture, and then farmed out to the agricultural colleges and experiment stations. The action taken by the committee completely reverses that, and puts it directly into the hands of the office of the experiment station the distribution and handling of these funds. I say that a long, long fight was made on this question, and I think it is a shame to lose the result of that struggle by such a provision as that contained in the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator from New Mexico know whether this provision was approved or protested by the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. ANDERSON. I believe the distinguished Senator from Georgia can tell the Senator about that.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I may say that this provision was inserted in the bill at the suggestion of the Department of Agriculture. The House had made a transfer of other research funds, not of course to the same purpose as proposed in this connection, but the department suggested that the amendment be included in the bill. They stated to the committee that it would simplify their bookkeeping procedures, and that it would not adversely affect the research program. I have requested of the Department a full statement of their position on this matter, and I will have it here tomorrow before the item is reached in the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. Is the Senator from Georgia satisfied that it will not adversely affect the research program?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am, of course, relying on the statement of the Department to that effect.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Georgia and, I expect the Senator from New Mexico, will agree that greater controls are no substitute for research and marketing investigation. I may say that if the Department suggested it, it might be in line with the policy of those who constantly emphasize a desire for more controls rather than for more research. It has appeared to me ever since the bill was passed that the Department has never put its heart into conducting the research and marketing work of the Department as the Congress had intended.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think there is no question that the results of all these research items have been disappointing to those of us who sponsored the original research bill. I would not confine that observation to the production and marketing end.

Mr. AIKEN. I would not, either.

Mr. RUSSELL. I would say that the entire research program, for which Congress has made perhaps too liberal a provision, has been disappointing to me.

Of course sometimes we have given the Department, at its request, money which it should not have had because it did not have available programs on which to expend the funds; and that has resulted in haphazard activities.

Mr. AIKEN. But the Department has requested the funds.

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, yes. Of course, we have provided advisory committees and other committees to assist in the program.

On the other hand, it has been in effect for only a few years, and perhaps I have expected too much of it by this time. However, the results have been disappointing to me.

Mr. President, I would be the last man to wish to injure any phase of the program under the Agricultural Act of 1946, of course.

Mr. AIKEN. Let me say that it has been very disappointing to me that the only solution which has been proposed for some of the problems has been that of providing more Government controls.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not understand that the question of more Government controls is involved in this amendment, although that may be the case. I am not in a position to say as to that.

However, I understood that it was merely a matter of simplifying the bookkeeping and of making more easy the administration, without attempting in any way to change the intent of Congress under that act, when it was passed.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I would be very happy if anyone could point out that that is the situation.

I simply point out the fact that the House has voted to merge the funds under sections 10 (a) and 10 (b), and the Senate Appropriations Committee has voted to transfer the funds under section 9. That matter is one over which we fought for months, namely, the question of whether it was better to appropriate the funds directly to the experiment stations or to appropriate them directly to the Department of Agriculture itself, so that it could apportion the funds in any way it saw fit to do.

Mr. President, I do not desire to detain the Senate in regard to this matter, except to point out that in the Department of Agriculture there are rooms full of surveys for the better utilization of agricultural products; there are charts and plans and studies, which have been made for 50 years, in regard to how to better utilize agricultural products.

However, when the surveys were made by the various interested groups, they discovered that it does not do any good to talk about the better utilization of an agricultural product unless those handling the program are prepared to make contracts with certain persons or firms to try to use the product. We found that it was one thing to say that cotton should be used for insulation, for instance, but quite another thing to persuade a company to use cotton for insulation; and we found that sometimes it was necessary to subsidize for a while the attempts to use a certain product in a new way, until such uses became established.

For instance, we found that sometimes a manufacturing company would have millions of dollars available to put to use in research in connection with the development of a synthetic product to be used as a substitute for cotton and in the adaptation of that synthetic product to various uses, whereas the cotton farmers did not have any research organization or facilities by which to compete with such efforts to substitute the synthetic product for cotton itself.

So Congress has realized that research is most important to the proper use of the various agricultural products. On that basis, the act was passed in 1946, and efforts have been made to start the research work.

I can say frankly that there are in the Department of Agriculture agencies which resisted when attempts were made to take away from them the research work they long had handled; and those agencies were not happy when an attempt was made to set up a research and marketing section.

Now we find the fruits of their efforts, when the funds under sections 10 (a) and 10 (b) have been voted by the House to be transferred, and when, now, the funds under section 9 are proposed by the Senate Committee on Appropriations to be transferred. I do not think that should be done. I think this matter is most important and most serious to the country as a whole. I think it is important that we have a chance to better utilize agricultural products. We should realize that we are faced with the fact that if these appropriations are reduced this year, possibly these agencies will not be able to do the necessary work in future years.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is not the situation the Senator has been discussing quite similar to the situation in connection with silver? In other words, the silver producers have set up committees to find new markets for silver. Is not that situation similar to the one in this case?

Mr. ANDERSON. Of course it is. We had hoped that we would be able to make great savings, as a result of the proper utilization and development of this research program. For instance, there is a field in which cotton can be used in the manufacture of fine bond paper. However, no paper manufacturer will begin to do so at once; it is necessary to supply cotton to him free for a certain period of time, and perhaps to subsidize him to a limited extent in connection with such a development; and then, finally, he will reach the point where he will use cotton for that purpose. The Department has done precisely that, and I think it has acted wisely in trying to find new uses for cotton and other products.

Cotton is not the only product for which attempts have been made to find new uses, but similar attempts have been made in regard to other products and commodities.

Certainly in that connection the various producers need the combined resources of the Department of Agriculture, it seems to me.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, I should like to call particular attention to wheat straw, flax straw, and corn, which the Senator has mentioned. It seems to me me that in that connection there is a chance to bring about very great developments.

I should like to ask the Senator whether the committee was apprised of these facts before it took the action it did take.

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not know. The best person to whom the Senator can address that question is the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

My understanding is that the matter was presented by the Department of Agriculture as a means of simplifying its budgetary and accounting procedures. I have tried to say that the Department has no finer friend than the Senator from Georgia. I know that from my experience as Secretary of Agriculture; and I know that if the matter had been properly presented to the committee, it would have been carefully considered.

It may be that there is nothing to the present proposal other than an attempt to bring about a change in the budgetary and accounting procedures. However, I do not so understand the proposal; it seems to me that it certainly smacks of the battle which we had for a long time regarding whether the Department of Agriculture itself should direct the research or whether it should turn the research funds over to the experiment stations and let them direct the research.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia a question, if the Senator from New Mexico will yield to permit me to do so. I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia whether the committee considered this matter?

Mr. RUSSELL. The committee considered it. No objection was raised, from any source, to the provision of the

House provision which consolidated the funds authorized in regard to research and administration.

The Department said it would apply the same rules to the transfer of the funds, as authorized in section 9 or section 9 (a), I beileve, of the original act, with assurances that in no wise would that affect the research work, but merely would be a simplification of the procedures.

A few minutes ago I stated that I had requested from the Department a full and complete statement of the effect of the amendment, from its standpoint, and a statement regarding what it proposed to do under the amendment, if the amendment is agreed to and goes into effect. I hope to have that information available tomorrow, when this title of the bill will be reached.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, to permit me to ask a further question?

Mr. RUSSELL. Certainly, if I now have the floor.

Mr. LANGER. I am quite sure the Senator is familiar, as is the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], with the situation in the Northwest, where literally hundreds of thousands of tons of wheat straw are burned each year. Great stacks of wheat straw are piled up and burned. I have always thought it was a terrific loss to the country that the wheat straw was not used beneficially in industry.

Of course it took us many years to find ways to utilize the flax straw. I remember, as I am sure my colleague the Senator from Minnesota does, the days when flax straw was burned, just as today wheat straw is burned, all over the Northwest.

I should like to bring to the attention of the distinguished Senator from Georgia the question of finding some use for wheat straw, so that when similar questions arise before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, he will have that particular subject in mind, because it seems to me that instead of permitting this tremendous waste to continue—and, so far as I know, it occurs only in the United States and in Canada—somehow, somewhere, such straw should be utilized, and the marketing division should find some way of utilizing it.

Mr. RUSSELL. It seems to me that that is certainly a proper matter of research. I have had a hobby of my own of research along similar lines for the past 10 years. It has always disturbed me greatly to know that one-fourth of all our timber was discarded in the form of sawdust and waste. It has always seemed to me to be almost a criminal waste, when we know that we are cutting down our forest resources every year and that the production is not keeping pace with the rate of consumption, particularly during the war years. So, for years I urged the Department of Agriculture, through the Forestry Products Laboratory, to make intensive surveys to ascertain if some feasible use could not be made of sawdust and shavings and materials of that kind which are now burned at tens of thousands of sawmills and planing mills throughout the country. Some little research has been done along that line. I shall be glad to do whatever I can in assisting the Senator to have some research done in connection with wheat straw.

Mr. LANGER. During the war there was an admitted shortage of paper, as the Senator knows.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. LANGER. The question arose as to whether certain kinds of timber could be used for the manufacture of paper pulp. Finally, as the Senator knows, we spent a great deal of money in Canada for paper to be shipped into the United States. The prices doubled, trebeled, and rose even higher. It seems to me that the attention of the marketing division should be called to the fact that wheat and oat straw makes excellent paper. Whether the cost is prohibitive I think is something that should be ascertained.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be happy to see research done along that line. I am sure the Senator knows that we also make paper from pine pulp.

Mr. LANGER. Yes, indeed.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from North Dakota also knows that tens of millions of tons of sawdust, slabs, and shavings from pine lumber have been burned. During my lifetime I have observed a great deal of it. But, thus far, very little research has been done toward the utilization of such material either in the production of paper or for other purposes.

Mr. LANGER. I remember that one of the most eloquent arguments ever heard upon this floor was made by the distinguished Senator from Georgia on the very matter which he is now discussing, about the waste of stumpage, I think it was called, at that time.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct. I thank the Senator. We have been too prodigal with the blessings of Providence in this country. We have been wasteful since the inception of civilization on this continent.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. LUCAS. May I inquire whether the Senator from Louisiana expects to get a vote on his amendment this afternoon?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; immediately following the obtaining of a quorum.

Mr. LUCAS. Have the arguments been concluded?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I desire to discuss the amendment, and I am pretty sure the ranking Republican member of the Senate Building Commission, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], will want 2 or 3 minutes.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. What is the pending business before the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the opinion of the Chair, the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, is the pending business.

Mr. LUCAS. Is that under the unanimous-consent agreement?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is under the unanimous consent that was granted yesterday to lay aside temporarily the motion of the Senator from Illinois and to proceed to the consideration of that bill.

Mr. LUCAS. If the Senator from Illinois should demand the regular order, that would, as I understand, place the so-called FEPC bill before the Senate again.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It would place before the Senate the motion of the Senator from Illinois to proceed to the consideration of that bill.

Mr. LUCAS. That is what I meant. Mr. President, I demand the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The regular order being demanded, the question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois——

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is the demand of the Senator open to objection?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is not.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So that, if the Senator from Illinois demands the regular order, there is no way of preventing it, is that correct?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct. Any Senator has the right to demand the regular order. Does the Senator from Illinois demand the regular order?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Illinois demands the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois to proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 1728) to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin.

Mr. LUCAS. No——

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is the pending motion.

Mr. LUCAS. No; I demand the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The regular order is that the motion be brought before the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. And it is now before the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. Then I withdraw the demand.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator withdraws the demand.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Just a moment. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is that open to objection?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is not. Any Senator may withdraw a demand that he makes.

Mr. LUCAS. I now move that we proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other

purposes. This is the bill we have been considering.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, is the motion debatable?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion to proceed to the consideration of the appropriation bill is debatable.

Mr. WHERRY. In order that I may know what is before the Senate, was it the intention to replace the appropriation bill as the pending business, which was taken up by unanimous consent?

Mr. LUCAS. I may say to the Senator from Nebraska that there was some misunderstanding as to what the parliamentary situation was. The Senator will recall that, earlier in the day, immediately following the vote upon the cloture motion, I asked unanimous consent to withdraw the motion for the consideration of the FEPC bill, and to move to resume consideration of House bill 7786. The Vice President, at that time, held that that was unnecessary, that the bill H. R. 7786 was the pending business and that it would be necessary to wait until we finished with the appropriation bill before I could request the withdrawal of my motion, unless we returned to the regular order. That is the situation.

Mr. WHERRY. That clarifies the parliamentary situation. So that the pending motion would make the appropriation bill the unfinished business. Is that correct?

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct. There was some question as to whether that was the case, and that is why I raised the question. That is all there is to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Illinois.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield the floor?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield the floor.

Mr. ELLENDER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. AIKEN. Will the Senator withhold the suggestion for a moment, to enable me to obtain a leave of absence?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] addressed the Chair before any other Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. I withdraw the suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair was on the verge of recognizing the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, to be excused from attendance upon the sessions of the Senate tomorrow, Friday, and on Saturday, if there should be a session on that day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I desire to say a few words on the new Senate Office Building.

Mr. HAYDEN. Let me suggest that the Senator can say it after we have a quorum call.

Mr. BRIDGES. Very well.

Mr. ELLENDER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has not been recognized for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum. The Senator from New Hampshire has the floor.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield for that purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Hampshire cannot yield for that purpose without losing the floor.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Hampshire was recognized, and he has the floor, if he wishes to proceed.

Mr. BRIDGES. I realize that, and I intend to proceed, but I thought I could yield for that purpose. I am sorry if I cannot.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator cannot yield for a quorum call without losing the floor, except by unanimous consent. If he wishes to ask unanimous consent that he may yield for that purpose, the Chair will put the question.

Mr. HAYDEN. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from New Hampshire may yield to the Senator from Louisiana for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum, without prejudice to his right to the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. I renew my suggestion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Louisiana makes the point that a quorum is not present. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	Lodge
Anderson	Graham	Long
Brewster	Green	Lucas
Bricker	Gurney	McCarran
Bridges	Hayden	McCarthy
Butler	Hendrickson	McClellan
Capehart	Hickenlooper	McFarland
Chapman	Hill	McKellar
Chavez	Hoey	McMahon
Connally	Holland	Magnuson
Cordon	Humphrey	Malone
Donnell	Ives	Martin
Douglas	Johnson, Colo.	Maybank
Dworshak	Johnson, Tex.	Morse
Eastland	Johnston, S. C.	Mundt
Ecton	Kefauver	Murray
Ellender	Kem	Myers
Ferguson	Kerr	Neely
Flanders	Kilgore	O'Mahoney
Frear	Knowland	Robertson
Fulbright	Langer	Russell
Saltonstall	Stennis	Watkins
Schoeppel	Taft	Wherry
Smith, Maine	Thomas, Okla.	Wiley
Smith, N. J.	Thomas, Utah	Williams
Sparkman	Thye	Young

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present. The Senator from New Hampshire has the floor.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the question before the Senate is the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] to eliminate the so-called new Senate Office Building from the legislative chapter of the appropriation bill. The pros and cons of the argument for the new Senate Office Building are known to every Senator. For many years Senators have been complaining that the space available to them is not sufficient to enable them to perform their work efficiently. As a result in 1947 the Eightieth Congress made an authorization for the initiation of a study for a new Senate Office Building. The story of the new Senate Office Building dates from that period.

Following the creation of the Senate Office Building Commission various steps were taken. Finally a site was selected on First Street, in the rear of the present Senate Office Building. Architects were employed, plans drawn, the land purchased, and the old buildings on the land removed. The land is now either unused or used in part as a parking lot. During this period Senator after Senator has gone to the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, first to former Senator Brooks and now to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. They have cried on their shoulders for more space, which they said they must have in order to make available reasonable working conditions for their staffs.

The issue is before us, Mr. President. There is nothing to be gained by discussing the subject further. Every Senator knows whether he is in favor of the construction of a new Senate Office Building. The proposal is to provide $10,000,000 in order to go ahead with the work. Some Senators who now object raised no question when we spent $65,000,000 to construct a building for the United Nations, $20,000,000 for a Court building only two or three blocks from the Senate Office Building, and approximately $23,000,000 for a new building for the General Accounting Office. If a Senator wants to be consistent, and therefore is against the construction of a new Senate Office Building, that is one thing. However, when we have gone ahead and furnished new buildings for various departments and divisions of the Government, and we fail to recognize or lack the courage to recognize the necessity of providing adequate quarters and efficient working space for our employees, it seems to me we have reached a sad day in the United States Senate.

If I may do so, I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Arizona. I should like to ask him if what I have stated regarding Senators making requests of him is not true?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, it is entirely true. I feel very strongly about the testimony given to me, not only by Senators but by members of their staffs.

er to carry on the war. It looks very much as if this struggle will develop into a full-scale war, and if it does, is there one Senator who will sit on the floor of the Senate and not join in passing the necessary legislation to stop Communists in our own country, to stop giving them an opportunity to sabotage the war effort, to sabotage the Nation?

Mr. President, an attitude of do nothing simply does not make sense to me. If the bill we are discussing is not as it should be, let us correct it, let us amend it, but before this session of Congress adjourns or recesses, in my opinion we should pass whatever legislation is necessary to deal with Communists within our own ranks, to reduce to the very minimum the opportunity of any sabotage among those who think as they do.

I see nothing un-American about that. It seems to me it is the most American thing we can do. I know of nothing more American than to protect America. I am confident that the great majority of the people of my State are for some sort of legislation which will put a stop to the undermining of our Government by those who would overthrow it, and if I understand the philosophy of communism correctly, it is to overthrow our Government and to overthrow the governments of all other countries.

Mr. President, I want to say in closing that I shall support any piece of legislation that looks to the control of saboteurs in the United States, and particularly in the face of the fact that we are now at war. It is not a police action. We are at war, and we are fighting those who hold to the philosophy of what we commonly know as communism.

So far as I know there are no good Communists. They are just Communists. I hope that Congress, before it adjourns, will take a good look at our laws, and makes certain that before we go home, if we do, there will be passed legislation which will properly protect the Government of the United States and properly protect and back up the boys who are giving their lives in Korea, who are face to face with and fighting the philosophy we know as communism.

CONVEYANCE OF FORT RUCKMAN MILITARY RESERVATION TO TOWN OF NAHANT, MASS.—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on House bill 7477, providing for the conveyance to the town of Nahant, Mass., of the Fort Ruckman Military Reservation, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7477) providing for the conveyance to the town of Nahant, Mass., of the Fort Ruckman Military Reservation, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That, upon payment to the United States of the sum of $23,000, the Administrator of General Services is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed to the town of Nahant, Mass., all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to all lands constituting the Fort Ruckman Military Reservation, situated within the town of Nahant, together with the buildings and other improvements thereon: *Provided, however,* That the instrument of conveyance shall contain such terms and conditions which will allow the recapture of the property in the event said property is not used for educational, recreational, or other public purposes: *Provided further,* That the instrument of conveyance shall reserve to the United States, for so long as it is necessary for governmental purposes, that certain 15-foot easement for the maintenance, repair, and replacement of a cable and its appurtenances, and at such time as it shall be no longer required for governmental use, said easement may be abandoned and upon such abandonment will automatically terminate, and that certain temporary easement, terminating June 30, 1954, covering one and eight-tenths acres of land used in connection with the Turf Drainage Investigation Program, with right of access thereto, both easements being more particularly described in WAA Form 1005 dated June 22, 1948, Reporting Agency No. WD–1299, as amended by WAA Form 1005 dated December 15, 1948, Reporting Agency No. WD–1299–B, which are filed in the office of the General Services Administration"; and the Senate agree to the same.

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
WM. BENTON,
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

WILLIAM L. DAWSON,
HERBERT C. BONNER,
ROBERT F. RICH,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

Mr. BRIDGES obtained the floor.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so I may make a unanimous consent request?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have on the desk some four amendments to the pending bill. I also intend to propose, on Monday, a further amendment to the bill. I am obliged to go to a committee meeting this afternoon, and I ask unanimous consent that if my amendments are reached in the course of consideration of the bill today I may be privileged to bring them up on Monday when the Senate convenes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator state what the amendments are?

Mr. MAGNUSON. One amendment, Mr. President, is on page 61, one is on page 179, one amendment, submitted by me and some 20 other Senators, is on page 329; one amendment is on page 247, and the amendment I propose to submit on Monday is to the cancer, heart and mental diseases section.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. DARBY], the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], and the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by us, jointly, to the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes, and request that the amendment be stated, after which I shall discuss the amendment for a moment or two.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken on pages 444, 445, and 446 by the committee amendment, insert the following:

CHAPTER X–4—GENERAL REDUCTIONS IN APPROPRIATIONS AND CONTRACT AUTHORIZATIONS

SEC. 1001. Except as hereinafter provided, each appropriation, reappropriation, and contract authorization or reauthorization, made by this act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, to any department or agency in the executive branch of the Government (including funds of Government corporations authorized by this act for administrative expenses), is hereby reduced by 10 percent.

SEC. 1002. In order to provide for the most effective use of appropriations and contract authorizations reduced by this chapter, the head of each department and agency in the executive branch of the Government is hereby authorized to make adjustments and

transfers between such appropriations, and between such contract authorizations, within his department or agency; but no such appropriation or contract authorization shall be increased under the authority of this section to an amount in excess of that provided in other chapters of this act.

SEC. 1003. The reductions provided for in this chapter shall not apply to the following:

(a) Title II of chapter IV; chapter X; so much of title I of chapter X–B as is contained in the paragraph headed "Mutual defense assistance"; and the amount appropriated to the General Services Administration for carrying out the provisions of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act of July 23, 1946;

(b) Appropriations in title I of chapter VIII for the Executive Office of the President under the headings "Compensation of the President," "The White House Office," "Emergency fund for the President," and "Executive Mansion and Grounds";

(c) Appropriations and contract authorizations for the atomic energy program;

(d) Trust funds;

(e) Funds of Government corporations excluding those made available in this act (1) for administrative expenses and (2) by appropriation from the general fund of the Treasury;

(f) Amounts (other than under the Veterans' Administration) for furnishing medical and hospital services and domiciliary care, excluding (1) administrative expenses not directly connected with the operation of a specific hospital, dispensary, or clinic, and (2) expenses for employee health service programs;

(g) Amounts provided in this act for payment of obligations incurred under prior appropriations or authorizations, and obligated balances of reappropriations;

(h) Appropriations of, or measured by, receipts;

(i) Amounts appropriated by this act for the operation of law enforcement agencies, including the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Bureau of Customs, Immigration and Naturalization Services, and the Secret Service; or for the payment of compensation and expenses of agents and auditors of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, and such other officers and employees of other agencies whose duties primarily pertain to intelligence operations (including funds transferred pursuant to section 6 (a) of the act of June 20, 1949; 63 Stat. 211) or to the investigation, apprehension, prosecution, or detention of persons suspected or convicted of offenses against the criminal laws of the United States;

(j) Amounts provided for any program of the Veterans' Administration, excluding (1) administrative expenses not directly connected with the operation of a specific hospital, dispensary, clinic, or facility, and (2) expenses for employee health service programs;

(k) Amounts provided for payments to States or political subdivisions thereof;

(l) Amounts provided to make payment of or contributions toward pensions, retirement and disability annuities and benefits, employees' death or injury benefits, or other items of a similar nature;

(m) Appropriations for refunds, awards, and indemnities.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the amendment has been prepared by Senators from both sides of the aisle as an economy amendment to be substituted for the Thomas-Taber amendment found in the House appropriation bill.

This amendment has been most carefully worked out by a group of Senators who have met many times in drafting the amendment. The group has been in close consultation with our own legislative counsel of the Senate and with representatives of the General Accounting Office and the Bureau of the Budget.

It is the opinion of our legislative counsel and of the downtown agencies that this amendment is technically correct to do the job of reducing appropriations in this 1951 omnibus bill.

Mr. President, only twice in the last 21 years has the Federal budget been in balance. The fiscal year just past has been one of deficit financing. The fiscal year we are entering will be one of deficit financing. We would incur a deficit in fiscal 1951 even if the Korean crisis had not developed.

The advocates of deficit spending always harp back to the cost of wars, past and future. The fact of the matter is, Mr. President, that the cost of war is not the sole cause of the continuing Federal deficits. Excluding the cost of national defense, Mr. President, excluding the cost of international aid, excluding the interest on the public debt, excluding the cost of the Veterans' Administration—all other costs of the Federal Government have increased from $2,000,000,000 in 1946 to an estimated $12,700,000,000 in the President's budget estimate for 1951.

Today, Mr. President, this Nation is faced with a crisis as severe as any that has confronted this Nation in its history. We do not know what the immediate future will ask of us. We do know that we may be called upon to exert every last measure of strength. Events of the past few weeks ought to have convinced every American of the need for military and industrial preparedness to match the hour.

We cannot spend our substance today on projects not directly related to the requirements for national defense and the minimum needs of Government operation.

This amendment which is submitted today, Mr. President, will not balance the budget.

I do not promise that it will stop all unessential operations of the Government. I know there are many members of the Senate who do not believe this amendment goes far enough. But I would remind you, Mr. President, that it is an amendment in the nature of a compromise, worked out by several different Senators representing several different sections of the country and representing both major political parties.

The amendment proposes to reduce most appropriations for nondefense items by 10 percent.

The directive given in the amendment to the executive branch of the Government is clear and unmistakable.

There is no surrender of authority from the legislative branch to the executive branch of the Government. If this amendment carries, the President will know exactly how much is appropriated under each title of the bill.

Because the sponsors of this amendment are aware that there may be some appropraition titles which cannot stand a cut of 10 percent, we have written into the amendment the power to transfer between appropriations within departments and independent agencies.

In practical effect, Mr. President, this transfer authority makes the cuts department-wide.

The amendment carries sensible exemptions.

National defense, everything having to do with the war effort, atomic energy, and related programs are exempted.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I have just entered the Senate Chamber. Has the Senator's amendment been printed and does it lie on the table?

Mr. BRIDGES. I will say to the Senator from Tennessee that I have just submitted it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Has the Senator a copy of the amendment which he can let me see?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes. I send a copy of it to the Senator's desk.

The Post Office, already operating on a deficiency basis, is exempted.

Payments of pensions and benefits to veterans and other personnel are exempted.

The fixed commitments of trust funds and existing contracts are exempted.

I would like at this time, Mr. President, to give a firm estimate of the amount that this amendment would reduce appropriations and reappropriations found in the 1951 bill. I am informed that the Director of the Budget currently is preparing such an estimate, which should be available within the next day or so.

Pending an estimate from the Bureau of the Budget, I believe this amendment may reduce the bill by approximately $600,000,000.

Mr. President, the amendment is a workable amendment. If it is adopted, appropriations and expenditures for nondefense items will be reduced.

Of course, Mr. President, this amendment is going to lessen some of the operations of Government. The number of employees in the executive branch will be reduced. I would remind the Senate, however, that defense agencies already are building up their employee list and that a manpower shortage in Washington is beginning to threaten.

The amendment, also, will reduce appropriations for programs not directly related to defense. If it is adopted, we will put off for another year some of the construction and development which we had proposed to do this year.

It is my hope, Mr. President, that the members who urged so strongly putting off construction of a badly needed Senate Office Building will be consistent and support the amendment.

I can anticipate the arguments that will be forthcoming in support of some of the nondefense programs which the amendment is going to reduce. But this is a critical period and many worth-while things must be put off. I, personally, would favor a deferment of all nonessential public works at this time. The amendment calls only for a 10 percent reduction in such spending.

The people of America, Mr. President, already are called upon to sacrifice their sons in battle. They know that, should the international situation become worse, they will be called upon for many sacrifices of civilian require-

ments. The people of America will stand behind Congress, Mr. President, if we have the courage to cut from the President's budget some of the funds not necessary for national defense.

In closing, Mr. President, let me say that I was very much impressed with a statement made a few years ago by a legislator in the State of Vermont, on the question of building an executive mansion for the Governor of Vermont. That question came up, and it had very popular support from the civic groups in the State. Finally one veteran legislator from a small town rose and turned the tide by making this statement: "I am not for voting money that we ain't got for something we don't need."

Mr. President, I think that very practical, humble statement could well be applied to the situation in our country today. I, too, am not in favor of spending what we do not have—for today we are operating on a deficit—for things we do not need.

That is the purpose of this amendment.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHAPMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am very much impressed with the statement which has just been made by the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, and I feel that I should like to identify myself with the proposal he is making. I should like to ask him a question, if I may.

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. At the time when I was studying the ECA program this year, and when I was discussing the matter with Mr. Hoffman, I asked him about the estimates of the funds needed by the ECA to carry on its work. He said that he was perfectly willing to take his cuts across the board, if he had to, but he hoped they would not be imposed upon the ECA after its funds had already been cut.

So I wish to ask the Senator whether he thinks it would be fair, after the funds for ECA already have been cut, to make a further cut of 10 percent in the ECA funds or commitments, which I feel are a part of our defense program.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I say to the Senator from New Jersey, who is a great student of international affairs, and who I know has a great interest in the ECA, as I have, that this amendment does not exclude the ECA. It does exclude arms implementation or other military aid. We would be delighted to have the Senator from New Jersey join with us in sponsoring the amendment, and have him reserve the right on his part to take a different position on the ECA item, if he chooses to do so.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I think I would check with those in the ECA with whom I have been studying this matter, and see what position they would take in regard to the ECA program which is the bedrock of our operations in regard to European aid; and I believe that I would reserve the right, when the matter comes up on the floor of the Senate, to try to restore the part of the ECA funds which then might be missing, if a 10-percent cut had already been made in the ECA funds, or if one was then proposed.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. IVES. Is it not a fact that if the ECA funds are found to be insufficient by the end of the calendar year, we very possibly can provide for the ECA by means of a deficiency appropriation before the next calendar year?

Mr. BRIDGES. Of course, that will be possible, particularly in view of the fact that, of course, it was not possible for the ECA to make exact estimates. Under those circumstances, the Congress was generous enough to appropriate more than ample funds for the ECA, and the ECA was efficient enough to conduct its operations in such a way as to have a carry-over of $277,000,000.

It is quite understandable that it was impossible for exact estimates to be made of the funds required by ECA. However, the situation would be as the Senator says, and the representatives of ECA would be able to come before the congressional committees at such a time when we would know more definitely about the world situation.

Mr. IVES. I thank the Senator.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from New Jersey has raised questions about the ECA. Is it not true that in the amendment, of which the junior Senator from Michigan is a cosponsor, provision is made that the 10-percent cut shall be on the amount stated in the bill as it is finally passed by both Houses of Congress and is signed by the President?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. So the conferees will be able to determine what, in their opinion, is the amount which is to be cut 10 percent; is not that a correct statement?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. As also indicated, is it not true that if an emergency arises, and if the President feels he needs money with which to take care of such an emergency—whether in regard to the ECA or otherwise—it is possible for a deficiency or supplemental appropriation to be requested?

Mr. BRIDGES. Of course.

Mr. FERGUSON. So the purpose of this amendment is to attempt to have the Congress cut the civilian, nonmilitary, nonfighting budget 10 percent; is that correct?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. When we are at war, even if it is termed a police action, and we are going to supply the men at the front and those who are engaged in arming Europe, then most certainly the time has come when we must save something from the least essential operations of Government in order to be able to give sufficient assistance and make sufficient appropriations for activities which are vital and essential.

Mr. BRIDGES. That is the philosophy of the amendment, and I think it is the best possible approach which can be devised at this time.

Mr. President, we have not had an opportunity to invite Senators generally to join in sponsoring the amendment, but I should like to say that any Senator—regardless of political party—is invited to become a cosponsor of the amendment. If Senators will notify us of that desire on their part, their names can be added to the amendment before it is printed this evening.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I have not seen the amendment, but under the circumstances I should like to know whether the proposed cut would apply to the rural mail carriers. Would they be cut 10 percent, under the provisions of the amendment?

Mr. BRIDGES. The amendment excludes the Post Office Department in its entirety.

Mr. LANGER. How about the Veterans' Administration?

Mr. BRIDGES. The amendment excludes it in its entirety.

Mr. LANGER. What does the amendment include?

Mr. BRIDGES. It includes all the civilian components of the Government which do not directly apply to the military, to veterans, to arms implementation aid, to the FBI, to the Secret Service, to the Immigration Service, to grants in aid to the States, and so forth.

Mr. LANGER. How many Government employees, or what percent, would be affected by the amendment?

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not know that I can state the exact percentage of Government employees who would be affected by the amendment, but I would say to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota that the amendment has been worked out very carefully so that it would not have the effect of injuring any program which is vital or essential at this time.

Mr. LANGER. Do I correctly understand from the distinguished Senator—if he will yield further—that the conferees will be able to determine which of the Government departments the amendment will affect and which ones it will not affect?

Mr. BRIDGES. No; they are stated in the amendment. What the Senator from Michigan said was that the conferees, of course, will determine the exact amount of the bill—as between the amount of the bill as passed by the House and the amount of the bill as passed by the Senate. So the amendment will apply to the amount arrived at in that way, rather than to the amount carried in the bill as passed by the Senate. That was the point the Senator from Michigan made, I believe.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire has made a splendid presentation of it, and I shall not attempt to cover the ground he has covered; as a cosponsor of this amend-

ment, I desire to discuss it briefly. When the appropriation bill passed the House of Representatives it contained the Thomas-Taber amendment providing for reductions by formula in addition to those specifically set forth in the various appropriation items.

This over-all formula reduction to provide further economy was adopted on the floor of the House by a vote of more than 2 to 1. The predominating criticism of the House provision has been with respect to the technical difficulties which would arise in its administration.

The Senate committee amendment, which is offered as an amendment to the Thomas-Taber amendment in the House, has been drafted with the benefit of assistance by technicians from the Bureau of the Budget, the General Accounting Office, and the Senate Legislative Drafting Counsel. The Bureau of the Budget is now preparing a careful estimate of the savings.

For myself, I should not hesitate at this time, in this perilous condition of the country, to vote for much larger reductions in domestic civilian expenditures.

We are virtually in a state of war and from recent experience we know what military operations cost. This amendment applies no reduction to appropriations for the Military Establishment or for direct activities in support of our military defense.

In the current circumstances of international crisis abroad with its fiscal and physical requirements at home, I vigorously urge that nonessential domestic civilian expenditures should be cut to the absolute minimum.

This amendment does not go that far. I wish it did. I wish it did. I would feel much better about the security of the Nation.

I realize, of course, that much of the appropriations in this bill are tied to long-term commitments made by law which cannot be remedied in an appropriation bill. I take this occasion to repeat what I have been saying for years: We should proceed with caution toward the enactment of basic legislation which in effect commits the Federal Government to virtually permanent spending programs, and I hope that before the next appropriation bill reaches the Senate, the Senate Appropriations Committee will be able to advise us as to these programs and how much each of them costs in terms of requested appropriations.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee, has explained in great detail, as I have said, the provisions of the amendment. It suffices for me to say that we do not propose by this amendment to reduce any appropriation essential to our national defense. The nonessentials which would be reduced would be cut by only 10 percent and there are few who would argue that there is not more than 10 percent of fat in every appropriation which comes before Congress. In addition, I am confident that we have had the benefit of the best technical advice available in the drafting of this amendment so that it simply raises the question as to whether, in the face of war conditions, we choose to retrench by 10 percent in nonessential Federal expenditures which involve neither the military defense of the Nation nor legal and moral commitments to individuals, corporations, or political subdivisions.

I repeat, it is my sincere belief that a 10-percent reduction can be absorbed at this time on every budget expenditure item with the exception of interest on the debt and national defense.

As a cosponsor of this amendment, I shall support it in the belief that it represents the very least that we can do in an effort to make secure the fiscal position of the Government of the United States. For myself, as I have said, I should like to do much more in the direction of reducing nondefense expenditures, and I believe more may have to be done if conditions develop as it now appears they will, requiring large additional expenditures for our military defense.

Mr. WHERRY, Mr. CAPEHART and Mr. LANGER addressed the chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. BYRD. I yield first to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I desire to ask the distinguished Senator from Virginia a question, but before doing so, I should like to state that I have worked with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations for many years, and with the entire minority membership, and I am well satisfied that all the Senators who have joined in offering this amendment to the appropriations bill have done so after careful study and consideration. If adopted, I feel satisfied that it will work mechanically in a very satisfactory way. That is a difficult thing to do, when an attempt is made either by way of rescission or by limitation or restriction in an appropriation bill.

I wish to say for the record that I regret that a greater reduction in the appropriations bill cannot be brought about this year. I feel satisfied that the Appropriations Committee, prior to the development of the Korean situation, had done a splendid job, and I wish to compliment the chairmen of the various subcommittees upon the bill which has been reported to the Senate. After nearly 8 years service in the Senate, with most of the time membership on the Appropriations Committee one of my regular assignments, I am satisfied that the Appropriations Committee has given a great deal of conscientious effort and study to the appropriations for individual items. But I must say that, in view of the emergency which confronts us, there can be no doubt of the absolute necessity of making every possible savings, to the end that military items for the defense of the country and trust fund items, which must be protected, are given adequate supplies of money, when and if the demand comes.

I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Virginia and the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire whether they have made any estimate of the saving which would be effected by this amendment. I do not know whether the figures have been worked out to the last detail, but I wonder whether the Senator can give us an estimate.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from New Hampshire, I believe, estimated the saving at about $600,000,000.

Mr. BRIDGES. From $600,000,000 to $700,000,000.

Mr. BYRD. A very careful estimate will be made by the Budget Bureau within the next few days.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Can the Senator give us an estimate of the total amount of reductions made by the House and the Senate, without the adoption of this amendment, and of the total amount of reductions that would be made with it?

Mr. BYRD. As a rough estimate, I should say that the reductions made by the House and the Senate without the adoption of this amendment would be about $1,200,000,000. I should say that the reductions, including the reductions proposed by this amendment, would approximate $2,000,000,000.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the distinguished Senator from Virginia, and to join with him wholeheartedly in his observations, in the course of which he has stated—and I agree—that this certainly is a step in the right direction. I hope the Senate will look with favor upon the amendment, and that it will have the support of the Senate as an effort to save money where money can be saved, and to make it possible to use money where it must be used, if and when occasion arises.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to inquire of the distinguished Senator how the proposed 10-percent cut under this amendment would be applied. Would it apply pro rata?

Mr. BYRD. It would be applied to each department of the Government, to be broken up by each of the departments for specific application within the department.

Mr. LANGER. For example, would it mean, if the amendment is adopted, that travel expense could be cut 10 percent?

Mr. BYRD. It would.

Mr. LANGER. Would it mean that the supplies could be cut 10 percent?

Mr. BYRD. It is left to the discretion of the heads of the departments. The appropiation for the department itself would be cut, and that cut would have to be distributed within the department.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I am reminded of a speech made some months ago, possibly a year ago, by the distinguished Senator, showing that in one department there was enough paper on hand to last for 78 years, and that another department had certain supplies on hand sufficient to last for 287 years. Under this amendment, I take it, it would not be necessary to cut

those supplies 10 percent, but they could be cut out entirely.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to ask one more question, if I may. If the amendment should be adopted, how would it affect the Byrd-Langer amendment?

Mr. BYRD. It would not affect the Byrd-Langer amendment, because that provides for a limitation upon employment. It would not be affected at all.

Mr. LANGER. In other words, the Bureau of the Budget would still have to reduce personnel?

Mr. BYRD. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator.

IMPORTANCE OF RETAINING OUR SURPLUS WAR MATERIALS

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I hold in my hand an article appearing in today's issue of the Washington Daily News, by Jim G. Lucas, entitled "GI's Could Use Tanks We Let Go." I do not rise to talk about it in a spirit of criticism, but, rather, to make a suggestion after I have read the article:

American GI's, fighting a losing battle against Russian-made heavy tanks in Korea, could use some of those Uncle Sam lost, sold, or gave away a few years back.

It wasn't too long ago that Uncle Sam was peddling surplus tanks to all takers at a few cents on the dollar. In July 1947, for instance, we sold 10 light tanks, worth $270,000, to Belgium for $10,000. In December, we disposed of 21 more, worth $568,000, to Canada for $17,000.

In January 1948 we sold nine tank engines, track assemblies, and spare parts, worth $166,000, to Venezuela for $8,000. In March, $49,000 worth of engines and spare parts went to Guatemala for $2,000. In April, we closed a deal with Ecuador for 21 tank engines and spare parts, worth $400,000, for $20,000. In September of that year, we sold Mexico 12 tank engines, worth $291,000, for $14,000.

NINE THOUSAND AND EIGHTY-FIVE TANKS LOST

The Hoover Commission's national security task force said we made 86,000 tanks during World War II. Army statistics indicated we had 25,045 at the end of the war. In 1948, the task force said, the Army could account for 15,960 tanks. The task force said the Army was unable to state what had become of the others.

The task force said it believed the Army didn't know how many tanks it had. The task force charged that the Army was asking for money to modernize more tanks than were in stock. The Army overlooked the fact, the task force said, that 102 had been sold to the Marines, and asked for money to modernize them, too.

Moreover, the task force said, the Army couldn't account for the vast quantities of matériel on hand at the end of hostilities. The Army says it has matériel sufficient to equip only 18 divisions, although at the end of the war it had 89 fully equipped divisions and great additional quantities of matériel in the pipeline.

Mr. President, in order to save the time of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have the remainder of the article printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remainder of the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"Loss of easily replaceable matériel is easily understood, but the loss of complicated, hard-to-produce military equipment is another matter, especially as the military was put on notice 6 months after the end of the war as to the seriousness of the international situation."

HOOVER REPORTED IT

The case of the missing tanks was first told to Congress by ex-President Herbert Hoover on April 11, 1949. The next day, ex-Army Secretary Kenneth C. Royall said Mr. Hoover was totally incorrect.

Mr. Royall said 7,170 tanks were found to be obsolete and were transferred, sent abroad as military aid or lost for similar reasons. He said the tank transfer to the Marines was discovreed and adjusted accordingly.

Mr. Royall said equipment for 35 divisions was sold to civilian, destroyed, demilitarized, given to the Red Cross or UNRRA, salvaged or made part of the Greek-Turkish aid program. Equipment for another 23, he said, was out of balance as to quantity, or needed repair.

The rug was pulled out from under Mr. Royall the next day. Defense Secretary Louis Johnson, at his first press conference, agreed with Mr. Hoover, who later said his facts were "taken from their original source, confirmed by officers in charge, and rechecked with independent sources."

The Hoover Commission task force said that—whatever the reason—it was evident we no longer had the tanks or the equipment for 71 demobilized divisions.

"Whether or not the equipment was perfect," the task force said, "its possession today would be of great comfort and value to the peaceful countries of the world."

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, when World War II ended, I urged as strongly as I could that the Government should not dispose of any war matériel. I even urged that it should dispose of no factories. I recommended that it dispose only of that which was perishable, on the theory that the best we could do was to receive from 10 to 15 percent of the value of the surplus war matériel, and that we might need it again sometime.

The argument against that suggestion, of course—and there was some merit to it—was that war matériel become obsolete.

My answer then was, as my answer is today, that it is better to have obsolete material than to have no material at all.

The purpose of my rising, Mr. President, was to urge upon the President of the United States that if we are disposing of any war material at the moment, such disposal be immediately discontinued and; that we keep such material, even though it be obsolete. I feel that my recommendation when the war ended was sound, and I think it is sound today, that we not dispose of any of our surplus war material. If we had today the tanks which we had at the end of the war they would be very helpful to the boys who are fighting in Korea.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I shall be very happy to yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Is it not true that some material which might be classified as obsolete consists of critical material which is not available at this time, and might it not be very well for us to consider it from that angle and to keep and preserve what we have?

Mr. CAPEHART. There is no question but that the Senator is correct.

As I said a moment ago, Mr. President, I am making these remarks not in any spirit of criticism, because we are at war, but only to urge upon our Government that it not dispose of any war materials, because even that which looks like scrap is made of steel, copper, and other materials which in an all-out war effort become scarce.

I strongly urge that the Government immediately stop disposing of any so-called surplus war material, because, frankly, I do not think there is any such thing as surplus war material. It may have become obsolete, but obsolete material is better than no material at all.

I think we made a mistake, and I so stated 5 years ago, in disposing of our war plants and of surplus war material. I know it is easy for one's hindsight to be better than his foresight, and I am not trying to be critical in this instance, because we are at war, and it behooves every American to support his Government in time of war. I think it behooves us as Members of the United States Senate to offer constructive suggestions. I believe the suggestion which I have just offered, that the Government discontinue the disposal of even one penny's worth of war materials at this time, until the war in Korea is over, is a good suggestion. When that war is over, let us keep our war material, because obsolete material is always better than no material at all.

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA—H. R. 331

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I desire to speak for a few minutes on a very important matter that is to come up for Senate consideration soon after we complete the consideration of the Appropriations bill, now before this body. I refer to the statehood bill for Alaska, House bill 331. The chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, on Monday last, made a similar short statement at the time he submitted the report of the majority for inclusion in the RECORD.

The original version of House bill 331 was, no doubt, pretty well circulated in Alaska both before and after its passage by the House, but I doubt if a dozen copies of the bill as finally reported by the Senate committee have reached Alaska. I personally airmailed four or five copies to the daily newspapers of Alaska as soon as I obtained printed copies of the bill as revised by the Senate committee. To date, I have heard from only one or two persons in Alaska with reference to the contents of the revised bill. I am certain that the revised Senate bill is a tremendous improvement over the House version, but I also feel that it may be wise to take more time to perfect the Senate bill, as evidenced by the editorial from the Juneau Daily Alaska Empire, which I shall insert in the RECORD with this statement. If more people in Alaska were given the opportunity of reading the statehood bill, as now proposed, I feel certain there would be many protests, not only with reference to the public lands provision, but also with regard to the provisions affecting the mining and fishing industries of the Territory.

At this point, Mr. President, I ask that the editorial above referred to be made a part of my statement.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT WILL BE TOO LATE

When the original Alaska statehood bill, H. R. 331, after having passed the House, came to the Senate, and a hearing was had before the Senate Committee on Territorial and Insular Affairs, it was brought to the attention of the committee that this bill had not been given any circulation in the Territory, so that very few persons were familiar with its contents.

It was also pointed out that the provisions of the bill relating to the transfer of public lands to the new State were wholly inadequate. Apparently most of the proponents of statehood agreed to that and so did the members of the committee, for the bill has been amended in the Senate committee, and the chief amendments deal with section 5, relating to the transfer of public lands to the new State. We have received a copy of the bill as it now stands and as it was amended by the committee on June 21 and 23. Section 5 (b) of the latest bill reads as follows:

"After 5 years from the admission of Alaska into the Union, the State, in addition to any other grants made in this section, shall be entitled to select not to exceed 20,000,000 acres from the vacant, unappropriated, and unreserved public lands in the State. Such selections shall be made in reasonably compact tracts: *Provided,* That valid, existing rights shall not be affected by any such selections or grants. Where the lands desired are unsurveyed at the time of selection, the Secretary of the Interior shall survey the exterior boundaries of the area requested without any subdivision thereof and shall issue a patent for such selected area in terms of the exterior boundary survey. Such lands may be granted or sold by the State in tracts of not more than 640 acres for any purpose, but with a reservation to the State of a royalty of not more than 12½ percent on all minerals produced therefrom. The lands granted to the State of Alaska pursuant to this subsection, and income therefrom and the proceeds thereof when said lands are sold, shall be held by said State as a public trust for the support of public schools and other public educational institutions."

In the first amendment made by the committee the provison "that valid existing rights shall not be affected by any such selections or grants" was not included. However, the inclusion of that in section 5 (b) would seem to add very little protection for the new State in acquiring public lands.

As the section reads, the State shall be entitled after 5 years to select not to exceed 20,000,000 acres from vacant, unappropriated and unreserved lands in the State. As the tracts are selected the Secretary of the Interior shall survey the exterior boundaries of the areas requested and shall issue a patent for such selected area in terms of the exterior boundary survey.

Now, let us suppose that the new State after 5 years begins to select areas to be transferred to it by patent from the United States. Let us say it selects an area containing three or four thousand acres in one locality. The new State is not likely to select mountain peaks or tundra, but it may be assumed that it will try to select the best lands available, and it is difficult to conceive of any considerable tracts of land which might be so selected which would not contain within their exterior boundaries some unpatented mining claims and some other unpatented ground held by settlers for one purpose or another.

In the first place, since the State is authorized to select only from vacant, unappropriated, and unreserved public lands, it could hardly be said that tracts which include unpatented mining claims and other unpatented claims would be either vacant or unappropriated; therefore, according to the strict letter of the law, the Secretary would refuse to make the survey and issue the patent to the State.

If he should attempt to make the survey and issue the patent, just how would the valid existing rights of any person be protected? Furthermore, there might be existing rights which the Secretary or the new State might consider not to be valid.

This would surely cause litigation in case the Secretary should consider the lands to be vacant, unappropriated, and unreserved and issue the patent to the new State.

The very best he could do would be to survey the lands selected and issue a patent which would contain a reservation in the language of the statehood bill that all valid existing rights on the land are unaffected. No one would know what those valid existing rights were, how many claims were involved, their area or extent, or what other rights might be affected, and there is no machinery set up in the bill for determining these things.

This is a most serious matter, and one which might well prevent the new State from ever getting any public lands or if it did acquire any, there would be endless law suits to determine who had valid existing rights on those lands prior to their transfer. Who would be the judge as to what was a valid existing right? In all cases it would require litigation.

Another objectionable feature in section 5 is the provision for the sale of State lands in tracts of "not more than 640 acres for any purpose." The meaning of that phrase is certainly obscure. We do not know whether it means that not more than 640 acres may be sold to any person or corporation—but if it doesn't mean that, it is meaningless.

If it does mean that any one person or corporation is limited to 640 acres, what would happen in the case of a mining company like the Alaska-Juneau Gold Mining Co. which operated before the war a large low-grade property on a very narrow margin requiring a very considerable acreage of land exceeding 640 acres? A mining property such as the Alaska-Juneau requires a very large investment, requires a large number of claims and millsites, power plant sites, land for transmission lines, dam sites, etc. How could it ever operate if it is restricted to owning 640 acres?

Another very objectionable provision in section 5 (b) is that which provides that when the State acquires lands and sells them it must reserve a royalty on minerals of not more than 12½ percent. The mining industry in Alaska and generally throughout the United States has always been strongly opposed to royalties, yet the statehood bill, for some reason which we cannot fathom, requires that the State must reserve a royalty on minerals, whether the people desire it or not. In our opinion this would further discourage mining in the new State.

A royalty is on gross production and again let us illustrate by taking the case of the Alaska-Juneau mine. It was a large low-grade mine and it was necessary to operate on a very extensive scale, mining 13,000 to 14,000 tons of ore a day on account of the very low grade of the ore. The mining in the prewar days was on a scale which required a gross production, we believe, of between five and six million dollars a year. The profit, in years when there was a profit, was very slim, and even if a royalty of 1 percent on the gross production had been in effect, that is to say, if such a mine were operated on lands acquired from the State, the royalty alone could well mean the difference between profit and loss.

It is difficult to see how such provisions were inserted in the statehood bill by the committee and we repeat what we said before, that if statehood is to be granted to Alaska, it is certainly of sufficient importance to permit the people of the Territory to express some opinion as to the public lands provisions of the bill.

We think the bill as amended by the Senate committee should be generally distributed throughout the Territory in order that the people may read and consider and comment upon section 5 before it is enacted. It will be too late afterward.

Mr. BUTLER. An Associated Press dispatch from Seattle, under date of July 10, quotes a member of the International Fisheries Commission to the effect that the fisheries provision in the amended statehood bill would encourage foreign entanglements. I personally feel that we already have enough troublesome international entanglements without adding to them with a hasty passage of this bill. Since I assume, Mr. President, that there will be considerable debate on this and similar provisions of the Alaska statehood bill, I will not take the time of the Senate now to elaborate further, except to request that the press release referred to above be made a part of my remarks at this point.

There being no objection, the dispatch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IFC PROTESTS TO PROPOSED CHANGE, STATEHOOD BILL

SEATTLE, July 10.—An International Fisheries Commission member today charged the fisheries provision of the amended Alaska statehood bill would encourage foreign entanglements.

Edward W. Allen, a member of General MacArthur's fisheries mission to Japan, said the amended bill "threatens to sacrifice an important food asset of this country."

Allen contended the bill should be rewritten to state specifically what fishery control is to be vested in the proposed new State (Alaska).

"At least it should be redrafted to provide expressly for the repeal of the present fishery laws relating to Alaska," he said.

The Federal Government has been regulating salmon fishing for many years.

"It is the only power which can protect salmon runs in the future against destructive fishing by Russians and Japanese," Allen said.

Allen said the amended statehood bill does not repeal the present Federal laws protecting Alaska fishing, but does take away all facilities for enforcing them.

Mr. BUTLER. I also request that a news article entitled "Query Asked Into Palmer Airport Deal," published in the Daily Alaska Empire on July 10, be made a part of my remarks at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

QUERY ASKED INTO PALMER AIRPORT DEAL—DICKER TO GET MATCHING FUNDS FROM FEDERAL AGENCY UNDER FIRE, NEWS-MINER

FAIRBANKS, ALASKA, July 10.—The Fairbanks Daily News-Miner has proposed a Federal inquiry into a $150,000 land transaction for an airport project at Palmer, in the Matanuska Valley.

The newspaper said its own investigation showed an attempt was being made to place a disproportionate value on the land to get matching funds from the Federal Government.

About 128 acres of land at Palmer are involved. The newspaper said the estimated construction cost of the airport was $120,000.

Senator McMAHON. I would like to point it out because a lot of people would like to point out something else.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia has the floor.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia indulge me for a moment, to make a comment in connection with the statement just made by the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am happy to yield to the Senator.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I am much interested in the statement the Senator from Connecticut has made. I have been similarly misquoted on the subject, although I am not in a class with the Senator from Connecticut as an authority in that field.

A few days ago I ventured to suggest that the President should give General MacArthur authority, if he deemed it expedient, to use the atom bomb. As very much of an amateur in this matter, I did not venture to express an opinion as to whether or not it was wise to do so.

I read with great interest what was reported as being an expersion of opinion by the Senator from Connecticut, who has given a great deal of study to the matter. I wanted my own position to be quite clear, namely, that I have not expressed an opinion as to whether the atom bomb should or should not be used, but merely that inasmuch as we have spent billions in developing the atom bomb, and inasmuch as at the present time our boys are dying because of an inadequate defense, the President should have authority in his discretion to direct that the atom bomb be used.

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I hope the first amendment under the agricultural section of the bill may be stated at this time. We have been on that section of the bill all day, but the amendment has not yet been discussed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the the heading "Chapter VI—Department of Agriculture—Title I—Research and Marketing Act of 1946," on page 168, after line 3, to strike out:

To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of section 9 of title I and title II of the act of August 14, 1946, as amended (7 U. S. C. 427, 427h, 427j, 1621–1629), as follows:

For payments to States, Territories, and Puerto Rico for agricultural experiment stations pursuant to section 9 of the Bankhead-Jones Act approved June 29, 1935, as amended by the act of August 14, 1946, $5,000,000;

For the improvement and development, independently or through cooperation among Federal and State agencies, and others, of a sound and efficient system for the distribution and marketing of agricultural products pursuant to the "Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946" (title II of the act of August 14, 1946, as amended), including the objects for which funds are available for titles II and III of such act of August 14, 1946, $6,000,000: *Provided*, That not less than $650,000 of this amount shall be available for contracts in accordance with the provisions of section 205 of said act: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may make available to any bureau, office, or agency of the Department such amounts from this appropriation as may be necessary to carry out the functions for which it is made (but amounts made available to the Office of the Secretary, Office of the Solicitor, and Office of Information, shall not exceed those which the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives of the Department, shall determine), and any such amounts shall be in addition to amounts transferred or otherwise made available to other appropriation items of the Department: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for work relating to fish or shellfish or any product thereof, except for the support of equitable transportation rates before Federal agencies concerned with such rates and for development of foreign markets.

In all, $11,000,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for beginning construction of any building costing in excess of $15,000, except that a poultry breeding house may be constructed at Purdue University at a cost to this appropriation of not to exceed $29,000.

And on page 169, after line 24, to insert:

To enable the Secretary to improve and develop, independently or through cooperation among Federal and State agencies, and others, a sound and efficient system for the distribution and marketing of agricultural products under the provisions of title II of the Act of August 14, 1946, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1621–1629), including the objects for which funds are available for titles II and III of such Act of August 14, 1946, $6,000,000: *Provided*, That not less than $650,000 of this amount shall be available for contracts in accordance with the provisions of section 205 of said Act: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may make available to any bureau, office, or agency of the Department such amounts from this appropriation as may be necessary to carry out the functions for which it is made (but amounts made available to the Office of the Secretary, Office of the Solicitor, and Office of Information, shall not exceed those which the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives of the Department, shall determine), and any such amounts shall be in addition to amounts transferred or otherwise made available to other appropriation items of the Department: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for work relating to fish or shellfish or any product thereof, except for the support of equitable transportation rates before Federal agencies concerned with such rates and for development of foreign markets.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, last week the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], formerly Secretary of Agriculture, expressed some concern about the change in the language of the appropriation affecting the funds for the Research and Marketing Act. I had requested the Department of Agriculture to furnish me with a statement as to its construction of the effect of this language. Let me read at this time an extract from that statement:

The action taken by the Senate Committee on Appropriations with regard to the transfer of the appropriation for section 9 of the Research and Marketing Act to the appropriation for other payments to State Experiment Stations in no way changes any provisions of the act or procedures for its administration. The research administrator has had the responsibility of administering the Research and Marketing Act. He retains that responsibility by the committee action since the Office of Experiment Stations is under his supervision. The separate identity of this section is maintained, the authorizations remain the same, there is the same distribution of funds by prescribed formulas to the different States, and the research program remains the same down to the last project. The provisions for regional research in section 9 and marketing research in section 11 remain unchanged. The law provides direct payment to the State Experiment Stations of the funds appropriated under section 9 and the stations have authority to initiate and conduct research authorized by section 1 of the act using such funds. The act itself, in section 9 (c) also states that this section is to be administered by the Office of Experiment Stations and the transfer of section 9 to the Office of Experiment Stations will continue the administrative procedure which has been in effect from the beginning. The committee action is consistent with these provisions of the act and is in the interest of simplifying budgetary, administrative, and fiscal procedures without in any way changing the evident intent of Congress as stated in the act. This action was recommended by the Land Grant College Association and by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire statement may be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE WITH RESPECT TO THE ACTION TAKEN BY THE HOUSE AND SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEES RELATING TO SECTIONS 9 AND 10 OF THE RESEARCH AND MARKETING ACT

The Appropriation Committees of both the Senate and House, as well as the Bureau of the Budget and the Department, have had difficulty since the initiation of the program under the Research and Marketing Act in clearly distinguishing between activities carried on under regular funds and those carried on with funds from sections 9 and 10 of the Research and Marketing Act. Because of this, the Congress recommended in April 1949 that the Department study the matter and recommend consolidation where needed. (See Report No. 384, on H. R. 3997 making appropriations for fiscal year 1950, House of Representatives, 81st Cong., 1st sess., p. 3.)

Subsequently, as of July 30, 1949, when the former Administrator of the Research and Marketing Act left the Department, responsibility for administration of the act was assigned to the Agricultural Research Administration. This Administration includes six Bureaus of the Department and the Office of Experiment Stations.

As a result of the recommendation from Congress, the Department and the State Experiment Stations thoroughly studied the questions involved and the Department presented to the agricultural subcommittees of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations for their consideration in connection with hearings on this bill, statements showing the relationship of work performed under sections 9 and 10 of the Research and Marketing Act, and that carried out under the other research appropriations of the Department. (See Hearings, House of Representatives, on the Department of Agriculture Appropriations for 1951, pt. 1, pp. 153 to 155.)

[The action taken by the Senate Committee on Appropriations with regard to the transfer of the appropriation for section 9 of the Research and Marketing Act to the appropriation for other payments to State Experiment Stations in no way changes any provisions of the act or procedures for its administration. The Research Administrator has had the responsibility of administering the Research and Marketing Act. He retains that responsibility by the committee action since the Office of Experiment Stations is under his supervision. The separate identity of this section is maintained, the authorizations remain the same, there is the same distribution of funds by prescribed formulas to the different States, and the research program remains the same down to the last project.] The provisions for regional research in section 9 and marketing research in section 11 remain unchanged. The law provides direct payment to the State Experiment Stations of the funds appropriated under section 9 and the stations have authority to initiate and conduct research authorized by section 1 of the act using such funds. The act itself, in section 9 (c) also states that this section is to be administered by the Office of Experiment Stations and the transfer of section 9 to the Office of Experiment Stations will continue the administrative procedure which has been in effect from the beginning. The committee action is consistent with these provisions of the act and is in the interest of simplifying budgetary, administrative, and fiscal procedures without in any way changing the evident intent of Congress as stated in the act. This action was recommended by the Land Grant College Association and by the Department of Agriculture.

Furthermore, the committee's action is consistent with the actions taken by the House in consolidating the appropriation for section 10 of the Research and Marketing Act with the regular appropriations for the various research bureaus and agencies of the Department.

The Research and Marketing Act was in fact two acts that were tied together for legislative convenience. Title I of the act was an amendment to the Bankhead-Jones Act of 1935, while title II was the "Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946."

The action of the Senate Committee on Appropriations and the action of the House are consistent with the provisions of the Research and Marketing Act and with the intent of Congress. The separate identity of title II, the "Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946" has been preserved in a separate appropriation. Since title I is an amendment of the Bankhead-Jones Act of 1935, the appropriation for section 9 of this title is combined in the same appropriation with other Bankhead-Jones funds for State experiment stations, and the appropriation for section 10 is combined with other Department appropriations financing similar activities. The provisions for advisory committees in the Research and Marketing Act have been retained and the Senate report as well as the report of the House on this bill points out that Congress expects that the functions of these committees shall extend to all research funds in the Department, rather than being limited to the Research and Marketing Act. Likewise, the provisions for contract research under section 10 (a) are retained and this bill provides a specific amount for contracts.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. Does the Senator from Georgia feel that the statement he has just read completely guarantees that the Research and Marketing Act funds will be used as contemplated in the original Research and Marketing Act?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Department of Agriculture says so explicitly; and in view of its statement, which is to be printed at this point in the RECORD, it is my judgment that the Department of Agriculture will follow this course.

Certainly, if the Department does not do so, Congress will be in session in January, and it will not be a very difficult matter for Congress to restore the section, so as to make it read in the way it reads at the present time.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am quite sure the Senator from Georgia recognizes that at the time when the Research and Marketing Act was passed, there was a desire to have these funds administered by the land-grant colleges. However, the Congress decided otherwise, and placed the responsibility in the Department of Agriculture. The land-grant colleges have not been completely happy about that decision.

I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia whether he is aware that the Research and Marketing Act Advisory Committee chairmen, meeting in Washington, D. C., on June 20, 21, and 22, studied the Research Marketing Act in its operations, studied this very question, and in their recommendations—I refer specifically to recommendation No. 9, which is carried on page 2 of the report to the Secretary of Agriculture from the Research and Marketing Act Advisory Committee chairmen—said as follows:

> The Research and Marketing Act has done much to stimulate the research, service, and educational work in agriculture.

I call the attention of the distinguished Senator from Georgia to the next sentence, in particular:

> To the maximum extent possible, separate identity of the RMA funds and their application should be maintained.

I wonder whether the Senator from Georgia is a little disturbed over the fact that these men, whose responsibility it is to make sure that the Research and Marketing Act funds are used in ways that are useful to agriculture, take a position opposite to that taken in this connection in the research and marketing appropriation.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, frankness compels me to state that I have not seen the statement from which the distinguished Senator from New Mexico has just read. It has not previously been called to my attention. It is altogether likely that a copy of the statement reached my office; but we receive so much printed matter that I have not seen it.

I think it very likely, Mr. President, that the Advisory Committee chairman and advisory boards, on whose advice Congress depends largely in connection with the distribution of these funds, has made that statement.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am sure the Senator from Georgia understands my view of this matter, and in regard to his position. As I said twice the other day, the Department of Agriculture has no better friend on the floor of the Senate or in the Congress as a whole than the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia; and I know that the Research and Marketing Act has no better friend in the Senate than he.

Therefore, I am trying to make sure that everyone is put on notice that the Senate certainly expects the Research and Marketing Act to be administered as it has been, and as it was originally conceived.

Let me call attention to the fact that recently, in the set-up in the Department of Agriculture, the Administrator of the Agricultural Research Administration has been given full responsibility for administering the Research and Marketing Act. Although Dr. Cardon, who has been given this responsibility, is an unually outstanding person and a very competent man, nevertheless that action reverses the former tendency, namely, to have a separate administration of the Research and Marketing Act.

I am willing to take at face value what is said in the statement submitted to the distinguished Senator from Georgia by the Department of Agriculture. I am quite willing to assume that this will be administered exactly as the Department has explained the matter to the Senator from Georgia.

I feel that the recommendations of the chairmen of the advisory committees might well be made a part of the RECORD at this point, if the Senator from Georgia will permit me to make that request at this time.

Mr. RUSSELL. Certainly.

Mr. ANDERSON. Then, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the recommendations and report of the Research and Marketing Act Advisory Committee chairmen, who met in Washington on June 20 to 22. The recommendations include recommendation No. 9, to which I have referred, in which it is pointed out that the research funds should have separate identity, and should not be merged with the other funds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT OF THE RMA ADVISORY COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN, JUNE 20–22, 1950, WASHINGTON, D. C.

In the passage of the Research and Marketing Act of 1946, Congress recognized the need for keeping the program close to the people it serves when it authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to establish appropriate committees including representatives of producers, industry, government and science to assist in effectuating specific research and service programs. In accordance with this legislation, the Secretary has established 20 commodity and functional committees to assist in developing and analyzing research and service programs. In addition there have been four State agency committees established to assist in the development of this program.

Members of these committees represent broad groups interested in the outcome of agricultural research and service work. They are familiar with the problems faced by these groups in particular parts of industry or of the country. They are expected to see that the Department becomes fully cognizant of these problems.

Congress in legislative acts has defined the basic objectives and general nature of the Department's program. Personnel of the Department are responsible, through administrative channels, to Congress. However, within the broad framework established by Congress, there is wide latitude for administrative judgment in determining what specific types of work should be undertaken. Advice for well-informed citizen groups provides a sound basis for administrative decisions. It should result in greater returns for money expended and a program consistent with the interests of the public as a whole.

After review of these programs the group of RMA Committee chairmen at their meeting in Washington, June 20–22, 1950, expressed general satisfaction regarding the functioning of the programs under the Research and Marketing Act. The advisory committees are serving a useful purpose in this general plan of research and such committees should be continued. The following recommendations and questions are presented, looking toward further progress and general improvement in the program:

PART I—RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Advisory committees should assist the Department in maintaining a balance between fundamental and applied research. Research should be directed toward practical operating problems as well as fundamental research.

2. There should be some research aimed at providing background data to serve as a basis for broad agricultural policy.

3. Research projects should be specifically outlined by the Department, showing objectives, and committees should be advised of related or similar projects being conducted in the same field by the Department, by State agencies, and, to the greatest extent possible, by industry. There should be complete cooperation between State and Federal agencies and, where possible, between governmental and industrial agencies.

4. Work under contract should be used and expanded as far as practicable to better effectuate the purposes of the act.

5. Projects should be completed and closed when the work is done, or when it is determined after consultation with the interested subject matter committee that the results are not practical, that further work is unnecessary, or would be of little value as fundamental research.

6. There should be an expansion of extension, education, and service work, looking toward wide distribution and commercial application of the results of research and the adoption of findings. Generally much of the research work will become valuable only when it has been applied to the problems of production and distribution.

7. Training programs should be encouraged, particularly by State institutions in the field of marketing and distribution, as well as in other technical fields to develop qualified personnel which will be needed in the growth of research work under this act.

8. All segments of the trade, from the producer to the consumer, should be encouraged to engage as much as possible in needed research with their own funds. This applies particularly to private corporations, trade and producer associations, various State and local commissions and other organizations which should be encouraged to conduct practical research as a supplemental and in addition to the research work being done in the Department.

9. The Research and Marketing Act has done much to stimulate the research, service, and educational work in agriculture. To the maximum extent possible separate identity of the RMA funds and their application should be maintained. Research is a continuing process and it is urged that adequate funds be made available by the Congress to continue and expand the program in accordance with the original provisions of the act.

10. Flexibility in use of funds is essential to provide for emergency situations and to insure maximum efficiency in the application of the funds.

11. Margin studies should include costs in relation to situations or conditions rather than margins alone.

12. With growing responsibilities and scope of work, additional funds for expanded staff work are necessary in order adequately to service the work of the committees and maintain the supervisory and correlative work necessary for maximum efficiency.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I should like to ask, also—and I now request such unanimous consent—that the list of members of the Agricultural Research Policy Committee be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH POLICY COMMITTEE

Dr. John D. Black, professor of agricultural economics, Harvard University, 205 Littauer Center, Cambridge, Mass.

A. A. Brock, director, department of agriculture, State of California, State Office Building No. 1, Sacramento, Calif.

Robert R. Coker, vice president, Coker's Pedigreed Seed Co., Hartsville, S. C.

Dr. John H. Davis, executive secretary, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

Albert S. Goss, master, the National Grange, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

Dr. C. G. King, scientific director, the Nutrition Foundation, Inc., Chrysler Building, New York, N. Y.

Albert K. Mitchell, Albert, N. Mex.

James G. Patton, president, National Farmers Union, 1555 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.

Harry J. Reed, dean and director, School of Agriculture, Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind.

Mrs. Raymond Sayre, president, the Associated Women of the American Farm Bureau Federation, Ackworth, Iowa.

Dean Stanley, president, Stanley Fruit Co., 626 Security Building, Phoenix, Ariz.

Executive secretary: Henry G. Herrell, Agricultural Research Administration, United State Department of Agriculture.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am going to say, as I said to the Senator from Georgia, I think a point of order would lie against this change. I do not intend to raise a point of order. I prefer to depend upon the assurances given by the Department of Agriculture in its statement to the Senator from Georgia and his assurances to the Senate that it is the intention to preserve the integrity of these funds and not let them become mixed with the ordinary funds granted to the experiment stations.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I shall not discuss the point of order, because that question is moot in view of the statement of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico. I shall express my apreciation of his kindly reference to the Senator from Georgia. I reiterate what I have said before on this floor that the distinguished Senator from New Mexico is one of the outstanding—if not the outstanding—Secretaries of Agriculture since that position was created. I am sure that we share the common hope and desire that the activities of the Research and Marketing Administration will proceed as contemplated by the Congress when the act was passed, and that there will be no change by administrative action in the Department of Agriculture of any part of the functioning of the research work by virtue of this change in language, which we understand is solely to simplify the bookkeeping and budgetary procedures within the Department of Agriculture.

The Senate committee, in its efforts to sustain the Advisory Committee, made quite a lengthy statement in the committee report urging that the Advisory Committee be given greater authority and more information, to enable those from outside the Department who view this matter perhaps from a little different light, because they have not been living so close to it for so many years, to take a larger part in the activities of the Research and Marketing Administration.

Mr. WHERRY rose.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have one other brief statement, after which I shall be delighted to yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for but one question, at this point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Is the Senator about to leave this subject and go to something else, or will he continue to discuss this amendment?

Mr. RUSSELL. We are still on the first amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall wait until the Senator is through, if he wants to offer a further observation regarding the amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. I wish to make a brief observation; yes.

Recently I stated I was disappointed in the results which had been achieved to date in these activities. That language was perhaps too strong. I should have said that I was unhappy because there had not been more outstanding achievements. The Department sent me two booklets dealing at length with examples of the progress which has been achieved under the Research and Marketing Act of 1946. I may say the pamphlets show that great progress has been made, and that Senators who are interested in the subject would find them interesting reading, if they could find time to look into them, because there have been certain accomplishments which have been notable.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am very glad that the Senator from Georgia put that statement into the RECORD. He will remember that the act was passed at a time when it was impossible to get the money which was needed. That was impossible until very recently. I think the men inside the Department of Agriculture, those connected with the land-

grant colleges, and persons in private industry have done a very fine job of getting these projects started. I would commend the activities of the Department of Agriculture, certainly those in recent months, for the fine job which has been done. I am particularly happy that independent groups have come forward and made their proposals, thereby making it possible for the Department to coordinate its work with what private industry is doing. I may refer particularly to the great activity of the National Cotton Council for Research in undertaking research in cotton mills. Cotton research was to some extent tied in with the work of the land-grant colleges, and finally with the work of the Department of Agriculture itself.

I am glad the Senator from Georgia has had an opportunity to look at what they have accomplished, because I think it is a rather impressive study—not because of what they have thus far achieved, but becouse of the sound way in which they are planning their work and looking into the future. I have nothing but praise for the work the Department is doing at this time.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator has stated it much better than I could. I may further point out that under the act an appropriation of $61,000,000 would have been authorized for the fiscal year 1951. In the great desire for economy, we have only requested appropriations of $19,000,000, which is less than one-third of the authorizations of the act.

Mr. WHERRY and Mr. LANGER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield first to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Referring to the observation made by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, the former Secretary of Agriculture, I did not quite catch the significance of his observation when he stated, if I heard him correctly, that he would not raise a point of order against this provision, on the assurance that the act would be administered, as I take it, as explained by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I should merely like to ask a question, through the Senator from Georgia, if I may reach the Senator from New Mexico in that way. Is there any apprehension upon his part that it might not be administered properly? Why the observation? I am as much interested as is the Senator from Georgia or the Senator from New Mexico in seeing to it that the research laboratories are able to conduct proper research. I am wondering whether there is anything in the Senator's mind which even indicates that under this new language of the bill that work might not be done.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, without my losing the floor, I may yield to the Senator from New Mexico for the purpose of his replying to the question of the Senator from Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I merely want to assure the distinguished majority leader that I saw, as I glanced at the language, as I was examining the bill, that there might be come significance in the fact that appropriations which had been made heretofore to the Department of Agriculture and by the Department then granted to the land-grant colleges were being changed by the fact that the money was now going directly to the land-grant colleges. I wondered whether that meant the termination of the over-all supervision by the Department of Agriculture with respect to this project.

Mr. WHERRY. I may say to the distinguished Senator, I think that is a very pertinent question. It is one of the questions I asked when this legislation came up.

Mr. ANDERSON. I may say to the distinguished minority leader that when the original survey was made of research projects now going on, the Department of Agriculture acquired examples, running into the thousands of pages, of agricultural research then being done in the United States; first of all, by the Department itself; secondly, by the land-grant colleges; third, by the Office of Experiment Stations; and then by private industry. It was found, for example, that in one State the very same problem was being studied that was being studied in another State through the granting of Federal funds. That is not wholly bad. Frequently it is desirable to pursue independently the same type of research in two States. But, very frequently, it is desirable to have somebody at the top knowing exactly what is going on.

Therefore, when I saw this language which I thought might take it away from the Department, I raised the question with the distinguished Senator from Georgia. He then took it up with the Department, because the Senator from Nebraska, the Senator from Georgia, and I had the same desire to make sure that the Research and Marketing Act would succeed. The reply which came to him from the Department of Agriculture—he supplied me with a copy of it—satisfied him and it satisfies me, as long as the Senator from Georgia is watching this particular point.

Mr. WHERRY. In order that the RECORD may be clear relative to this matter, I may say it is my understanding that this language is added for no other reason than as a bookkeeping proposition which mechanically helps accomplish what has been suggested. It in no way impairs, but might to the *n*th degree bring about what the distinguished Senator from New Mexico has just mentioned. Is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Senator from North Dakota raised some question about research activities relative to wheat straw. I had happened to mention research in the use of wood waste materials. The Department, in order to show that the work has been done, has sent me quite a list of pamphlets relative to wood waste, and also relative to the waste of wheat straw. I am sure the Senator from North Dakota will be glad to see them.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator have any objection to placing in the RECORD for reference the titles of the two pamphlets to which he referred, in order that any farmer who desires to obtain them may have reference to them?

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be glad to do that. One of them is Appendix 1, "Examples of Progress Under the Research and Marketing Act of 1946," issued May 25, 1950. The second is Appendix 2, "A List of Publications Reporting Results of Work Under the Research and Marketing Act of 1946," dated the same date.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, may I make a further inquiry?

Mr. RUSSELL. Certainly.

Mr. LANGER. Does the distinguished Senator know whether they are available to other Senators?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. If the Senator will have one of his assistants call up the Department, the Department will have the documents on the Senator's desk in the morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment beginning on page 168, after line 3, striking out certain language and inserting other language ending on page 169, line 25.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Agricultural Economics," on page 171, line 16, after the word "trends", to strike out "$2,600,000" and insert "$2,720,000."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, last year Congress appropriated for this purpose $2,621,000. The House Appropriations Committee recommended a cut of $21,000, which brought the figure to $2,600,000. The Senate committee has raised it to $2,720,000. That is an increase of $120,000 over the House figure, and is virtually an increase of $100,000 over the amount appropriated last year. In view of the war situation, it seems to me we should make reductions in funds of this kind. I hope the amendment will be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 172, line 7, after "(7 U. S. C. 951–957)", to strike out "and data on farm construction as provided by title V of the Housing Act of 1949 (Public Law 171), $2,725,000" and insert "$2,904,000."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, last year Congress appropriated $2,817,000 for this purpose. The House bill cut the

figure to $2,725,000. The Senate committee has proposed $2,904,000. This is an increase of $86,000 over the appropriation of last year, and an increase of $179,000 over the House figure. It also carries with it the elimination of funds to carry out the provisions of research on farm construction. So we are giving this group more money with which to do less work. I hope the committee amendment will be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may I ask the distinguished Senator from Georgia whether the amendment involves a pay increase? Is it approximately the same figure as that provided last year?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, this item includes the pay adjustment costs which were authorized through the pay-increase act which was passed last year. When we take into consideration the pay adjustments under the Federal Employees Compensation Act which was enacted last year, with the sums appropriated, there is less money available for this purpose in the coming fiscal year than there was in the past fiscal year.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I do not wish to delay the proceedings, because there will be many of these proposals, but, as a general principle, it seems to me we should have the agencies absorb the salary increases by a decrease in personnel. The appropriation called for is an increase of $86,000 over last year which should help to some extent but the rest should be absorbed.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I wish to point out that this item is substantially below the budget estimate, and it does not allow all the pay increases. The Department is absorbing and has absorbed a part of them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 172, line 7.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Agricultural Research Administration—Office of Administrator," on page 172, line 19, after the word "of", to strike out "Advisory Committee" and insert "advisory committees."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 174, to strike out:

WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS, AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH CENTER

For the establishment of a working capital fund, to be available without fiscal year limitation, for expenses necessary for furnishing facilities and services by the Agricultural Research Center to Government agencies, $300,000. Said fund shall be reimbursed from applicable appropriations or other funds to cover the charges for such facilities and services, including handling and related charges, for equipment rentals (including depreciation, maintenance, and repairs), for supplies, equipment and materials, stores of which may be maintained at the Center, and for building construction, alterations, and repair, and applicable appropriations or other funds may also be charged their proportionate share of the necessary general expenses of the Center not covered by the annual appropriation.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Research on agricultural problems of Alaska," on page 175, line 10, after the word "Alaska", to strike out "$260,000" and insert "$280,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment, was under the subhead "Office of Experiment Stations," on page 175, line 14, after the word "advance", to insert "where applicable."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 175, line 24, after "(7 U. S. C. 427–427g)", to strike out "$2,863,708" and insert "Sections 3 and 5, $2,863,708, and sections 9 and 11 of said act as added by the act of August 14, 1946 (7 U. S. C. 427h, 427j), including administration by the Office of Experiment Stations in the United States Department of Agriculture, $5,000,000, no part of which latter amount shall be used for beginning construction of any building costing in excess of $15,000, except that a poultry breeding house may be constructed at Purdue University at a cost to this appropriation of not to exceed $29,000;".

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, may I be privileged to ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. Certainly.

Mr. DOUGLAS. This is an appropriation of $5,000,000 to carry out the purposes authorized under the Bankhead-Jones Act of 1945, is it not?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, if the Senator from Georgia will permit me, this is transferred from a previous amendment and placed at this point. It is the amendment as to which I raised the question awhile ago. It was previously carried under the research and marketing operations, and it will be recognized from the earlier amendment that it is a transfer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 176, line 17, after the word "Alaska", to strike out "$27,500" and insert "$37,500", and in line 21, after the name "Puerto Rico", to strike out "$7,406,208" and insert "$12,416,208."

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia if where the bill mentions the amounts which shall be available to Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico, it does not also include agricultural experimental work which should be done in the Virgin Islands. In other words, are the Virgin Islands continued as a part of Puerto Rico in the operation of the experimental station?

Mr. ANDERSON. I hope the Senator from Nebraska will not hold me strictly to this, but I believe it does not include the Virgin Islands, because income-tax payments from the Virgin Islands are not transferred to the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think that is altogether correct. So far as I am advised, there is no experiment station in the Virgin Islands. There is one in Puerto Rico. I conclude that a great deal of the material gathered in Puerto Rico would be available to the Virgin Islands. Their research in agriculture would be along similar lines. They have practically the same agricultural economy.

Mr. BUTLER. It is true that the Puerto Rico station is approximately 40 miles from the Virgin Islands, and the experimental work done in Puerto Rico does contribute to the economy of the Virgin Islands, but the Virgin Islands are not mentioned. I think the Virgin Islands receive the benefit of much of the experimental work conducted in Puerto Rico, but I should like to have it understood that the Puerto Rico station is also responsible for experimental work in the Virgin Islands as well as in Puerto Rico.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Nebraska may be entirely correct, and, in view of his past experience as former chairman of the committee dealing with the islands, he undoubtedly is correct. But I know of no authorization for that purpose. It would be necessary to pass specific legislation for an experiment station in Puerto Rico. There is none in the Virgin Islands of which I have any knowledge.

Mr. BUTLER. I am not asking that the appropriation be increased; I do not believe it is necessary; but I think it is necessary for Congress to understand that the station in Puerto Rico serves the Virgin Islands as well as Puerto Rico.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think any information developed should be available to the Virgin Islands.

Mr. CORDON. I should like to address a question to the Senator from Nebraska. I happened to have been with him on an inspection trip in the Virgin Islands, during the course of which we both visited an experimental farm which was operated either by the Department of Agriculture or the Department of the Interior. My inquiry is whether the Senator from Nebraska can identify the department which was responsible for the experimental work.

Mr. BUTLER. The experimental farm which has been conducted in the Virgin Islands is conducted under the general supervision of the Department of the Interior jointly with the Virgin Islands government. I do not believe that the Department of Agriculture is officially connected with the experimental farm in the Virgin Islands.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 176, line 21.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Salaries and expenses," on page 177, line 5, after the word "of", to strike out "December" and insert "September," and in line 8, after the name "Puerto Rico", to strike out "$237,500" and insert "$252,500."

The amendments were agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics," on page 178, line 9, after the word "subjects", to strike

out "$1,500,000" and insert "$1,763,200."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, as the text of the bill indicates, this represents an increase of $263,000 above the amount appropriated by the House. It is a slight increase of $14,000 above the amount appropriated last year. I should like to read from the House report, at page 130, as follows:

The funds for this Bureau have increased from $360,000 in 1941 to approximately $1,800,000 in 1950, including Research and Marketing Act and special research fund allotments. The committee believes that continued increases in appropriations for the work of this Bureau cannot be justified at this time, and the survey of rural family living expenses cannot be provided for, and that development of farmhouse plans is adequately covered by the regular work of this and other bureaus.

The committee expects this Bureau to make a thorough reevaluation of all of its activities during the next year to make certain that attention is devoted only to the most essential research work in the field of human nutrition and home economics.

Mr. President, in view of the need for great budgetary stringency and the prospect of greatly increased war appropriations, I hope the committee amendment will be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 178, line 9.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Animal Industry—Salaries and expenses," on page 178, line 23, after the word "Hatcheries", to strike out "$2,250,000" and insert "$2,319,000."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, this is an increase of $69,000 above the House bill. It seems to me that the House appropriation of $2,250,000,000 should be sufficient. The Senate committee report speaks of provision for repairs, reconditioning, and replacement of facilities. In view of the current situation it seems to me that the facilities could be allowed to remain as they are for a while. I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I wish to ask the chairman in charge of this section of the bill if the bill includes an appropriation for salaries of meat inspectors located in terminal markets.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is a separate item, which has not yet been reached. We did not alter the House figure with respect to the Meat Inspection Service.

Mr. BUTLER. Did the committee increase the amount?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; it did not. The House allowed the budgetary estimates except to the extent of some $50,000. I may say that the excitement about meat inspectors grew out of the so-called Taber-Thomas amendment, which proposed to cut 429 meat inspectors from the Service. That provision has been stricken from the bill. The Meat Inspection Service is adequately provided for.

Mr. BUTLER. That is the phase in which I was interested.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Meat Inspection Service is adequately provided for in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 178, line 23.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 179, line 1, after the word "products," to strike out "$1,300,000" and insert "$1,350,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 179, line 15, after the figures "$7,950,000", to strike out the comma and "including not to exceed $30,000 for the acquisition of land and construction of four buildings for inspection of livestock at Canadian border ports of entry."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I have an amendment on page 179, on line 15, which I should like the clerk to report. It deals with the Meat Inspection Service.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, as I understand, we must conclude consideration of committee amendments before taking up individual amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's amendment, which deals with the text of the bill, is not in order.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The amendment would add only a small amount to the $7,950,000 figure, which was the amount provided by the House.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I believe such an amendment would not be in order at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's amendment, being an amendment to the text of the bill, is not in order at this time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Would my amendment be in order after the section now under consideration is disposed of?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's amendment would be in order after the disposition of the committee amendments.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the distinguished Senator from Washington must leave the city, I ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to submit the amendment at this time. He must leave for his home State.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator desires to leave, I have no objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thought this would be a good time to bring up an amendment with reference to the Meat Inspection Service.

Mr. RUSSELL. I would not accede to the Senator's request on those grounds.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator from North Dakota. I can wait until later.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington withdraws his amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, at this time I should like to submit an amendment which I intend to propose. It is on page 472. I realize that is far from the page which we are now discussing. The amendment relates to the Commodity Credit Corporation. I thought it could be presented at this time. I send the amendment to the desk and I ask that the Clerk read it. I also ask that an explanation of the amendment may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks. I may say that in attempting to make it possible for the Commodity Credit Corporation to deal with some of its problems, inadvertently no provision was made that the Corporation shall not be subject to the apportionment procedure. I should like to present the amendment at this time and to have the explanation printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table. Unanimous consent is requested that the amendment be read. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The Clerk will state the amendment.

The legislative clerk read the amendment as follows:

On page 472, strike out all after the word "States" and the period in line 1 down to and including line 7 and in lieu thereof insert the following: "No funds (other than funds for administrative expenses) available for price support, surplus removal, and related operations, with respect to agricultural commodities shall be subject to apportionment pursuant to this section."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Mexico that his explanatory statement be printed in the RECORD at this point?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPLANATION

The Secretary of Agriculture, through Commodity Credit Corporation and other means available to him, is required or authorized to make available price support on agricultural commodities and to engage in surplus removal operations with respect to agricultural commodities. The nature of these operations makes it impracticable to apportion the funds available therefor, since the extent or character of the operations must necessarily be related to supply and market conditions, and such conditions cannot be foreseen with any degree of certainty, but instead, are dependent upon weather, general economic conditions, and other fluctuating factors. Accordingly, it is believed that the price support operations and the surplus removal operations and other related programs with respect to agricultural commodities should be excluded from the provisions for apportionment. The operations which would thus be removed from the provisions requiring apportionment would include operations such as programs undertaken by the Secretary of Agriculture under section 32 (the act of August 24, 1935, Public Law 320, 74th Cong., as amended) and the price-support program, the supply program, the foreign purchase program, the commodity export program, and the storage facilities program, as described in the Commodity Credit Corporation's budget program for the fiscal year 1951.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, in view of the parliamentary situation, I shall not ask for a vote on my amendment at this point. However, I should like to discuss it for about 5 minutes, inasmuch as both the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] are interested in it. In answer to inquiry from the Senator from

Nebraska, the Senator from Georgia has made the statement that he thought the House amount was adequate with respect to salaries for Federal meat inspectors. It may be that the committee heard evidence to that effect. However, the amendment I am suggesting clearly points out that reductions which would result would cripple stock inspections at certain points. My amendment would add $2,500 to the bill. It would be added for the purpose of employing a part-time veterinarian in the Union Stockyards at Seattle. The Department of Agriculture tells me that the budgetary requirement and the amount in the committee bill would not allow for such part-time inspection service. It would leave the Seattle Union Stockyards without any inspection at all. In view of the fact that we have reduced the import duty on Canadian beef from 6 to 3 cents a pound, there has developed some very serious competition to the packers in the Seattle area. Immediately after the Federal inspection was discontinued the Canadians started shipping their cattle into the United States as dressed beef instead of as beef on the hoof. Shipments on the hoof, of course, would give the slaughtering and packing business to Seattle firms, but unless this small amount of $2,500 for a part-time veterinarian is provided the cattle will not be shipped into the Seattle Union Stockyards.

Another important point involved is that without Federal inspection livestock can be shipped from Canada to the United States only on direct assignment for slaughtering. With Federal inspection such livestock can be shipped for resale.

It may be that enough money is included in the appropriation, but all my information is that the Seattle Union Stockyards will be without the services of a part-time veterinarian, and it seems to me to be very false economy from the standpoint of public health not to have a sufficient amount to make possible a part-time veterinarian in that area. It is not too large a stockyard. It does not compare with the Omaha, Chicago, Kansas City, and South St. Paul stockyards, but it is an important union stockyard for our section of the country.

Mr. President, I do not know why it is, but it seems to me that every year since I have been a Member of Congress we have been confronted with the appropriation for Federal meat inspectors. If it is not the Weather Bureau it is the Federal Meat Inspection Service, and every year we have to make the attempt to restore very minute amounts to keep the inspection alive.

I do not know what the situation is in the other stockyards, but I am going to ask for $2,500 so that the inspection service can be kept alive in the Seattle Union Stockyard. I hope the Senator from Georgia, in view of this particular situation, may accept the amendment, take it to conference, and see whether or not this amount is adequate. The decreased appropriation in the bill does not amount to much, but it does stop all Federal inspection in that particular stockyard.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I could not accept the amendment without having some idea the Department as to the effect it would have on the other stockyards. I daresay a number of other stockyards are situated about like the one in Seattle, and if we agreed to give a part-time inspector to Seattle, we would certainly be bound to give such inspectors to the other stockyards similarly situated.

This bill carries $12,800,000 for meat inspection. That is $159,000 below the Budget estimate. It seems to me that with appropriation of $12,800,000, we ought to be able to save the $159,000 by which the House decreased the Budget estimate of $12,959,000.

I shall be glad to get a statement as to whether the other stockyards are similarly situated, but I could not agree to accept the amendment at this time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I brought the matter up because the situation is such that the amount provided, it is said, is not sufficient to keep a part-time man in the stockyards in Seattle. The officials say that it is because of the budget ceiling. They did not present a formal request to the committee to keep this place alive. There may be other like cases.

I hope that for the sake of saving $2,500 a stockyard serving a great area will not be denied the right of Federal inspection, because it has even this further effect, that the Canadians, instead of sending their cattle to Seattle on the hoof to be slaughtered, are sending their dressed beef. With inspection, the tendency is to send the cattle from Canada into the Seattle Union Stockyards for consumption in that area.

Mr. President, I shall not submit the amendment until the parliamentary situation is favorable, but I thought this was a good time to bring up the subject of Federal meat inspectors.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator makes a very appealing case. The agricultural appropriation affords more opportunities for appealing pleas than any other single feature in the entire bill. At one time I counted them and found there are 1,863 different activities under this chapter of the bill. Some of those 1,863 activities are carried in every State in the Union. There has never been any instance where those within the States have not desired to have their services improved. Of course we all hear about those things in the Nation's Capital, because it is our responsibility to represent our people.

I should like very much to be able to accept the Senator's amendment, but I cannot do it if it is going to result in discrimination against any other stockyard that is similarly situated.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I am not familiar with what the effect would be on other stockyards. If the Department says that because of the budget limitation they cannot assign an inspector to Seattle, a great area of the country served by one union stockyard would be denied the right of inspection.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does the Senator know whether there are other inspectors there?

Mr. MAGNUSON. There are none there.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Department ought to assign one to that area, because they have, I believe, approximately, 4,000 inspectors.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I am deeply interested in the discussion taking place between the Senator from Washington and the Senator from Georgia. I wish to repeat the statement that the United States Department of Agriculture Inspection Division operates almost solely for the protection of the health of American citizens, and I think it is an extremely important service to be continued for the benefit of the people as a whole.

I am surprised that there is any question that $2,500 cannot be available out of a total of $12,800,000 for the services referred to, but I am willing to take the word of the chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, who has the bill in charge, that the Taber amendment is not being considered in connection with this particular item.

Mr. RUSSELL. No; the Taber item is not in the bill. By committee action it was stricken out. There is nothing in the appropriation for this item that brought about the drastic reduction in meat inspectors, as to which we all received innumerable telegrams. The Taber-Thomas amendment would have resulted in dropping four-hundred-odd meat inspectors. As I have said, I think there is a total of nearly 4,000. I am told by the clerk of the committee that there are 3,220. They are provided for in this bill. That being the case, it seems to me that the Senator from Washington could get a part-time inspector, and I should be delighted to join with him in making a representation to the Department of Agriculture, so that there could be at least one part-time inspector assigned to the Seattle area.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, in view of the statement of the Senator and in view of the facts that there are some 3,300 inspectors, it seems to me that what the Senator says is correct. I shall talk to the Department again and see if we cannot get one for the Seattle area, at least one, perhaps a full-time inspector.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator could get at least a part-time one, I believe.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It seems to me we have the same problem as to meat inspection coming up all the time. I know it has been coming up since I have been a Member of Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a statement showing the situation in the Seattle area, together with a letter from Henry J. Kruse, president of the Seattle Packing Co.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON

I am offering an amendment proposing the addition of $2,500 to funds provided in the bill for the item "Animal disease control and eradication," under the Bureau of Animal Industry.

In line 15, page 179, I propose to strike out the figure "$7,950,000" and insert in lieu thereof $7,952,500."

This addition of $2,500 is urgently needed to provide Federal inspection at the Seattle Union Stockyards. I have talked to the Department of Agriculture informally about the need for Federal inspection at the Seattle yards. The Department agrees that Federal inspection is highly desirable, but because of the budget ceiling was unable to present a formal request to the committee.

Through 1946 the Seattle yard had Federal inspection. The Eightieth Congress cut rather drastically funds allotted the Bureau of Animal Industry, and, in consequence, Federal inspection at the Seattle Union Stockyards was discontinued. Inasmuch as these yards do not now have inspection, there is a tendency for cattle, particularly feeder stock, to be diverted to other areas.

In addition, serious competition has developed for Seattle packers from the Canadians. Immediately after Federal inspection was discontinued, Canadians started shipping their cattle into the Pacific Northwest in the form of dressed beef rather than on the hoof.

A current factor in this influx of dressed beef was the tariff reduction, effective January 1, 1948, from 6 to 3 cents per pound. Both management and labor in the meat packing industry believe that restoration of Federal inspection will encourage the shipments to come in the form of livestock rather than dressed beef.

Shipments on the hoof will give the slaughtering and packing business to United States firms and workers, and would go some distance toward cushioning the competitive effects of this particular type of Canadian import.

The important point is that without Federal inspection, livestock can only be shipped from Canada to the United States on direct consignment to a slaughter. With Federal inspection, such livestock can be shipped for resale.

It is obvious that there is great merit in making it possible for the Bureau of Animal Industry to restore Federal inspection at the Seattle Union Stockyards. The amount involved is only $2,500—just enough to pay the half-time salary of a qualified veterinarian.

I hope the Senate will adopt this amendment.

SEATTLE PACKING CO.,
Seattle, Wash., June 30, 1950.

Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Although the Department of Agriculture recognizes the need for restoring Federal inspection at the Seattle Union Stockyards, it is unable to do so because of a shortage of funds. The Department estimates, however, that only $2,500 is needed to restore the Federal inspection at Seattle as only the part-time services of one veterinarian is required. It is, therefore, suggested that you obtain an appropriation of $2,500 for this purpose. This is important to the Northwest for the following reasons.

Increased control of livestock diseases is a protection to the general public. With Federal inspection the Seattle Union Stockyards would be assured that a veterinarian would be in charge and that adequate inspection with regard to communicable diseases would be in effect.

Livestock producers will be better served under Federal inspection. At the present time the Northwest is served by only two Federal-inspected yards. These are located at Spokane and Portland. Under State law, health requirements are enforced by the Brand Division which require that all female stock be tested and tagged when sold, except when sold to a packer for slaughter or for resale at a federally inspected yard.

Since a federally inspected yard has a veterinarian on duty, the additional expense and delay required by testing female cattle is avoided. Inasmuch as the Seattle Union Stockyards are not now inspected, livestock producers tend to make their shipments either to Spokane or to Portland.

Slaughter in the Northwest area would increase. Since reductions in the tariff on meat from Canada to the United States from 6 to 3 cents per pound effective January 1, 1948, and the termination of shipments from Canada to the United Kingdom, meat importations to the United States have been greatly increased. Due to higher wage rates, expenses, etc., in the United States, most of this importation is now in the form of meat that is dressed. It would be desirable to have it come in the form of livestock so that the slaughter and processing could be performed here. Federal inspection at the Seattle Union Stockyards would therefore greatly facilitate the movement of livestock from Canada. Without Federal inspection livestock can only be shipped on direct consignment to a slaughterer. Whereas, under Federal control such livestock could be shipped for resale. This would increase the flow of Canadian cattle and would help the packers in that area to meet the competition of Canadian packers. This competition has been particularly severe in the Seattle area since the reduction in tariff duty.

Very respectfully yours,

HENRY J. KRAUSE,
President, Seattle Packing Co.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the able Senator from Washington whether any slaughtering is done in the union stockyard at Seattle.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. THYE. There is slaughtering there?

Mr. MAGNUSON. There is much slaughtering, but because of the lack of meat inspection, the cattle on the hoof have not been coming in, and the dressed beef has been coming in.

Mr. THYE. It seems to me very strange that the Department of Agriculture would permit slaughtering to take place and not have a meat inspector on hand. If that is the situation in Seattle, I would join with the Senator from Washington in asking that the Department of Agriculture assign a meat inspector from the regular appropriation, or join the Senator in seeking to have allowed the amount he has requested. It seems to me to be incredible that the Department of Agriculture does not have one of its meat inspectors at a point of slaughter.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We never have been able to get one.

Mr. THYE. I cannot imagine that.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I appreciate the Senator's interest. We never have been able to get one.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 179, line 15.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Dairy Industry," on page 182, line 14, after the word "butter", to insert "not to exceed $100,000 for construction of 10 or more housing units for employees"; and in line 15, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "$1,600,000" and insert "$1,735,000."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the amendment provides an increase of $135,000 above the amount appropriated by the House. Apparently it is for two purposes: $35,000 for repairs, and $100,000 for housing facilities, that is, 10 houses for personnel. The personnel of this bureau, as I understand, are in Maryland near Greenbelt, and the House committee in turning down the recommendation to build 10 houses said that in their judgment it is quite possible that these employees might find housing at the Greenbelt housing project. In view of the need for economy, I hope the committee amendment will be rejected.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation of the amendment. I do not see why we should build houses at the place designated at $10,000 apiece.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, $35,000 is what the committee allowed of a total of $125,000 requested for repair and reconditioning of physical facilities at field stations. There have been no repairs made in any of the various field stations of the far-flung experimental organization of the Department of Agriculture since 1941, except emergency repairs. There has been very little painting done. The Government of the United States has an enormous investment in all these operations. We have allowed about 15 to 20 percent of the budget estimates for repairs in each instance. We did not allow the full amount. We allowed just sufficient to make the most emergent repairs and to prevent the deterioration and loss of capital investment.

Now as to the question asked by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota. The $100,000 was asked for, for the purpose of constructing 10 houses at Beltsville to take care of the labor that is employed at the dairy there. The testimony showed that there were no houses available, and that the men working at the dairy have to get to work very early in the morning, and ofttimes have to work very late at night. The Department could not obtain for the labor wage scale workers, who would have to get up in Washington perhaps at 2:30 or 3 o'clock in the morning and go all the way to Beltsville to reach their place of work.

It is a nonrecurring item, and the houses will be self-liquidating, because rent is charged for them. The rent that is paid for these houses will eventually liquidate this $100,000 item. I do not think it is going to affect the whole universal scheme of salvation if we refuse to appropriate this $135,000, but I think it is a good business deal to appropriate it, because there is an enormous turnover in employment at the dairy. The work is very important. The research work carried on there with respect to

dairying and livestock is of vital concern to every person in the United States who owns a cow; and a great many people own cows.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, considerable testimony was heard by the committee as to why the sum in question should be allowed. The able Senator from Georgia has stated the situation very ably. The men employed in the dairy division must be there early and late. A great amount of expense would be incurred by a man who had to drive from his home in Washington to the experiment station, and then home again. Many of the employees, in fact, do not possess automobiles. Therefore, they are under a handicap in going to and from their home in the city. I believe the amount of $100,000 is reasonable. The cost is only $10,000 a unit. Much thought and consideration and discussion was given to this item at the time it was considered. It was finally agreed to in committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from Minnesota. I wish to reiterate that the amount in question will amortize itself. The houses will pay for themselves from the rents collected.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. FREAR. In order to clarify the situation in my own mind, I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia a question. He said the project will amortize itself. If and when the houses are built, will the rentals received from the properties revert to the Treasury or to the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am quite sure the money will go to the Treasury, unless there is an act to the contrary which deals specifically with this particular subject. A cow is occasionally sold at Beltsville, and the proceeds go to the Treasury.

Mr. FREAR. Then the Department of Agriculture would not have the authority to expand the rentals?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, may I ask the distinguished Senator from Georgia if it is not true that Beltsville, Md., where the Bureau of Dairy Industry has its station, is just a mile or so from Greenbelt, where a town of 7,400 persons has been built as a housing project?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not really apprised as to the distance between Greenbelt and Beltsville. I do know that the Department of Agriculture does not own any homes in Greenbelt, and that it is some distance from Beltsville.

Mr. President, the evidence on this subject is very convincing. I may say that I had overlooked the fact that we took testimony on this matter. It shows that prior to the submission of budget estimates the possibilities of obtaining such housing in the surrounding area, including the town of Greenbelt, had been fully explored, but without success.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 182, lines 14 and 15.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry," on page 182, line 25, after the word "thereof", to strike out "$7,750,000" and insert "$8,500,000."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, this is an increase of $750,000 above the amount appropriated by the House. It is an increase of $105,000 above the amount Congress appropriated last year. In view of the need for economy, I suggest that it would be much better if we reject the committee amendment and save $750,000.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (S. 2591) to amend the Public Health Service Act to support research and training in arthritis and rheumatism, multiple sclerosis, cerebral palsy, epilepsy and blindness, and other diseases, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. PRIEST, Mr. BIEMILLER, Mr. WILSON of Oklahoma, Mr. WOLVERTON, and Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR., were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

(At this point Mr. MORSE addressed the Senate on the subject of recent increases in food prices. At his request, and, by unanimous consent, his remarks were ordered to be printed in today's RECORD at the conclusion of the debate on the general appropriation bill.)

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 182, line 25.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the next amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering," on page 183, line 24, after the words "crops", to strike out "$3,400,000" and insert "$3,475,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, this is an increase of $125,000 for research in the field of fruits, vegetable, and specialty crops.

May I ask why the increase is to be put into effect?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, this item includes $50,000 of the estimated $190,000 for repairs and reconditioning of physical facilities at field stations to strengthen the research program; $60,000 for research work on vegetable sources for the new drug, cortisone, and $15,000 additional to provide a total of $40,000 for gladiolus research. Those are the three items that go to make up the increase of $125,000. As I have stated heretofore, there has been no substantial repair work done on these field stations for 8 or 10 years. Certainly no one can challenge the importance of cortisone. It is a drug recently discovered which has proved to be a boon to humanity suffering from rheumatism and arthritis. It now comes from the gall bladders of animals, I believe, and it takes 10,000 cows to supply enough to treat one case. There have been some amazing developments, and it would be worth while to appropriate a much greater sum than the one in question in order to discover additional sources of supply so as to secure adequate quantities of cortisone.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, is the distinguished Senator from Georgia giving a justification for the increase in the appropriation referred to at the bottom of page 183? If so, I am afraid that I must oppose it, not because I do not like it, but because of the general need for economy.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is the item which I was discussing and attempting to explain.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the next amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 184, line 3, after the word "plants", to strike out "$2,950,000" and insert "$3,075,000."

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia a question.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be glad to try to answer the question.

Mr. FREAR. I notice that $40,000 is to be appropriated for research in connection with gladioli. Is the gladioli industry in this country sufficiently large for the Federal Government to appropriate $40,000 for research?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, evidence before the committee in the past 2 or 3 years has disclosed some facts in connection with the gladioli industry which were rather amazing to one who is not familiar with it. It is a $110,000,000 industry. Tens of thousands of small producers who own and operate florist shops produce their own gladioli and sell them in those shops. A new disease has appeared, of which no knowledge had been had heretofore. It threatens to wipe out the only source of livelihood of these thousands of farmers and to seriously impair the opportunity for livelihood of thousands of small operators of flower shops. In my judgment, the appropriation is completely justified. When we have a spectacular attack upon the corn crop by the corn borer, we do not hesitate to appropriate fifteen or twenty million dollars with which to combat it. The amount appropriated here for the gladioli industry is not disproportionate with what we are doing in other lines of agriculture.

Mr. FREAR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to observe that the reduction in income tax paid by one producer of gladioli in the State of Florida for last year was a good deal more than the total amount that

is involved in this appropriation. That reduction in income-tax payment was caused solely by the attack on the gladioli crop by this new disease which we wish to combat through this experimentation.

Mr. RUSSELL. Some progress has been made, and we hope we may be able to conquer the disease.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 184, line 3.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 184, line 6, after the word "control", to strike out "$450,000" and insert "$455,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 184, line 18, after the word "management", to strike out "$2,680,000" and insert "$2,767,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 185, line 6, after the word "products", to strike out "$1,120,000" and insert "$1,140,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine—Salaries and expenses," on page 186, line 22, after the word "application", to strike out "$4,100,000" and insert "$4,165,000"; and on page 187, line 2, after the word "expended", to strike out the colon and the following additional proviso: *"Provided further,* That $50,000 shall be transferred to applicable appropriations of the Public Health Service for investigations and studies of effects of insecticidal and fungicidal residue on human health."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 188, line 6, after "(7 U. S. C. 166)", to strike out "$4,185,900" and insert "$4,651,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 189, line 11, after "(7 U. S. C. 147a)", to strike out "$2,325,000" and insert "$2,384,400."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Control of emergency outbreaks of insects and plant diseases", on page 189, line 21, after the word "citizens", to strike out "$850,000" and insert "$2,350,000"; and in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to insert "of which $1,500,000 shall be apportioned for use pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes for the purposes of said joint resolution only to the extent that the Secretary, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, finds necessary to meet emergency conditions."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Control of forest pests," on page 190, line 19, after "(7 U. S. C. 147a)", to strike out "$539,500" and insert "$590,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 190, line 22, after "(16 U. S. C., Supp. I, 594–1—594–5)", to strike out "$900,000" and insert "$1,900,000", and in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to insert "of which $1,000,000 shall be apportioned for use pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes for the purposes of said act only to the extent that the Secretary, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, finds necessary to meet emergency conditions."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 191, line 6, after "(16 U. S. C. 594a)", to strike out "$3,280,000" and insert "$3,700,000"; in the same line, after the word "amount", to strike out "$508,750" and insert "$565,350"; in line 12, after the word "States", to strike out "$1,727,800" and insert "$1,947,150"; and in line 14, after the word "and", to strike out "$1,043,450" and insert "$1,187,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Forest Service," on page 195, line 1, after the word "forests", to strike out "$26,890,000" and insert "$29,320,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 195, after line 4, to insert:

Cooperative range improvements: For artificial revegetation, construction, and maintenance of range improvements, control of rodents, and eradication of poisonous and noxious plants on national forest lands, pursuant to section 12 of the act of April 24, 1950 (Public Law No. 478), $750,000, to remain available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 196, line 9, after the figures "$1,300,000", to insert "of which $30,000 shall be made available for the establishment of a forest utilization service unit in the Southwest."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, before we reach line 9, I should like to send to the desk an amendment which proposes an insertion on line 6 on page 196.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Apparently the Senator's proposed amendment is an amendment to the text of the bill. Therefore it is not in order at this time.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 196, line 9.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 196, line 14, after "section 10", to strike out "$880,000" and insert "$1,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Forest development—Roads and trails," on page 196, line 22, after the word "administration", to strike out "$10,348,000" and insert "$12,000,000."

Mr. MURRAY. I send to the desk an amendment to the committee amendment and ask that it be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 196, line 22, it is proposed to strike out "$12,000,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "$14,500,000."

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, this amendment is necessary because of the construction of Hungry Horse Dam in Montana. The cost of the construction is $108,000,000. As a result of the construction of this dam, highways, and roads in the forest have been destroyed. Therefore it will be necessary to build new roads to take the place of the roads which have been covered up. The logging and timber industry is the most important industry in the area, and it is absolutely necessary to construct these roads in order to protect the industry. As I understand, the Bureau of Reclamation has authority to construct new roads whenever old roads are destroyed. However, they are limited with respect to the character of roads that may be constructed under such circumstances. The roads which it will be necessary to construct in this case are of a character which will require expensive construction. They are to be constructed on the side of hills.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it not customary to include the cost of relocating highways in the cost of the dam itself? I wonder why the cost of relocating highways for a dam should be put in an agricultural appropriation bill. So far as I know they are always put in the appropriation for the dam itself.

Mr. MURRAY. The item now before the Senate is under the title "Forest Development Roads and Trails." The roads to whcih I refer are forest roads.

Mr. AIKEN. Even if a forest road is destroyed by the construction of a dam, it would have to be replaced by the agency of the Government which constructed the dam.

Mr. MURRAY. The agency of Government is limited in the amount of funds which it can expend in the construction of a road. The specific road I have in mind is of a character which requires very expensive work, because it is on the side of a mountain. It is a road 52 miles long on the west side of the reservoir, and it must be built in order to make the national forest timber accessible. The timber products from the mills in this area are worth more than one and a half million dollars a year to the local industries. Wages alone amount to about $1,000,000 a year. In the construction of the Hungry Horse project the Bureau of Reclamation has stated that it may request appropriations to replace roads which will be inundated or damaged by the reservoir, but not for roads of higher standards or involving superior construction not required in connection with construction of the project.

Mr. McKELLAR. May I ask the Senator from Montana whether he came before the committee in connection with this amendment, or whether he got a budget estimate for it?

Mr. MURRAY. Apparently it was——

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not believe it has ever come before the committee. We are reading the appropriation bill for committee amendments, and I hope the Senator will withhold his amendment.

Mr. MURRAY. I am satisfied to withhold it. However, it may be that we could complete its consideration at this time. We have spent some time on it already.

Mr. McKELLAR. Was this proposed amendment laid before the committee?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no.

Mr. MURRAY. This additional amount is necessary because of the special conditions which exist. The special conditions result from the construction of this huge dam, which has cut off the

roads which were previously in use. In order to continue the lumber and milling industry it is necessary to construct this road. As I understand, in the construction of the Hungry Horse project the Bureau of Reclamation has stated that it may request appropriations to replace roads, but not for roads of higher standards or involving superior construction not required in connection with the construction of the project. A survey is now under way to determine the location and cost of the road and the amount which the Reclamation Bureau is authorized to finance.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, my reason for questioning the Senator from Montana as I did was because I thought it might be establishing an undesirable precedent if we undertook to charge the costs of work of this nature to the Department of Agriculture, when the cost is really necessitated by the operations of some other Department of Government. I am not questioning the need of the road, because I do not know anything about it. I merely questioned whether this is the part of the appropriation bill where the amendment shall be added.

Mr. MURRAY. The Department of Agriculture has jurisdiction over forest roads and trails.

Mr. AIKEN. Is this a forest road or an access road? The Senator has said there is a million and a half dollars worth of timber a year coming from the forest in this area. I think provision for access roads is included under some other appropriation.

Mr. MURRAY. This amendment is not for building a new road to give access to the timber. The business involved has been in existence for a number of years, and it is a very important industry in that section, amounting to many million dollars. With the roads now cut off as a result of the construction of the dam, it is necessary speedily to provide a new road.

Mr. AIKEN. I still think it should be charged to the cost of the dam, instead of as an agricultural appropriation.

Mr. MURRAY. The Bureau of Reclamation is assuming that part of the cost which it is able to take under the Bureau of Reclamation law. The cost of the road is now being studied, and it is estimated at $4,000,000. The share of the Bureau of Reclamation is estimated at from one and a half to two million. To make certain that funds are available to build a road of the necessary standard, two and a half million dollars should be added to the Forest Service appropriations at this point. To the appropriation of $12,000,000 provided in the bill, we are asking that two and a half million be added to order to make provision for the road.

Mr. AIKEN. Does this request come from the Forest Service?

Mr. MURRAY. I understand it has the approval of the Department. I have not any evidence of it here, but I know they have talked to me and have talked to my office about it, and the amendment was prepared for me by the Department.

Mr. AIKEN. Will the Senator yield, so that I may ask the Senator from Georgia if the Forest Service requested this appropriation?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not doubt that the Forest Service would like to get all the money it could for roads and trails, but it did not especially request this appropriation, because it could not. It has a limitation on its budget estimates.

I have a brief statement to make in connection with the amendment when the Senator from Montana concludes.

Mr. MURRAY. I submit the matter.

Mr. RUSSELL obtained the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield so that I may address a question to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. Can the Senator advise the Senate as to whether the proposed increase of two and one-half million would be supported by the authorization, or whether the $12,000,000 completely uses up the authorization?

Mr. RUSSELL. I cannot say as to that. I think there is adequate authorization to take care of the two and a half million dollars, but I hope the Senate will not approve the amendment. It is entirely out of line with anything else in the bill, proposing as it does to appropriate two and a half million dollars for one immediate project, for something which sounds almost suspiciously like a superhighway. There is nothing that causes us more trouble than forest roads and trails. There are innumerable forests scattered throughout the United States, and in all of them roads are desired. I do not doubt we could spend $20,000,000 on forest roads, to the delectation of the people living in the communities adjacent to them, and those who go into the forests for fishing and recreational purposes.

Mr. President, it is certainly all out of reason to ask two and a half million dollars above the Budget estimate for one road, even though it be one leading to a project so important as is the Hungry Horse Dam. This road ought to be built, if built at all, by funds that come from the same source and are used for the same purposes for which the dam is constructed, and the Forest Development Road and Trail item should not be loaded up with such an item. It is not justified or sustained by any budget estimate.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I should like to add a word about the amendment. It properly belongs under the appropriation for the Interior Department, Bureau of Reclamation. All States have projects, perhaps on smaller scales than the one referred to by the Senator from Montana. In my own State there are some where there are parks nearby, and roads are needed. The money for the proposed road should come under the appropriation authorized for the dam.

I am opposed to the amendment for another reason. The agricultural bill already contains a vast sum of money, and the public looks upon it as an appropriation for agriculture. If one made an analysis he would find that probably only about one-third of the money appropriated goes to agriculture. If this proposed appropriation is added, for another item which is not at all agricultural in nature, it only increases the amount apparently appropriated for agriculture but looked upon by the public sometimes as a subsidy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should like to offer an amendment to the committee amendment, striking out the figure "$12,000,000" on line 22, page 196, and substituting $6,000,000"; in other words, to cut the appropriation in half.

Last year we spent a litttle over $10,000,000 for the item of forest roads and trails. The House provided the same appropriation for the coming year as was made last year. The Senate committee raised the figure by $1,600,000.

Mr. President, I have been going back over the history of appropriations and expenditures for roads in national forests and national parks, and I find very large sums spent over the years. In view of the national emergency, it seems to me we should slow up on road construction, and save $6,000,000 on this item, and that is the effect of my amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Acquisition of lands for national forests," on page 197, line 14, after "(16 U. S. C. 513–519, 521)", to strike out "$100,000" and insert "$401,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Farm and other private forestry cooperation," on page 199, line 15, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$490,382" and insert "$785,034"; in line 16, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$671,392" and insert "$449,200"; and in line 17, after the word "exceed", to strike out '$138,226" and insert "$65,766."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Flood control," on page 200, line 3, after the word "expended", to strike out "$10,750,000" and insert "$9,880,000."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the committee for making a reduction below of approximately a million dollars the amount provided by the House. I am informed, however, that of the final figure of about $9,900,000, which is being recommended for flood control in the Columbia Basin area, $1,900,000 is for planning, leaving about $8,000,000 for construction.

Mr. President, the word "planning" seems to have a mesmeric influence upon Congress, causing us to appropriate very large sums for planning. In view of the national emergency, I hope that the committee will persevere in its good work, and will consent to a reduction in the

appropriation to $8,880,000, which will leave approximately $8,000,000 for construction, but will reduce the total for planning from $1,900,000 to nine-tenths of a million dollars. I hope the committee will accept the amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I regret very much that I would not feel authorized to accept the amendment. If there is any justification for a reduction in this item, it should be applied to the construction item and not to the planning item.

Mr. President, the planning item involves a Nation-wide plan to prevent the siltation of all of the vast reservoirs we are building at such enormous cost all over the United States. The jurisdiction of the Board of Army Engineers does not extend beyond the immediate watershed on which a dam is located. The Soil Conservation Service undertakes to draw plans for all the tributaries to the main streams so as to prevent the loss of fertile soil from thousands of acres of land to which we look for that which we eat and wear, as well as to prevent impairment of the investment of the United States in the main reservoirs. The truth of the matter is that we are probably 20 years behind now with our planning. The planning is going forward. It is not limited to the Columbia River. Surveys are being made upon thousands of small streams throughout the entire United States. I do not believe there is any item in the bill which is more inextricably connected with the future welfare of the United States and the sources of our food and fiber and the preservation of our soil resources than this planning item. I hope the Senate will reject the Senator's amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] to the committee amendment on page 200, line 3.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Soil Conservation Service," on page 201, after line 17, to strike out the subhead "Salaries and expenses."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 202, line 14, after the word "information", to strike out "$52,900,000" and insert "$52,400,000."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] to give me an explanation as to why this cut was made, and whether or not the cut will fundamentally affect the soil-conservation programs which are being planned at the present time. I have received a number of letters from persons in Minnesota who are vitally interested in soil-conservation activities, in which they have told me that a cut in the budget amount would jeopardize their plans of operation, including more areas and more counties being brought in under the program of the Soil Conservation Service.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I may state that there is no cut in the budget item, because the figure allowed by the Senate committee is approximately one-half million dollars above the Bureau of the Budget estimate. This is the one item where the House allowed the Department $1,000,000 above the Budget estimate. Since the House had allowed $1,000,000 above the Budget, it seemed that if there was any place where we could cut the bill by reducing in part of this increase above the Budget estimate, it was here. It is true there have been a number of new soil-conservation districts organized, and they do not have all the technical staff they should have. But splendid progress is being made in the soil-conservation districts.

It is not the kind of thing that can be done overnight. Plans must be drawn, and then the farmers must be induced to accept the plans. Then there may be required a 20-year program on one farm in order to complete the plans. It would be highly desirable, if conditions were not so difficult with respect to public funds, to increase this item about $4,000,000 and give all the soil conservation districts all the technical help they need. But I believe that by the proper use of the large number of technical soil conservation operators the service has, if it distributes them properly, this work can be carried out without any damage whatever resulting from this modest cut.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator, because I think the people of Minnesota recognize that the Senator from Georgia is an outstanding expert in this field. I wanted the RECORD to show exactly what his observations on this subject were.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not an expert, but I am an ardent advocate of soil conservation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 202, line 14.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Land utilization and retirement of submarginal land," on page 203, line 2, after the word "note", to strike out "$1,490,000" and insert "$1,665,175."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Water conservation and utilization projects," on page 203, line 10, after the word "expended", to strike out "$400,000 and insert "$500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Production and Marketing Administration—Conservation and use of agricultural land resources," on page 203, line 23, after the word "States", to strike out "$282,500,000" and insert "$283,000,000"; and on page 206, line 2, after the word "States", to strike out the colon and the following additional proviso: "*Provided further*, That not to exceed 5 percent of the allocation for the agricultural-conservation program for any county may be allotted to the Soil Conservation Service for services of its technicians in formulating and carrying out the agricultural-conservation program and the funds so allotted shall not be utilized by the Soil Conservation Service for any purpose other than technical and other assistance in such county."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Sugar Act," on page 207, line 23, after "(7 U. S. C. 1001–1160)", to strike out "$60,000,000" and insert "$63,750,000."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I assume that the amounts which we appropriate under the sugar act are more or less prescribed by the act itself?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Illinois is correct. Of course, the Senator knows that these funds are derived from a special processing tax upon sugar, and are set apart as payments to the sugar producers in this country. If the sugar production does not warrant the payment of this amount, which is materially below the budget, I will say the remainder is returned to the Treasury. In no years has there been paid to the producers of cane sugar and beet sugar of this country the entire amount collected from the special processing tax which is imposed for their benefit.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I notice that the House appropriated $60,000,000, which was the amount appropriated for the last fiscal year. I think that should be sufficient, and I shall oppose the committee amendment. The Senate committee apparently divided the difference between the appropriation by the House and the recommendation by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. RUSSELL. The House appropriated the amount which was appropriated last year. The Bureau of the Budget allowed $67,500,000. I do not think that much money will be needed, but out of an abundance of precaution we did allow half of the increase in the budget estimate, which is $3,750,000, which, as I say, is derived from the special processing tax imposed upon sugar for the benefit of the producers of sugar in this country.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is not within the province of the Appropriations Committee, but does the Senator know if the appropriate committee has considered the possibility of expanding the production of sugar further, in order to meet some of the shortages which have recently occurred in our cities?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not an expert on sugar. I see present the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], both of whom represent States which produce large quantities of sugar. I may say that the very purpose of these payments is to increase domestic production of sugar. In the last 50 or 60 years we have never produced more than a small percentage of the sugar consumed in the United States.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from Georgia has referred to the fact that only a small percentage of the sugar consumed in the United States is produced in this country. I may point out that about 28 percent of the sugar consumed

in the United States is produced in the continental United States. The remainder is imported from our possessions, and from Cuba and other foreign countries.

As the distinguished Senator from Illinois has correctly stated the amount provided is to pay conditional payments to sugar growers pursuant to existing law.

As the Senator in charge of the pending chapter has stated the appropriation requested is $3,750,000 under the budget estimate. Should the amount herein appropriated be in excess of the sum required to meet conditional payments to sugar growers such excess will revert to the Treasury.

Mr. President, I trust that the recommended appropriation will not be disturbed.

Mr. RUSSELL. Seventy-two percent of the sugar consumed in the United States is off-shore sugar. The purpose of the tax, as I said, is to increase the domestic production of sugar.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I know that the domestic production is tied in with the international agreements with respect to production of sugar in Cuba, Puerto Rico, and so forth. But I think the needs of consumers should be given due weight in this matter, because the effect of the international sugar cartel, enforced by international agreements and by national law, has been greatly to boost the price of sugar for city consumers.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 207, line 23.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, is the amendment which has just been agreed to the one which comes under the heading "Sugar Act"?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. As I previously stated, the committee saw fit to approve an increase of $3,750,000 in the amount available for payments to sugar producers.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the amendment provide for any change in the basic Sugar Act?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; the amendment makes no change in the basic Sugar Act whatever. Such action could not be taken in connection with an appropriation bill. Separate legislation would be required to do so.

Mr. WHERRY. I understood the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] to say that the act should be amended so the rights of consumers of sugar could receive greater recognition.

Mr. RUSSELL. What the Senator said was obiter. He merely observed that the law should be changed for the benefit of consumers.

Mr. WHERRY. That would require amendment of the substantive law.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Marketing services," on page 208, line 20, after the word "products", to strike out "$2,050,000" and insert "$2,187,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 211, line 23, after "(7 U. S. C. 135–135k)", to strike out "$3,550,000" and insert "$3,495,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Federal Crop Insurance Corporation," on page 212, line 6, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$6,854,000" and insert "$7,204,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Salaries and expenses," on page 212, line 14, after the word "reports", to strike out "$8,150,000" and insert "$8,750,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Loan authorization," on page 212, line 21, after the word "program", to strike out "$25,000,000" and insert "$40,000,000."

Mr. DOUGLAS. This amendment would increase by $15,000,000 the authorization for rural telephones.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. We increased the loan authorization from $25,000,000 to $40,000,000 for the rural-telephone program which was authorized by an act of last year. It is still $10,000,000 below the budget estimate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, on page 212, line 21.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MYERS subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, in connection with the REA amendment, which I understand appears on page 212, a statement I have prepared.

There being no objection, the statement of Mr. MYERS was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MYERS

Within the last few weeks, this country has come face to face with a test that may well be as crucial as any in our entire history. In the final analysis—whether the decision is achieved now or some day in the future—it is a test of strength between the free world and the tyrannical world. The success of our cause will depend upon the strength of our free people, the strength of our democratic institutions, and the strength of our economic system. Let us thank God for the opportunities we have had to build that strength and for the enterprise that has impelled us to use our opportunities.

Today, as we give consideration to the appropriation bill before us, I want to bring to the attention of the Senate what the farmers of America are doing through their REA program to build a stronger and more productive agriculture in this country. As a result of the work they have already completed, rural America is infinitely better prepared than ever before to meet whatever emergency may be forced upon us.

If the leaders of our industry should announce that they had just brought into 85 percent of their factories a new kind of low-cost power capable of increasing factory output and efficiency, it would be news that would startle the world. Yet that is exactly what the farmers through the REA are doing right under our very eyes, without fanfare and without headlines.

When REA was established in 1935, only 1 farm in 10 had central station electric service. At the time of Pearl Harbor, 3 farms in 10 had electricity. Despite that relatively small percentage, electricity helped the farmer achieve record after record in production through the years of World War II.

Today, 85 percent of the farms in this country have electric power on them. The REA program that barely had time to get started before the Japs blasted us into the war, has, in the last 5 years, virtually revolutionized American agriculture.

What farmer today would dream of undertaking a dairy farm without electricity? His labor-saving milking machines, his milk-saving refrigeration, his electrically-powered water system—all these and more are essential parts of a well-run, efficient and productive dairy farm.

What has happened on the dairy farm is just one instance. The same thing has been happening on 85 percent of all the farms in America. So multiply these advances by the 5,000,000 farms that have modern electric power today. Then you will begin to appreciate the impact of REA on our agriture and on our whole economy.

In the electric motor, industrial America has had an efficient source of power for many decades. It has been a significant factor in the development of America as the world's greatest industrial nation. Today the electrict motor is also out on the farm, ready to help the farmer grind feed, clean the barn, pump water, dry grain and hay, and in general provide highly essential and low cost power for the farmer.

Consider these things in the light of the crisis that is confronting us today. We have out on the farms of America the equivalent of millions of extra hands that just a few years ago were not available. We have put into our agriculture new power, new efficiency, new productivity. All of it is adding to the strength of this Nation as we go forward in the leadership of the free world.

The progress farmers are making with the help of the REA program is all the more significant when the character of the program is taken into account. The REA program is one of the finest expressions of our democracy. It works on the principle of local control, local ownership, and local accomplishment.

Here is a program that helps the people help themselves. REA is only a lending agency. It is the local people, with the help of Government financing, who are building the power systems that are electrifying the farms. It is the local people who operate these power systems and who are paying back the money to the Government—paying it back with interest.

Last October when Congress passed legislation authorizing loans for the improvement and expansion of rural telephone service, it followed this REA pattern of providing the people with the help they need to do the job themselves. Today this new telephone program is beginning the job of modernizing rural communications as the electric program has been modernizing power and light on the farm during the recent past.

I have always been glad to support the rural electrification program—one of the most beneficial and forward-looking measures instituted by the Roosevelt administration.

It has been of benefit to every part of the country. I am happy to point out the achievements of the REA borrowers in my own State. From 23 percent of our farms electrified when the program started, we have since then forged ahead until now the percentage is well over 90 percent.

We have 15 REA-financed systems in Pennsylvania and these privately owned, locally managed, taxpaying business organizations have already invested $25,000,000 of loan funds in their power systems. They are paying back these loans, in a sound business-like way, while doing a job of building a stronger agriculture in Pennsylvania.

From the time Morris L. Cooke, of my home State of Pennsylvania, as the first Administrator of REA, set the program on its course of progress, this program has built, and built well, the strength of rural America. It is a program in which the people of this country and the free world have a big stake and which must be pressed forward in the achievement of its objective.

It is for that reason that I urge upon you to support the appropriation of the Rural Electrification Administration in the bill before us. This program is making a great contribution to the people of this country at a very minimum of cost, since the loans are being paid back to the Government. This is tremendously important to all of us, whether we are permitted to live in peace or whether we must mobilize our strength for war. REA is an investment that is already paying back dividends many times over in extra power for farmers and for America.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Farmers Home Administration—Loan authorization," on page 214, line 6, after "(except grants under 504 (a))", to strike out "$56,350,000" and insert "$71,350,000"; in the same line, after the amendment above stated, to insert "of which not to exceed $3,500,000 of the amount available for the purposes of title I and section 43 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, may be distributed to States and Territories without regard to farm population and prevalence of tenancy, in addition to the amount otherwise distributed thereto, for loans in reclamation projects and to entrymen on unpatented public land."

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to ask a question of the Senator from Georgia in regard to the amendment in line 6 on page 214. Will that provision encourage the settlement of the more sparsely populated States where there is a large amount of undeveloped land?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; the amount of $3,500,000 is supposed to be available for some irrigated projects in some States which have very small populations, but where the veterans have moved in to take up the lands which are subject to irrigation.

Mr. AIKEN. The amendment would apply particularly to a State such as Wyoming, would it?

Mr. RUSSELL. Exactly, and possibly to three or four other States where such irrigation projects are coming into operation.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HILL. To what amendment does the Senator from Vermont refer?

The VICE PRESIDENT. To the committee amendment on page 214, beginning in line 6 and ending in line 13.

The question is on agreeing to that amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was on page 215, line 5, after the word "acts," to insert a colon and the following additional provisos: "*Provided further*, That for the purpose of making loans pursuant to the foregoing authority, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public-debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under that Act are extended to include such loans to the Secretary: *Provided further*, That repayments to the Secretary of the Treasury on such loans shall be treated as a public-debt transaction."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr President, I should like to have an explanation from the Senator from Georgia in regard to the amendment. It seems to me that it is clearly legislation on an appropriation bill, and that the amendment, if adopted, would open wide the door.

The amendment is clearly legislation, Mr. President, and it goes into a field which certainly was not dealt with in the bill as it was passed by the House of Representatives. Certainly the language of the amendment is wide in its implications and scope.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I trust that the Senator will withhold any point of order he may intend to propose against this amendment.

I think I would be less than frank if I did not say that the amendment is subject to a point of order. However, identical language has been carried in the appropriation bill for a long time, as a means for the procurement of funds with which to make this type of loans under the Farmers Home Administration. The language of this amendment or similar language was set forth in the budget, just as was the case in last year's bill. It was included in the bill as reported by the House Appropriations Committee, but on the floor of the House the provision was stricken on a point of order.

There is nothing new so far as this method of borrowing is concerned. It has been used for a number of years. Up until now a very creditable repayment record has been made.

There can be no question that the amendment is legislation; but its enactment into law is necessary in order to implement all of the activities of the Farmers Home Administration.

Mr. BRIDGES. What is the repayment record? From my own impression and the impression of the persons with whom I have talked, this amendment would leave the matter wide open.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, the Senator realizes that when rehabilitation loans are made under the Farmers Home Administration, we are not dealing with the very best credit risks, because the basic law provides that no such loan can be made until the prospective borrower is able to submit evidence that the loan is not available from any other source. In that connection, the general practice has been to require such statements from the banks in the community, from the production credit agency, and from other sources of credit.

So far as the tenant loan program is concerned, there has been a perfectly amazing repayment record. Repayments are current; in fact, the collections really are ahead of the repayment schedule in the case of the purchase of farms by means of the funds obtained under this provision of the act. In the case of rehabilitation loans, there have been some losses; there can be no question as to that. Those who were administering this portion of the law inherited a great many loans from the old Rural Resettlement Administration and from the old seed loans, which were made only in cases of dire emergency. So the transactions in the case of such loans are included under this heading. Of course, the loans to which I have just referred occurred away back in 1918 and 1920—almost in the days of antiquity, so far as any modern agricultural program is concerned.

However, generally speaking, a very fine record of collections has been made. For the past 5 years the collections have greatly exceeded the loans. A study of the collections would do a great deal to restore one's faith in the honest purposes of mankind, because some of the loans were made years ago and some of the borrowers meantime have left the farms. Yet when they reached a time when they were able to secure employment, they repaid the loans.

This program has been vital in connection with extending aid to veterans of World War II. As I recall, approximately 50 percent of the loans which have been made were made to veterans, and all the new loans being made are being made to veterans.

Mr. BRIDGES. But is there a limitation? Will not the sky be the limit?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no; a limit is set forth on page 214.

On page 215, this amendment would begin with the words:

Provided further, That for the purpose of making loans pursuant to the foregoing authority—

And the loans are limited by the amount set forth on page 214.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Do I correctly understand the Senator from Georgia to say that the same language was included in the last appropriation bill?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; and funds have been available. I do not know that the provision in last year's appropriation bill was in identically the same language as the language of this amendment; but the funds have been available from the Treasury, under the last several appropriation bills.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In view of the fact that it is recognized that such language is essential to the program, why has not enabling legislation been introduced through the normal channels, and enacted?

Mr. RUSSELL. I cannot answer that question, because I am not a member of the standing Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I really cannot say why such enabling legislation has not been enacted.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will not the Senator from Georgia agree that that is the manner in which the matter should have been handled?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, yes; there should have been legislation in that connection. However, I am sure the Senator from Delaware will agree with me that in the

case of the appropriation bills generally, certain language has been carried for years in those bills, although normally it would properly be the subject of proposed legislation introduced by some of the standing committes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I can understand why the matter might be handled once in this way; but I do not understand why year after year the appropriation bills should carry provisions which are purely legislation.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, there is a question as to whether the amendment is legislation. It was regarded as legislation in the House of Representatives. However, there is some question as to whether it is legislation.

This language makes available to the Secretary of the Treasury funds for the purpose of being loaned by him to the Secretary of Agriculture, to be used by the Secretary of Agriculture for this purpose.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Do I correctly understand that this authority is limited by the amount set forth on page 214, in line 6?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, yes; there is no question about that. It is absolutely limited by that amount.

Mr. BRIDGES. So in this case, if no point of order is made against the amendment, and if the amendment is adopted and is contained in the bill as finally enacted, the provision thus made will be similar to the provision which has been made in previous years in the appropriation bill. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. BRIDGES. And the amount is limited to the appropriation set forth on page 214, in line 6; is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from New Hampshire is entirely correct.

Mr. President, I would be the last person to be willing to have this language make available an unlimited amount of money, because, of course, the provision is in the nature of an appropriation.

Mr. BRIDGES. I understand that the Senator from Georgia watches these matters carefully, but, of course, I wish to be sure just what we are doing in this respect.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BRIDGES. Do I correctly understand that the Senator from Georgia has no information about this matter, except as to what has occurred in the past?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; I think I can state that, so far as loans for the purchase of land are concerned, the repayments are current, and no losses have occurred. Some losses have occurred on rehabilitation loans, but the funds lost since the Farmers Home Administration was established would be less than 3 percent of the total amount of money made available.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it not a fact that the repayments have been approximately 85 or 90 percent—in short, that the repayments have been good?

Mr. RUSSELL. They have been more than that, under the Farmers Home Administration.

Mr. AIKEN. I think the repayments have been somewhere between 90 and 95 percent in my own State. The repayments to the Farmers' Home Administration on loans which were made to the poorest class of agricultural borrowers——

Mr. RUSSELL. The poorest credit risks in the Nation.

Mr. AIKEN. The repayments on those loans have compared very favorably with the repayments to the RFC, I am sure, although the loans made by the RFC were made to what was supposed to be a higher and better class of borrowers—in the case of the RFC, to industrial and financial borrowers.

I am sure a very good record has been made, considering the fact that loans have been made only to persons who could not borrow money anywhere else.

However, I do question the language of the amendment and the continuance of the language year after year in the appropriation bill. It seems to me that there cannot be a clear statement of the Government's financial affairs, in reporting on what our expenditures and our receipts are, until this matter is treated as one related to the expenditures and receipts of the Government, rather than as public debt transaction. I think that point should be cleared up, and that a correction should be made.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. I should like to raise a question in connection with this matter. Certainly it is never the intention to write off any of these loans unless it becomes a positive fact that the loan cannot be collected. The loan may be carried for a number of years; and it is necessary to review it again and again before a decision finally is reached to write off the loan as being uncollectible.

I think that has been one reason why it has been difficult to write any specific language on this point, because it is the desire not to write off such a loan if it can possibly be collected. For that reason, the language is broad, almost to the point of vagueness, in this case.

However, I would say, as the Senator from Georgia has said, that probably there is no other legislative provision which has done more, actually, to take a young man or a young family off the relief rolls or to get them out of a discouraged state of mind, and put them on a self-supporting and self-respecting basis, by providing them with funds, and by doing so at a time when they have neither credit nor proof that they would be good managers, except for the fact that the man may have been a good hired man somewhere in the neighborhood. He may have married a good, sound, reliable young girl, and that was the only asset he had. No banker could loan to a man under those circumstances. Here was an agency from which he could obtain the funds, start farming, and, in due time, pay off the loan.

I could relate three specific cases of young men or young couples who obtained such loans. It was only for a matter of 3 or 4 years. The loans enabled them to carry on. They have made a most remarkable achievement in starting out in life for themselves. I would say it is one of the appropriations which has functioned in a commendable manner. The vagueness of the language results from the lack of knowledge of how to write an act in any manner that would be applicable to such a situation.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his contribution. I shall be through, as soon as I give the Senator from New Hampshire the specific figures for the year 1949. In that year, $91,507,510 was loaned; principal and interest was collected of $117,114,511.

Mr. BRIDGES. I may say to the Senator that that is a rather unusual Federal accomplishment; but I still say the regular committees of the Congress should provide for this project by law rather than to place the item in a general appropriation bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I was not present when the testimony was adduced on this item. In the table for loan authorizations the loan authorization for 1950 was given as $40,000,000 for farm tenancy and housing loans. The estimates for 1951 were $70,000,000. The House bill provided for $56,350,000, which was an increase over last year, but which was short about $13,000,000 of the budget estimate. I have been quoting from the table of loan authorizations found on page 112 of the committee report. The Senate committee has restored the full amount of the budget estimate; in fact, it has gone further than that and added $1,350,000. A footnote reads:

> Includes $1,350,000 transferred from direct appropriation for enlargement and development loans.

So the appropriation exceeds the estimate by $1,350,000. What was the evidence adduced which required the Senate to exceed the budget estimate by $1,350,000? That is my first question. The second question is, is the $1,350,000 cash, or is it a loan authorization.

Mr. RUSSELL. The House transferred the $1,350,000. I will read to the Senator a brief statement from the House report.

Mr. WHERRY. I have read the side slip.

Mr. RUSSELL. I quote from the House report, page 141:

> An increase of $15,000,000 has been authorized for farm tenancy and housing loans, $1,350,000 has been approved as a transfer from direct appropriation to borrowing authorization for enlargement and development loans under section 504b of the Housing Act of 1949, and an additional $1,000,000 in borrowing authority has been provided for water facilities loans.

The reason for that, and what has happened, is that instead of appropriating the money directly from the Treasury, it was all put into this loan arrangement, to be borrowed from the Secretary of the Treasury. Last year we made a modest appropriation for the Housing Act, and

it was made as a direct appropriation from the Treasury.

Inasmuch as the House had included the $1,350,000 in the funds authorized to be borrowed from the Secretary of the Treasury, instead of making it as a direct appropriation, we left it in that shape.

Mr. WHERRY. The point I make is, was there a decrease by $1,350,000 at some other place in the appropriation bill? This exceeds the budget estimate by $1,350,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no.

Mr. WHERRY. The Budget estimate for 1951 is $70,000,000, and the Senate committee has recommended $71,350,000. That is provided through the transfer of funds. What I should like to ask is, if the transfer is made and covers this particular item, where is it deducted in the appropriation bill?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is mistaken about the Budget Bureau's estimate. The total Budget estimate was $160,000,000.

Mr. WHERRY. We are talking about farm tenancy and housing loans. I refer merely to loans.

Mr. RUSSELL. Very well.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator will refer to page 112 of the report of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate he will find the table of loan authorizations.

Mr. RUSSELL. I understand, but the Budget Bureau's estimate for these items was $160,000,000.

Mr. WHERRY. That is true, but it is broken down into farm tenancy and housing loans, $70,000,000; production and subsistence loans, $85,000,000; water facilities loans, $5,000,000; a total of $160,000,000. The House bill provided $145,350,000. The Senate committee has recommended $160,350,000. The answer is obtained by the breakdown of farm tenancy and housing loans, which we are talking about. I am asking where the $1,350,000 comes from, and where it is deducted in the appropriation bill. It states in a footnote that the $1,350,000 was transferred from direct appropriation for enlargement and development loans.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand that. But why did the Senate committee add $1,350,000 to the farm tenancy and housing loans, unless the amount were taken from something else? The Budget estimate is $70,000,000.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I think he will find that $1,000,000 of that was taken from water facilities loans.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand that. I have that explanation. But it still runs $1,350,000 above the budget estimate.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The entire amount recommended by the Senate committee is $160,350,000, which includes an increase in the farm tenancy and housing loans of $1,350,000.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the point I am making. Why was that done?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am advised by the clerk of the committee, though he has not absolutely shown it to me yet, that it comes off the appropriation and was transferred to loans.

Mr. WHERRY. Does that mean that it comes off the general appropriation for agricultural purposes?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct; and it is put into the loan provision.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it deducted in cash? This is a loan authorization.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is deducted from the item for grants. I have the Budget Bureau's estimate now. The item for grants comes under the Farmers Home Administration, for housing.

Mr. WHERRY. Oh, the amount comes off housing, is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. On the item found on page 215, in line 16. Whereas the budget estimate is $2,000,000, the item of appropriation is $650,000.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator. That is the transfer that is made, is it?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. One more thing: Is this still a loan authorization of $1,350,000, or is it cash coming from the direct appropriation?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is a loan authorization.

Mr. WHERRY. And are the loans reimbursables?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, yes.

Mr. WHERRY. They are reimbursables, the same as the farm tenancy and housing loans?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 215, line 5.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Salaries and expenses," on page 216, line 1, after the numerals "1949", to strike out "$27,700,000" and insert "$29,000,000."

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Georgia a question in connection with page 95 of the report on the general appropriation bill. It has to do with rural electrification and the Southwestern Power Administration. I attended all the hearings on this subject, which, as I recall, were joint hearings of a subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and a subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I notice, at the end of the first paragraph under the heading "Rural Electrification Administration," the following:

> The committee believes that no loan should be made for construction of such facilities unless in areas where private power companies cannot or will not furnish adequate power at reasonable rates and within a reasonable time.

I thoroughly agree with the report, and I concurred in it as a member of the subcommittee, but it was my understanding that the Administrator had the determination, because there were such great variations in various sections of the country. As I understand, up to the present time the Administrator has studied carefully the needs, and it was rather left to the Administrator as to the loaning of the money.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not know of anyone who can pass upon that question other than the Administrator of the REA. The funds are made available to him. He is responsible for making loans, and certainly it would be within his jurisdiction to determine the facts and reasons.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thank the Senator from Georgia for his statement.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I also desire to thank the Senator from Georgia for his statement, because I agree with him 100 percent that it is the Administrator who has the jurisdiction and the full authority for determining what rates are reasonable. As the Senator knows, in States which have public utility commissions all existing rates, presumably, are reasonable from the standpoint of the utility companies, because they have been found so by the State commissions.

Utility rates may be reasonable in the light of a company's accumulation of investments, including uneconomical and obsolete ones, and still be completely unreasonable from the standpoint of the cooperative's need for lower cost power to extend electric service to farmers and its ability to obtain such low-cost power by constructing its own generating facilities.

So, as the Senator knows, under the basic law and under the intent of the committee, these are facts within the jurisdiction and the authority of the Administrator of the REA to determine.

Mr. RUSSELL. I never had any other thought with reference to it.

Mr. HILL. I will say to the Senator that as a member of the subcommittee, I did not, either.

Furthermore, even though the rates themselves may be reasonable, other terms and conditions demanded by the power companies may impose intolerable burdens on the cooperatives. Such burdens, appearing in many existing contracts, include restrictions on resale of power, refusal to deliver power to the co-ops' load centers, necessitating costly construction by the co-ops; insistence on ratchet clauses requiring the co-ops to pay for more power than they get; and requirements that the co-ops pay higher rates for power used by consumers in larger amounts.

Of course, the Administrator, in considering whether loans should be made on generating plants or transmission lines, has it fully within his jurisdiction to consider, and he should consider these questions; is not that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. They all go to the reasonableness of the rates.

Mr. HILL. For instance, a power company in the State of Alabama, in submitting a proposed contract had in the contract a provision permitting the company to stop serving the cooperatives by reason of war. We know, of course, that in time of war it is very important that farmers have power. We know that during the last war farmers, with less manpower, with less fertilizer, fewer insecticides, and other things which they had in the past, stepped up their crops. One important reason why they were able to do it was because so many of our farms had electricity and the farmers

were able to use the electricity to step up war production. So, of course, in determining whether rates are reasonable, the Administrator has it in its jurisdiction and should consider all these questions to which I have adverted.

As the Senator knows, the REA has made loans for generation and transmission facilities only where no adequate source of power was available or where a saving in the cost of wholesale power to the cooperatives could be achieved. The matter is in the discretion and in the judgment and determination of the Administrator, just as the distinguished Senator from Georgia has so well said. The policy of the Administrator as to loans for generating plants and transmission lines is clear. It stands today just as it has in the past.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The able Senator from Alabama has well stated the present policy of the REA as related in its administrative bulletin which was placed in the hearings. The question I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia is this: Was it the intention of the committee to rewrite the REA law through this paragraph in the report?

Mr. RUSSELL. Not in the slightest degree. We did not undertake to rewrite the REA law, and we did not propose to do anything which would interfere with getting electric current into farm homes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. And there is nothing in either the bill or the report which would overthrow the present policy of the REA?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not know that I am completely familiar with all the details of the present policy, but there is nothing in the committee report which, in my judgment, disturbs the power or the discretion which the Administrator has under the present law. There has been a feeling in some quarters—but, speaking for myself, I did not concur—with reference to putting anything at all in the report dealing with the subject. There has been a feeling that the proportion of loans being made for generating and transmitting facilities by the REA was increasing at too great a rate, perhaps to the detriment of the cause of getting power into farm homes. Hearings were had for four or five days in conjunction with the Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations.

I was not sufficiently well qualified in the science of electricity and its distribution to be able to pass upon each and every one of the cases presented to the committee. They were presented, on the one hand, by those who were very much in favor of transmission and generating lines, and they were opposed, on the other hand, by those who were very much opposed to them. I could not pass upon the question. It was necessary for someone in the administrative end of the Government to pass on it. The Rural Electrification Administration has its Administrator, and it is his duty to pass upon these applications. That is his obligation under the law.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. In the Senator's judgment there is nothing in this provision, is there, which would take away from the Administrator his authority or discretion?

Mr. RUSSELL. For my own part, I take this to be an admonition to the Administrator to exercise great care in the making of these loans. As I see it, there is nothing in the bill which changes the law. There is nothing in the report of the committee which could be construed as changing the law.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I believe the committee was justified in stating that no loans should be made for the erection of generating plants unless private power companies cannot or will not furnish adequate electric current at reasonable rates and within a reasonable time. The Subcommittee on Interior was presented with evidence to show that REA loans were being considered on the guaranty of SPA agreeing to purchase all the current produced so as to make possible the discharge of the proposed loan. In other words, one Government agency guaranteeing the loans of another Government agency. Such should not be permitted for obvious reasons.

Mr. President, I should like to read the following language from page 95 of the committee's report as indicative of the fact that the committee realizes that it was not within the province of the Appropriations Committee to change the law on the subject of REA:

> In view of the importance of this matter, the committee respectfully suggests that the standing Committee on Agriculture and Forestry review this entire subject to determine whether legislation is necessary.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. I agree with that. That is where legislation ought to come from. It cannot come from the subcommittee.

Mr. HILL. If there is to be a change in policy, it ought to come from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the standing legislative committee of this body.

Mr. RUSSELL. I took that position in the subcommittee. I also took it in the full committee, but was not sustained. However, that is my position.

Mr. YOUNG. Would the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee interpret the paragraph to mean that REA has been making loans in the past which were not justified, and that this was a word of admonition to the REA to curtail some of its present loans?

Mr. RUSSELL. I made no such statement, Mr. President. I said that for my own part I was not sufficiently expert nor would I undertake to go into the merits or demerits of these loans. I think it is a matter for the Administrator of the REA and for the standing committees of Congress.

Mr. YOUNG. I had the same idea. I felt that there was nothing in the language of the bill which would change the present program or do injury to it. My understanding is that if they are not able to get current from existing companies at reasonable rates they may build generating plants as they have done in the past. Does the Senator have the same understanding?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, yes. There is no question that in compliance with the spirit and letter of the original REA Act the Administrator would have that authority when it is necessary to get current to the farmers.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I wish to say that what the Senator from Georgia has stated is also my understanding of the matter.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] received a telegram which deals with the subject under discussion. He had to leave before he was able to present the telegram for insertion in the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent that the telegram be printed in the RECORD, at this point.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> RUTLAND, N. DAK., *July 15, 1950.*
>
> United States Senator WILLIAM LANGER:
>
> Have been informed restrictive language in pending Senate report on Interior and Agriculture appropriations could have bad effects on future administration of generation and transmission loans. Urge your cooperation in bringing about deletion of any language or items that could be construed or interpreted as restricting administration of Rural Electric Administration in any way. The great value of unrestricted policy is in its competitive strength. The good common sense of our cooperatives and Administrator will avoid unreasonable or excessive investment in generation or transmission. But if REA ever loses its power to build facilities whenever or wherever found necessary expedient or desirable—then our co-ops and the people they serve will be at the mercy of the commercial private-owned utilities. On the other hand the threat of real competition will make them willing to coordinate and cooperate for the common and public good. We have achieved a considerable degree of coordination and cooperation with the private-owned public utilities here in North Dakota. We could never have done this with a restricted Rural Electric Administration. Strongly urge your complete vigilance in maintaining a strong unfettered REA and a public power policy that puts the good of the people above any special privilege group.
>
> OBED A. WYUM,
> *President, North Dakota Association of Rural Electric Cooperatives.*

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, may I inquire which committee amendment is now under consideration?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment on page 216, line 1.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I wish to discuss this amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, may I inquire what was the Chair's statement? I could not hear it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair announced that the amendment under consideration is on page 216, line 1.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to point out that last year this organization spent for administration $26,149,000. The House increased the figure to $27,700,000, or an increase of more than a million and a half dollars. The Senate committee has raised this figure still further by $1,300,000. I am very glad to see that everyone seems to approve of the substantive work of the Farmers Home Administration. I think it is doing a very excellent type of work. However, these appropriations would not help the tenant farmers. These appropria-

tions are intended for the officials in the Farmers Home Administration. I hope very much that the Senate will reconsider the action by which it approved the amendment, and I move such reconsideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment has not been approved. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 216, lines 1 and 2.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I hope very much that the committee amendment will be rejected and that we may save $1,300,000. Its rejection would reduce the amount of money to be spent by the officials in the Department of Agriculture. Otherwise they would get a million and a half dollars more than they received for the fiscal year just ended.

Mr. RUSSELL. I merely wish to call attention to the fact that last year we passed a housing bill. The provision for farm housing, when compared with what was provided for urban areas, is somewhat pathetic. We have insured billions of dollars worth of urban housing. However, when we get $40,000,000 for farm housing all over the Nation, objection is raised to that small amount. Of the billions which we have provided for housing the farmers would get the so-called magnificent sum of $40,000,000 under the provisions of this bill. These are not self-executing loans. Someone must execute them and administer them. The item is $1,000,000 less than the Budget Bureau allowed. We tried to go just as slowly as we could. I think the amendment should be approved.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is my understanding that the House of Representatives included $739,385 to take care of the projects which the Senator from Georgia has described.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Therefore even if we reject the Senate amendment of $29,000,000 and accept the House figure of $27,700,000, that amount would be available to take care of the project which the Senator has described.

Mr. RUSSELL. But that is not for housing alone. Water facilities are involved also. They are considered to be very important.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It does include housing.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That was included at the time the House determined the figure of $27,700,000. It will be found that the House figure was $26,960,615. They decided to make it the round figure of $27,700,000, and included in that item are all the expenses which the Senator from Georgia has described. The Senate appropriation committee has increased that item by an additional $1,300,000. As one who voted for the reorganization plans, with the thought that if we would support the President in the reorganization of the Government we would get a lower cost of administration, I now find that under this appropriation bill practically every administrative branch of the Government is calling for an average increase of 8 to 10 percent over and above what was allowed to them last year. I do not understand it. I am beginning to wonder if, as one who supported the Hoover Commission reorganization plans on the basis it would provide greater efficiency that I was not being fooled. Instead of saving 3 or 4 billion dollars a year as was promised if we would accept these reorganization plans, we now find the reorganized departments costing more than the old agencies. I wish the Senator from Georgia would point out why this department should cost the taxpayers approximately 10 percent more than it cost last year, and unless good reasons are given I shall vote against the committee amendment which increases the amount by $1,300,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall undertake to explain the matter. The amount which was available last year, as I recall, was $26,960,615, if the appropriation for the full year reflected the increase in salaries that was allowed by the Congress.

In the 1950 estimate, the Budget Bureau approved the sum of $618,000 for the expense of making additional farm ownership and water facilities loans to homestead entrymen and others on reclamation projects. I am not altogether familiar with the details of those loans, but members of the committee who are familiar with them, who live in the areas where these projects are now being developed and opened up, stated that that was most important.

Then for costs of making the additional farm housing loans and grants in 1951, and servicing farm housing loans made in 1950, the budget allowed an increase of $2,059,300.

For servicing in 1951 insured mortgages made in prior years and the additional production and subsistence loans to be made in 1950, the budget allowed $362,060.

Then there were the pay adjustment costs, which grew out of the increases in pay given under the accelerated pay increase act, the Ramspeck Act, and any other acts of Congress, which amounted to $811,615, which made a total of $30,000,000 for the 1951 Budget estimates.

Of that amount, the Senate committee has allowed a total of $29,000,000, which is $1,000,000 below the Budget estimate.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I point out to the Senator that it may be $1,000,000 below the Budget estimate, but it is still $2,000,000 more than the amount under which the same agency operated during the past 12 months.

Mr. RUSSELL. I just undertook to explain that there is $2,059,300, for the housing loans in the rural areas.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That law was in effect at the time the House gave consideration to the bill, and the House decided that $26,700,000 was enough.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, the House decided that, but I do not agree with the House. I do not think these loans will be self-executing. There is no way the provisions of this act can be carried out other than that we have provided.

Time and again I have seen members of the Committee on Appropriations sitting on the floor when there came before the Senate bills to increase the pay of Federal employees and Senators receiving telegrams from one source and another and would come in and vote "aye" to raise the salaries of employees. Then they would go out and telegraph someone, "I voted for your pay increase," and would telegraph another one, "I voted for your pay increase." They received the plaudits of those whose salaries were increased, but later when the Committee on Appropriations received a budget estimate which raised the appropriation a million dollars more than the agency had had the previous year the Senators would come forward and say, "What do they mean by increasing this estimate a million dollars?" The Budget Bureau did not do it; Congress did it by voting for the increases in pay.

The same thought applies when we pass an act such as the Housing Act. We said we were going to let the farmers get just a little housing. Of course, it was hardly enough for them to smell, $40,000,000 over the entire United States, as compared with a billion dollars poured out for housing in the cities. But when we passed that bill and some official came in and asked for a little money to administer the Farm Housing Act, he was told, "You are going away up in your appropriation." We cannot add to the duties of a bureau of Government on such an extensive scale, to deal with farm housing in 3,000 counties in the United States, without allowing for some increase in the appropriation to administer the program.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am very glad to hear the Senator from Georgia point that fact out, because it is one of the facts that needs to be brought out. I remind him that I emphasized the same thought in 1949 at the time the Congress passed the pay-increase bills. I was one of the few Senators who voted against these increases, and, if I remember correctly, the Senator from Georgia voted for them. If I am in error, the Senator can correct me. I agree with him fully that it is inconsistent for those who vote for every salary increase and every authorization bill to then attack the appropriations bills and try to convince the public that they are great economizers.

The best way to cut Government expenditures is to stop voting for the authorizations.

Perhaps I am in error in thinking the Senator from Georgia voted for the pay bills.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator's memory is completely in error on that point. It so happened that the Senator from Georgia, the Senator from Arizona, and the Senator from Colorado, who sit in the same row of seats, got together and framed an amendment to reduce every salary increase that was brought out by the Senator's committee, and we got the amendments approved on the floor of the Senate. Then I voted against the bill, after it was amended. As I recall, it was a viva voce vote.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I stand corrected in my statement then. I do know that there were very few Senators who voted against the salary increases. At that time I took the position Congress should not increase the salaries until we had a

balanced budget, and I agree with the Senator from Georgia that it is poor taste for those who have consistently voted for the authorizations to attack the appropriations.

Mr. RUSSELL. I hope the Senator did not understand me to be making a personal statement with respect to him when I was discussing the pay-increase bills, because I will say that the Senator from Delaware has saved the Government millions of dollars by his constant objection to such bills on the calendar and otherwise.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the committee has approved $27,700,000 for administrative expenses of the Farmers' Home Administration, which is an increase of $1,551,000 over 1950 appropriations. The House committee stated, on page 141 of its report, as follows:

> This increase will permit the Department to put the farm-housing program authorized on a part-year basis in 1950 on a full-year basis in 1951, and will cover increased pay costs. In addition, it will provide approximately $300,000 for servicing insured mortgages made in prior years and for handling the additional farm-tenant and water-facilities loans authorized for 1951.

We are not proposing that we should go back to the appropriation for the year 1949 and 1950. We are perfectly willing to have the appropriation go forward by a million and a half beyond that. The House says that is sufficient to provide for the extra work. We simply do not want to go up $2,800,000.

I point out that if we approve a $29,000,000 appropriation for administration, that will represent administrative costs of 18 percent of the moneys disbursed and loaned by the Farmers Home Administration. They are disbursing and lending something over $166,000,000, and here there is recommended $29,000,000 for administration, which represents an administrative cost of 18 percent. I submit that is a rather high administrative ratio, particularly when, as the Senator from Georgia has correctly pointed out, at least half of the outlays are for loans, not direct appropriations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee on page 216, line 2.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask for a division.

On a division the amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Extension Service—Payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico," on page 217, line 25, after the word "and," to strike out "section 3 of the act approved June 20, 1936 (7 U. S. C. 343c), extending the benefits of the Capper-Ketcham Act to the Territory of Alaska, $10,000" and insert "the act approved October 27, 1949 (Public Law 417), extending to the Territory of Alaska the benefits of the Capper-Ketcham Act and sections 21 and 23 of title II of the Bankhead-Jones Act, $42,150; Puerto Rico, section 3 of the act of March 4, 1931 (7 U. S. C. 386f), authorizing extension of the Capper-Ketcham Act to Puerto Rico, $31,348"; in line 12, after the figures "$408,000," to insert "and the act approved October 26, 1949 (Public Law 406), extending the benefits of section 23 of title II of the Bankhead-Jones Act to Puerto Rico, $40,000"; and in line 17, after the name "Puerto Rico", to strike out "$27,000,000" and insert "$27,103,498."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Salaries and expenses," on page 218, line 24, after the word "possessions," to strike out "$900,000" and insert "$915,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of the Secretary," on page 219, line 11, after the word "Agriculture", to strike out "$2,143,300" and insert "$2,179,300."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was under the subhead "Office of the Solicitor," on page 220, line 6, after the word "service", to strike out "$2,450,000" and insert "$2,675,000"; and in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to insert "together with such amounts from other appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules in the budget for the current fiscal year for such expenses which several amounts not exceeding a total of $207,000 shall be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation."

Mr. DOUGLAS. This is not an appropriation for persons giving direct service to agriculture. It is an appropriation for lawyers in the Department of Agriculture. In 1950 the appropriations for legal services in the Office of the Solicitor were $2,364,000. The House upped that to $2,450,000, an increase of $86,000. The Senate committee is now proposing an appropriation of $2,675,000, which is an increase of over $300,000 compared with the appropriation for the current year. There is the further provision that there shall be added to this sum for legal services other appropriations or authorizations provided for in various other items in the bill.

The legal profession is a very valuable profession, but it seems to me that economy can be made on the legal staffs in virtually every governmental bureau in Washington. Washington is well known for being top heavy with lawyers, and the departments are top heavy with lawyers. This is one place where we can effect a reduction without impairing service in the slightest.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Has the Senator from Illinois made investigation to determine how much of this additional $250,000 or $300,000 increase is for the use of law libraries? It is inconceivable to me that a request of that kind should be made, because in every section of the United States, in every city of any consequence or in every county of any consequence there are public law libraries.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not know. I cannot believe, however, that that is an item which is of any significance in the total. I believe the principal amount must be for the payment of lawyers.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Illinois understands, does he not, that it takes a great many lawyers to find the proper interpretation for acts of the Congress which will be entirely satisfactory to the head of the Department that employs the lawyers. Being sure of that on my own part, I will gladly support the proposal of the Senator from Illinois to kill this amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Vermont has again and again, I think very properly, called the attention of the Senate and the country to the fact that increasingly the heads of departments, instead of asking for legal opinions from the Attorney General, ask for legal opinions from their own legal departments, and then these legal departments solemnly give opinions satisfactory to their chiefs.

The Senator from Vermont has pointed that out again and again, and I quite agree with him in that respect. I am delighted that he reenforces my proposal.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I think I pointed out that for the year 1948, the Attorney General's office, which is supposed to intepret laws which are not clear to the agencies which are concerned, gave only 33 formal opinions on laws to all the agencies of the Government. The other interpretations, or "misinterpretations" perhaps would be a better word, for some of them anyway, were made by solicitors in the offices of the various agencies, and, of course, the solicitors and their staffs, being responsible to the heads of the agencies for their jobs, do the best they can to bring forth interpretations which will be satisfactory to the heads of the agencies which employ them.

One of the greatest weaknesses of our Government today is the great amount of employment and money expended on these solicitors' offices, which spend so much time in finding ways of getting around the intent of the Congress.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I realize it is always very popular to jump on the lawyers in the Government.

Mr. AIKEN. No, no, Mr. President; I was not jumping on the lawyers. I was jumping on the heads of the departments who insist that the lawyers bring in the interpretations they want.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am impressed by the fact that in every revolution the first persons who are in danger are the lawyers. When Jack Cade delivered his famous address to his men at Cheapside, he told them how he was going to bring it about so that they could buy a 3-penny glass of ale for half a penny, and a 4-penny loaf of bread for 1 penny, and one of his men said, in referring to the revolution, that "the first thing we will do is to kill off all the lawyers." Much of that same spirit seems to have come down from the days of Jack Cade's rebellion.

It is not a question of securing lawyers for the Department of Agriculture. The increase was not put in the bill arbitrarily and capriciously to give Mr. Brannan some high-powered gentleman who could twist the laws around to his liking. It was put in the bill in the hope that we would be able to have a sane lending program in connection with the telephone

legislation which was passed last year and the housing legislation which was passed last year, which greatly adds to the legal duties of the Department of Agriculture.

The Department is going to lend a great deal of money under those two bills. It is going to lend $40,000,000 for housing, and $30,000,000 is contained in the act dealing with the rural telephone program.

In addition innumerable cases are arising by virtue of the imposition of acreage allotments and marketing quotas in the case of some commodities, and the plans we have been compelled to make for adjustments on other crops next year. Of course, if this war continues I imagine all acreage allotments and marketing quotas will go out the window, because the farmers will be requested to produce a great deal more.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Georgia realizes, does he not, that if acreage allotments and quotas go out the window probably twice as many lawyers will be required to enforce the price ceilings on farm commodities.

Mr. RUSSELL. That will not be a matter which will be dealt with in the Department of Agriculture. If that must be dealt with we will have a Mr. Henderson or someone else to handle it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The subcommittee took proof as to all these matters, did it not?

Mr. RUSSELL. The subcommittee did, yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. The bill was reported after the most careful investigation and after extensive proof, and after careful consultation both in the subcommittee and in the full committee. Is it not reasonable to suppose that what was done in the subcommittee and in the full committee is a better way of legislating than simply to take the offhand opinion of one of our own Members on the floor?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that the committee reported this item $395,000 below the budget. Some Senators have been talking about a 10-percent cut. Here is a case where more than a 10-percent reduction was applied to the budget estimate. I believe it would be a short-sighted policy to defeat this amendment, involving as it does about $207,000, when the money is absolutely necessary to any sane and sensible administration of the telephone loan program and of the farm-housing program. Senators can strike it out of the bill if they will, but I unhesitatingly predict that in the long run such action will mean much greater losses to the National Treasury in connection with these two important lending programs which were authorized last year.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The side slip does not state the number of lawyers that should be hired. Does the Senator know, from the evidence, the number of lawyers proposed to be employed?

Mr. RUSSELL. I can find how many the Department wanted to employ. I do not know how many the Department will hire with this money, because we applied a rule of thumb and hoped this modest increase would be sufficient to enable the Department to avoid great loss in connection with the telephone loan program and the housing program. We have the figures requested by the Department, but it is impossible for me to carry them all in my mind. They requested 125 lawyers. That is the number they would employ if they were allowed the entire six-hundred-thousand-odd dollars requested. I imagine the amount the committee allowed would, on the original basis, probably mean the employment of 35 or 40 lawyers.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does not the Senator feel that such a number of lawyers is altogether too many simply to interpret the provisions of three or four statutes? Could not such interpretation be made in the local office?

Mr. RUSSELL. This appropriation is for the local office.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is what I understood. Does not the Senator feel that 40 lawyers are too many to be employed simply to interpret three or four laws?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think if they can get by with respect to the Telephone Loan Act with 40 lawyers it will be an achievement to be hailed throughout the country. If a private enterprise were to embark on a program of that kind, which is supposed to expand from year to year and will involve the lending of probably $2,000,000,000 of Government funds, they would undoubtedly employ more than 40 lawyers, and each lawyer would be paid three times the salary scale provided for the Government lawyers. If some gigantic organization were getting ready to embark on a program of the same kind it would certainly need more lawyers than are proposed to be hired by the Government.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I agree that they would be paid more money, but I do not think any firm would hire 40 lawyers.

Mr. RUSSELL. Many a firm would have more than 40 lawyers.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I, too, was of the impression a few years ago that the lawyers in the Department of Agriculture did not work very much. However, last year and the year before I had many occasions to deal with the Department in connection with the REA program. I then found that the lawyers in the Department of Agriculture are among the hardest-working employees of the Government. I have known them to work Saturdays and Sundays, in order to develop programs for my own State.

Mr. FERGUSON. Were they working on programs or on propaganda?

Mr. YOUNG. They were working on the strictly legal aspects of the REA in my own State. I had a lawyer friend from North Dakota working with them, so I know whereof I speak.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to hear that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KERR in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 220, in line 6. [Putting the question.]

The "ayes" appear to have it.

Mr. FERGUSON. I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of Information," on page 221, line 19, after the figures "$611,128", to insert a colon and the following proviso: *"Provided,* That when and to the extent that in the judgment of the Secretary agricultural exhibits and motion and sound pictures relating to the authorized programs of the various agencies of the Department can be more advantageously prepared, displayed, or distributed by the Office of Information, as the central agency of the Department therefor, additional funds not exceeding $300,000 for these purposes may be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation, from the funds applicable, and shall be available for the objects specified herein."

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of this amendment? I understand that it provides for an additional $300,000 for sound pictures which will set forth and propagandize the programs of the various agencies of the Department of Agriculture. I, for one, would like to have an explanation of this amendment, and I should like to know its source.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the language to which the Senator adverts, which I believe is to be found on page 221, beginning in line 19——

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. That language has previously appeared in the appropriation bill. It was submitted by the Bureau of the Budget this year. It was then approved by the House Committee on Appropriations, but was stricken from the bill when the bill was being dealt with on the floor of the House of Representatives. That action was taken on a point of order.

The amendment was voted by the Senate Appropriations Committee to be restored to the bill, in view of the statement to the committee by the Department of Agriculture, which I shall read:

> The purpose of this language is to facilitate financing the production and distribution of motion pictures for bureaus in the Department by the existing and authorized facilities in the Office of Information. The authority of the Department to produce motion pictures, in furtherance of the purposes of the Organic Act of 1862 (5 U. S. C. 511) has long been recognized and the Department has provided them since 1912. They are used mainly by the Extension Service as education and demonstrational aids.
>
> The authority to transfer contained in this language was inserted in the Agriculture Appropriation Act of 1943. While essentially the same result can be accomplished under the reimbursement authority of section 601 of the Economy Act, the above provision per-

mits a merger of transferred funds, in the interests of simpler accounting.

Mr. AIKEN. But has the amount been used in other years?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on this point?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Let me say that one of the best of all sound motion pictures developed by the Department of Agriculture is one which deals with the preservation of agricultural products in canning work and in the preservation of fruits. I am sure the Senator from Vermont is familiar with some of those motion pictures. Their great advantage is that instead of requiring a home demonstration agent to go from house to house and to set up the demonstration in each house, films are now available to show how these facilities can be used in the deep-freeze units—an extremely fine demonstration of what to do in the home canning of fruits and vegetables.

I think the sound film developed on the canning of fruits and vegetables alone is worth all the money which has been used for this purpose.

Mr. AIKEN. But if there already is a provision of $1,265,800 for this purpose, is the Secretary of Agriculture to be given authority to exercise his own judgment in the spending of an additional $300,000 for the production of motion and sound pictures relating to the authorized programs of the various agencies of the Department? Why do we have the appropriation in two places? Why do we provide that the $300,000 can be taken from some other fund if the Secretary of Agriculture desires to use it in the production of motion and sound pictures which will set forth the work of any agency of the Department which he may choose to have set forth?

The amendment almost gives the Secretary of Agriculture unlimited authority to produce the kind of motion picture or sound picture he wishes to have produced, so long as it has some relationship to the work of one of the agencies of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me at this point?

Mr. AIKEN. Certainly; but first let me say that I am particularly concerned with this amendment, and perhaps the Senator from New Mexico knows why.

Mr. ANDERSON. I can only say to my good friend, the Senator from Vermont, that I do not know why the matter is handled in this fashion. I was only attempting to reply to the question as to whether or not sound films and motion pictures demonstrating the work of the Department have heretofore been used.

I say that in my opinion the expenditure of money for films heretofore prepared has been a very good expenditure.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from New Mexico is entirely correct. If properly used, a reasonable amount of money well spent would return good dividends on the investment.

However, I see no restriction on the Secretary of Agriculture in regard to the use of this $300,000 to produce the kind of film he may wish to have produced, so long as it relates to some phase of the work of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Can the Senator say whether any division of the Department of Agriculture which under the agricultural appropriation has any money to spend in relation to authorized programs of the various agencies of the Department, could transfer all that money to this particular agency and have it do all the work and handle all the program?

Mr. AIKEN. I would rather have the Senator from Georgia answer that question. As I read the law, it seems to me that $300,000 would be taken out of the $1,265,800. Or could it come from any unused funds of the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; the $300,000 is very similar to the appropriation for the Office of the Secretary. As the Senator is aware, there go into the Office of the Secretary various allotments from various bureaus and agencies within the Department of Agriculture, for the purpose of supervision of the work within that agency. I think the $300,000 is in addition to the appropriation referred to by the Senator, and I think it can be transferred from funds which are appropriated for the various branches of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. FERGUSON. But not necessarily under the Office of Information? That is the idea, is it not?

Mr. RUSSELL. It has to be spent under the Office of Information.

Mr. FERGUSON. But it can come from any other agency of the Department of Agriculture; can it not?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, yes; there is no question about that.

So, as I understand this $300,000, it comes by transfer from any agency of the Department. For example, I think the Commodity Credit Corporation, if it has any funds available for this purpose, can transfer them so as to have a film made to show farmers how to store corn in home storage; and the money could also be used for the distribution of that film.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Could the money also be used to show the advantages or disadvantages of the Brannan plan? It could be used for that purpose, could it not?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if the Senator from Vermont will permit me to reply, let me say that I do not think the money could be used for that purpose at all. If I thought it could be used for that purpose, I certainly would not approve of this amendment. However, I do not think the money could be used for such a purpose, because the amendment states that the funds may be used for "authorized programs."

Up to this good moment, the Congress of the United States has not authorized the Brannan plan.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Michigan that I think I agree with the Senator from Georgia that the money could not legally be used to promote a new program. But the money could be used for the production of a sound or motion picture to show how the American farmer in recent years has attained salvation under the programs of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Marketing is a part of the Brannan plan, is it not? Distribution is a part of the Brannan plan, and both are recognized in other sections relating to the marketing of farm products. Does not the Senator think that the funds could be used for that purpose, and, therefore, to demonstrate the values of the Brannan plan?

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Michigan believes, as I do, that certain funds appropriated to the Department of Agriculture have already been used—or misused—for the promotion of the Brannan plan.

There is no guaranty that, if Commodity Credit or PMA funds have been used for that purpose, this $300,000 movie or sound film could not also be used at least promote enthusiasm, to show that while we are doing pretty well under the present programs, we might do even better.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator is familiar with the recent program in Minnesota, under which some $34,000 or perhaps as much as $50,000 was used in behalf of the Brannan plan, even though not authorized. The Senator has no doubt as to that fact, has he?

Mr. AIKEN. I also pointed out recently, when the Senator from Michigan was absent from the Senate Chamber, that the Comptroller General never ruled on the point raised by the Senator from Michigan, namely, that the Secretary of Agriculture, at the meeting in Minnesota, violated the law by making a speech in favor of the Brannan plan. The Comptroller General held that it was a matter which would properly come before the Department of Justice, not before the Comptroller General.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is the Senator from Vermont familiar with the statement I made previously on the floor of the Senate, in which I showed that the Secretary of Agriculture had pointed out to his top PMA men that in his opinion it was more important that they work toward the enactment of his legislative program than that they work to make the existing law function?

Mr. AIKEN. I believe the Senator from Delaware made some such statement.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I quoted a portion of a letter which the Secretary had written to his top officials, in which he had made that statement.

Mr. AIKEN. There is some indication that at least a few of them have

borne that admonition in mind. It appears to me that this is definitely legislation on an appropriation bill, and I ask the Chair to rule on it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Chair correctly understand that the Senator from Vermont is making the point of order?

Mr. AIKEN. I am making the point of order that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I should like to be heard on the point of order.

Mr. AIKEN. I may say that I am highly suspicious of this item of $300,000, which is to be used for the production of a sound or motion picture, as proposed. I make the point of order that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, it is a legislative matter, but it is an amendment to a legislative matter, because the language which precedes it, writing out all the numbers of the yearbooks which can be printed, is itself legislative. So it is an amendment to a legislative provision which comes to us in the House bill. We certainly have a right to amend a House legislative provision which comes to the Senate. When the House undertakes to write out and prescribe how many of the Yearbooks of Agriculture shall be printed for the use of the House and Senate, and to write in a great deal of legislation in connection with the Office of Information, the Senate has a right to amend it to the extent proposed, because when the House legislates, then the Senate has a right to legislate. The House provision, prescribing the number of yearbooks which can be printed, is purely legislative. That is one form of information. We come forward with another.

While I am about it, the distinguished Senator has talked about a sound film. This provision is not only for a sound film, but for preparing an agricultural exhibit to be taken around to State fairs and gatherings of that kind. It was not placed in the bill with any idea of promoting the Brannan plan—perish the thought, so far as our committee is concerned.

I do not know how the Members feel about it. I did not poll them. But this is a provision which has been in the bills since 1943. It is not a new idea to assist by means of the dissemination of information by way of agricultural exhibits, moving pictures, and otherwise. It has been in progress since 1943, and it is certainly not put in this bill with any idea of propagandizing for the Brannan plan. The Brannan plan was in existence before 1943. It was not called the Brannan plan. It bore the name then of a gentleman from Iowa or Illinois, some doctor from one of the agricultural college experiment stations in that area, who headed the movement as an emergency or a depression measure.

The Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan, later pinned his name to the program evolved by this professor. But there is nothing about the Brannan plan in this amendment. I hope the Senator will not assail it on those grounds, because it does not relate to the Brannan plan.

Mr. AIKEN. I may say that the Senator from Vermont did not bring up the idea that this might be used for promoting the Brannan Plan. However, the Senator from Vermont is not satisfied with this provision. I should prefer, Mr. President, to make the point of order that the provision is not germane to the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it not a fact that this identical language was stricken from the bill in the House, that a point of order was made against it, and that it was removed from the bill for that reason?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is exactly correct. But the House has an entirely different system from that of the Senate when it comes to dealing with points of order.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand that. But, unless there is something else about this amendment which is absolutely germane——

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, it is germane.

Mr. WHERRY. Unless it amends the provision which came to the Senate from the House, it seems to me that it is not germane.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is a proposal to amend what the House sent to the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. What the House sent to the Senate was a provision for information, and this amendment relates to information. It provides for exhibits explaining new agricultural developments of major interest to farmers and is supplied to some 35 large State and interstate fairs which request this material each year. Technical assistance and production facilities are also extended to department agencies for the preparation of small exhibits, for limited use. In addition, the Office of Information provides motion picture, radio, and projection service for the Department and supervises the distribution of films from 72 cooperative State film libraries for the use of extension agencies.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. This amendment goes far beyond the provisions sent to the Senate by the House. In fact, it authorizes the Secretary to use his own judgment as to whether or not $300,000 worth of sound or motion-picture film would promote the work of the Department.

Mr. RUSSELL. Upon whose judgment are we going to have to depend for information?

Mr. AIKEN. I ask for the judgment of the Senate upon the point of order.

Mr. CHAVEZ and Mr. LUCAS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield first to the Senator from New Mexico, after which I shall yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The language sought to be employed is that which has to do with information.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It happens that what the House did was to provide for information in the form of yearbooks. The yearbook contains possibly a thousand items of information beneficial to the farmer. Am I correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Besides the items outlined in the yearbook, giving sound information to the farmer, the Senate amendment provides only for additional information, but, nevertheless, information. Is not that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct. There can be no question about the germaneness of the amendment. The item is as follows:

> For necessary expenses in connection with the publication, indexing, illustration, and distribution of bulletins, documents, and reports, the preparation, distribution, and display of agricultural motion and sound pictures, and exhibits, and the coordination of informational work in the Department.

It goes on to provide for the publication of 230,850 copies of the yearbook for the use of the House and the Senate, which is certainly legislation. Then comes the amendment which provides for additional information dealing with agriculture, to be furnished by the transfer of $300,000 from other appropriations. Then follows this legislation:

> That in the preparation of motion pictures or exhibits by the Department, not exceeding a total of $10,000 to be used for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706 (a) of the Organic Act of 1944—

And so forth. That is legislation. The whole section is legislation.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Georgia has just read into the RECORD what I had intended to read, under the general caption of "Office of Information." Everything which he has read, it seems to me, is right in line with what the proviso does. It deals with the same subject matter, and it seems to me it is all absolutely germane.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The point on which the House sustained the point of order, however, was that the $300,000 was to be transferred from other bureaus within the Department of Agriculture, in addition to the amount of money allocated for the purposes which the Senator just mentioned. It seems to me it is new legislation, and that the House was correct in striking it out.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not intend to pass on the rules of the House, because from what little experience I have had I know that they are widely different from the rules of the Senate. Limitations are not out of order in the House.

In the Senate it has been held that all limitations are out of order. There is no similarity of rules as between the House and the Senate in dealing with appropriation bills. I claim, and shall continue to insist so long as I am a Member of the Senate, that when the House legislates one line, as it does when it spells out the number of yearbooks to be printed, it has opened the door, and the Senate can legislate on the subject even in an appropriation bill.

Mr. WHERRY. I agree with the distinguished Senator in that respect, but I make the point that that was not the issue in the House. It was not on the question of whether it was germane to the Office of Information; it was that the $300,000 was to be transferred within the Department for the purposes outlined. It was on that question that the point of order was made. I submit that if the Senate attempts to write it into the bill under the theory that it is amending what the House did, a point of order can properly be made.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not agree at all with the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the amendment provides that—

> Not exceeding $300,000 for these purposes may be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation, from the funds applicable, and shall be available for the objects specified herein.

The amendment could not be more germane.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McFARLAND. Is a point of order debatable?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is not debatable.

Mr. McFARLAND. I insist on the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia has raised the question of germaneness of the Senate amendment, which has just been discussed, to the bill as passed by the House. Under rule XVI, paragraph 4, the Chair will submit the question of germaneness to the Senate, which, under the rule, is not debatable.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the Senate is anxious to have a vote on this question tonight, the junior Senator from Nebraska will suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Eastland	Ives
Anderson	Ecton	Jenner
Brewster	Ellender	Johnson, Colo.
Bridges	Ferguson	Kem
Butler	Fulbright	Kerr
Chapman	George	Kilgore
Chavez	Graham	Langer
Connally	Hayden	Lehman
Cordon	Hickenlooper	Lodge
Donnell	Hill	Lucas
Douglas	Holland	McFarland
Dworshak	Humphrey	McKellar
Magnuson	O'Mahoney	Stennis
Malone	Pepper	Taft
Martin	Robertson	Thomas, Okla.
Maybank	Russell	Thye
Millikin	Saltonstall	Watkins
Morse	Schoeppel	Wherry
Murray	Smith, Maine	Williams
Myers	Smith, N. J.	Young

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

The question is, Is the committee amendment before the Senate germane to the House provision? The question is submitted to the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. The rule provides that no further point of order can be made and that the question of germaneness must be settled by a vote.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Two questions are involved. One is the question of new legislation. Where new legislation is proposed by a committee, the Senate may decide that it is germane to the provision in a House bill. In that case the point of order on the ground that it is new legislation no longer lies.

Mr. WHERRY. In other words, if the Senate decides that the language is germane, the point of order is actually settled by the vote on the question of germaneness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senate decides it is germane, of course it can vote on the question of agreeing to the amendment separately. However, the point of order that it is new legislation is then disposed of.

Mr. TAFT. A point of inquiry, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. Germane to what? Germane to the bill? Germane to the provision of the House bill?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Germane to the House language, to which it is an amendment.

The Senator from Georgia, in charge of the bill in reply to the point of order that it was new legislation, contended that it was germane to the provision of the bill to which it is an amendment, which is the House language.

Mr. WHERRY. A parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. Was the point of order raised to the question of germaneness or on the ground of new legislation?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order was made against the amendment on the ground that it was new legislation, and the Senator from Georgia, to counter that point of order, said that it was germane to the legislative provision in the House text.

Mr. WHERRY. I did not hear the Senator from Georgia raise the question of germaneness, and the point of order was not debatable, so how was it raised?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The present occupant of the chair was temporarily called out at the time the point was raised, but the Chair understands that when the point of order was raised against the language on the ground that it was new legislation, the Senator from Georgia contended that it was germane to the House provision, and that raised the question, and the occupant of the chair at that time submitted the question to the Senate, and the point of no quorum was made. That is the present situation.

The question is, Is the amendment germane to the House language?

Mr. WHERRY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Those who take the position that the language of the committee amendment is germane to the House language will vote "yea." Those who take the contrary position will vote "nay."

The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senators from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON and Mr. MCMAHON], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN and Mr. LEAHY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] are detained on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is absent on official committee business.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. DARBY],

the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] are detained on official business.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 35, nays 25, as follows:

YEAS—35

Anderson	Hill	Maybank
Chapman	Holland	Morse
Chavez	Humphrey	Murray
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Myers
Donnell	Kerr	O'Mahoney
Douglas	Kilgore	Pepper
Eastland	Langer	Robertson
Ellender	Lehman	Russell
Fulbright	Lucas	Stennis
George	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Graham	McKellar	Young
Hayden	Magnuson	

NAYS—25

Aiken	Ives	Smith, Maine
Brewster	Jenner	Smith, N. J.
Bridges	Kem	Taft
Butler	Lodge	Thye
Cordon	Malone	Watkins
Dworshak	Martin	Wherry
Ecton	Millikin	Williams
Ferguson	Saltonstall	
Hickenlooper	Schoeppel	

NOT VOTING—36

Benton	Hendrickson	McMahon
Bricker	Hoey	Mundt
Byrd	Hunt	Neely
Cain	Johnson, Tex.	O'Conor
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Sparkman
Darby	Kefauver	Taylor
Downey	Knowland	Thomas, Utah
Flanders	Leahy	Tobey
Frear	Long	Tydings
Gillette	McCarran	Vandenberg
Green	McCarthy	Wiley
Gurney	McClellan	Withers

The VICE PRESIDENT. On this vote the yeas are 35, the nays are 25, the Senate holds the amendment germane, and that settles the point of order on the ground that it is new legislation.

COMMUNISTS IN GOVERNMENT SERVICE—REPORT OF MAJORITY MEMBERS OF SUBCOMMITTEE OF FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE

Mr LODGE. Mr. President, the report of the majority members of the Tydings subcommittee which is just out, not having gone through the Foreign Relations Committee, asserts that I was absent for 9 of the 31 sessions of the meetings of the subcommittee, that for this reason the subcommittee was "burdened in its work" and that there was significance in most of these absences coming during consideration of the Amerasia case.

The truth is that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], who is one of the majority signers of the report, missed five meetings—five of the nine—as I did, because we were members of the subcommittee of two which was taking testimony in New York and abroad on the day-to-day policing of the loyalty program pursuant to a unanimous vote of the full subcommittee. This was between the date of May 26 and June 5 when most of the consideration of the Amerasia case occurred. I missed the other four meetings because a young man who was a close friend of my son's, of myself, and of my whole family, was drowned near my home in Massachusetts and I was preoccupied for several days with many thing pertaining to the tragedy. This occurred in March just as the subcommittee was beginning its hearings and could have had no possible effect, burdensome or otherwise, on the work of the subcommittee.

It is a pity—and it is foreign to all the usual courtesies between Senators—that I should be criticized by name for being absent on official committee work and, secondly, for being absent because of the death of a close and beloved friend.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey and Mr. HICKENLOOPER addressed the Chair.

Mr. LODGE. I shall be glad to yield in a moment when I have completed my statement.

It is this type of petty sniping—this attempt to hit below the belt—which has made the work of the subcommittee so difficult. If the other statements in the majority's report are no more accurate than these statements about myself, the report will be chiefly valuable as fiction and as special pleading, rather than as fact. Indeed this makes the whole document suspect.

The majority report also attacks me by name for reading 12 of the 81 loyalty files. Twelve files taken at random and requiring five whole days to read, are a representative cross-section and convinced me that the files were in such an unfinished, undeveloped state as not to provide a sound basis for reaching conclusions. It is noteworthy that, while the majority criticizes me for refusing to acept these files blindly at their face value, nowhere in the majority report are these files discussed as individual cases, one by one the way I do. There is merely a blanket endorsement, and there is no way of knowing whether the majority read 81 files or none at all. My report goes into specific details.

Mr. President, in my minority views, I purposely made no personal attacks on any members of the subcommittee and, at this serious moment in history, I shall not do so, but it is necessary that I clarify the flagrant misstatements which the majority have seen fit to make about my part personally in this investigation. They must be indeed desperate men to use these personal methods to divert attention from the main issue which, of course, is the total inadequacy of their investigation.

I now yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Massachusetts a question. As I recall the history of this investigation, the resolution adopted by the Senate authorized the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to investigate the matter and to report to the Senate. Am I to understand that the subcommittee, which was designated to investigate and report to the full Foreign Relations Committee, has released a report to the press purporting to be the report of the full committee?

Mr. LODGE. Yes. It is an unusual proceeding, though, since the subcommittee should have reported to the full Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. As a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I must utter a vigorous protest against that procedure. I have never heard of it before. The subcommittee was appointed to report to the full committee, and the full committee was to consider it before any public report was made.

Mr. LODGE. I think that is correct. I think it is a most unusual procedure. I know of no reason for taking this unusual procedure and ignoring in rather cavalier fashion all the other members of the committee.

I now yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Massachusetts would tell me when he managed to obtain a copy of this report of the subcommittee, that is of the majority members of the subcommittee of which I happen to be a minority member. I am curious about that.

Mr. LODGE. I got it this afternoon at about 4 o'clock. I went down into the sort of battle station they have down in the cellar. I went in and asked a young lady there to give me a copy of the report, which she did. Maybe she was not supposed to do so. Maybe I am not supposed to see it until it comes out in the newspapers tomorrow.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. For a considerable period of time, I may say to the Senator from Massachusetts, I have been obtaining my information about the subcommittee from the newspapers. I have been totally unable to secure a copy, galley proof, or otherwise, of this so-called report of the majority party membership on this subcommittee. I understand it was freely handed out to the newspapers this morning, and perhaps yesterday, and on last Friday at least one or two newspapermen, I am told, had access to the galley proof; and yet, as a member of the subcommittee, I was not provided with any such report. I understand that after some considerable inquiry on the part of my office this afternoon two copies were sent over late, after they had been pretty generally scattered around to the public.

I think it is a rather fantastic procedure, and I expect to have something to say about it when I can find out what the majority has said. One or two little things that have been quoted to me by the press certainly will lend themselves to a considerable amount of interesting comment.

Mr. LODGE. Let me say to the Senator from Iowa that we have a well-established procedure in the Senate, which has developed over the years as the result of experience; and whenever a little handful of Senators undertake to violate that procedure and bypass it, naturally and obviously it makes anything they do suspect.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Was it the understanding of the Senator from Massachusetts that this subcommittee, to which he and I both, at least on paper, belong, was to report to the Foreign Relations Committee as a creature of the Foreign Relations Committee, or was the

Mr. LUCAS. Please do not do that now.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator should certainly let me comment on what he said my views were. I know he is fair.

Mr. LUCAS. The report speaks for itself. I have merely been told that by someone. Perhaps I should not even have mentioned it. If it misinterprets in any way the Senator's attitude, I will simply withdraw it, to keep him from entering upon a long discussion, because the three majority members of the subcommittee, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], are not present. Frankly, perhaps, I should not have said that.

Mr. LODGE. I wonder where they are. [Laughter.]

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment on page 221, beginning in line 19.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, this amendment had not been called to my attention until now. It is a quarter of seven. I should like further opportunity to examine it and study it. I wonder whether the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Georgia, would be willing to postpone the vote until tomorrow. The amendment reads:

Provided, That when and to the extent that in the judgment of the Secretary agricultural exhibits and motion and sound pictures relating to the authorized programs of the various agencies of the Department can be more advantageously prepared * * * by the Office of Information, * * * additional funds not exceeding $300,000 for these purposes may be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation, from the funds applicable, and shall be available for the objects specified herein:

The distinguished Senator from Georgia says that that is not an increase in the funds available for information, and that the amount can be used by the different departments. He has other arguments, including the argument that this amendment has been in the bill before. Nevertheless, Mr. President, the way it is framed, it seems to me that it can be used very well for a program like the Brannan plan. I have seen Department of Agriculture bulletins which are distinctly propaganda for the Brannan plan, and whether "authorized programs of the various agencies" includes programs simply authorized by Mr. Brannan and not authorized by Congress, I have no particular means of checking, without further investigation.

If the Senator is willing to defer action on the amendment, if after I examine all the Senator's arguments I find them sound I shall make no further request for delay tomorrow morning, and shall say nothing on the subject. But I should like the opportunity, if the Senator is willing, to go over the evidence until the first thing tomorrow morning.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am always agreeable to any reasonable request, and it may be there is nothing unreasonable about the request of the Senator from Ohio. I am a little amazed that my distinguished friend from Ohio should have been 7 years discovering this horrible bugaboo under the bed. This language has been in agricultural appropriation bills for 7 years. It has been renewed. It has been before the Senate time and time again. It is not merely getting read now to jump forth, seize the Senate, and force the Brannan plan through. It has been in the bill for all these many years. I do not believe there is any reason for delaying action on the amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Possibly it is the language under which the Brannan plan has been printed and issued in booklet form by the Secretary of Agriculture. If so, then I want it to come out of the bill. That may not be true. I can only say to the Senator that it is now 10 minutes of 7. I should like, if he will grant me the privilege, to have the opportunity of looking into it somewhat further. It may be that I shall find that I am wrong. If so, I will yield fully to the Senator's views, the first thing in the morning.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should be willing to agree to any language which would protect us from an avalanche of propaganda for the Brannan plan. I should be perfectly willing to include a provision that the programs must be authorized by Congress. I think that that is the only logical construction that could be placed on the language. But if the Senator from Ohio wishes to study the matter through, tonight, and peruse it, I shall not object to letting it go over until tomorrow.

Mr. TAFT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. RUSSELL. I hope his good, sound judgment will bring him to the conclusion that he should vote for the amendment, and that he was in error in thinking the amendment was not germane.

Mr. TAFT. That was based on the fact that I had not thoroughly examined it. But it seemed to me that in the way the authorization was framed, it permitted the use of money for particular agricultural programs not primarily informational, but to be used as informational programs. The Senator assures me that that is not so; so possibly my thought as to its germaneness was wrong. But it seems to me that if the amendment does what has been indicated, then I shall not think it germane to a general appropriation of money for programs of information.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, in view of the fact that this amendment is going over until tomorrow, I think I should read this further paragraph from the testimony before the committee:

The authority to transfer, contained in this language, was inserted in the Agricultural Appropriation Act of 1943, and while essentially the same result can be accomplished under the reimbursement authority of section 601 of the Economy Act, the economy measure permits the transfer of funds in the interest of simplified accounting.

Really, there is authority under other laws for the transfer of these funds. This provision makes it simply a matter of bookkeeping. But I am perfectly willing to let the vote go over until tomorrow morning. I should like to have action on the other amendments completed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will go over until tomorrow.

The clerk will state the next amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Library," on page 222, after line 19, to strike out:

Not to exceed $12,000,000 of the funds appropriated in this title shall be available for travel expenses. Amounts available from appropriations contained in this title are hereby reduced by the total sum of $645,496, such amount to be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury immediately upon approval of this chapter.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II—Corporations," on page 223, line 17, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$16,000,000" and insert "$16,350,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 224, line 3, after the word "discharge", to strike out "$170,515,131" and insert "$66,698,457."

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of that amendment? It seems to me to revert to the old method of keeping the Commodity Credit Corporation funds intact by canceling notes which the Corporation has given the Treasury. I recall that the General Accounting Office protested very vigorously against that kind of bookkeeping, because the losses of the Commodity Credit Corporation never appeared as a Government expenditure under such a method. While I realize that the Senate committee has cut the amount which the House had canceled from approximately $170,000,000, to approximately $66,000,000, and for that I am very grateful, I wonder if the Senator——

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator will rejoice and be exceedingly glad when he hears the explanation. The reason the sum was cut from $170,515,131 to $66,698,457 was because upon a reaudit it was found that the losses were that much less than the figure of $170,515,131. Therefore, the Government is really $103,816,674 better off than we thought it was as a result of the transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it the plan to wipe out losses of the Commodity Credit Corporation simply by canceling notes given to the Treasury?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is the only way in which we have ever handled it.

Mr. AIKEN. I know. As I pointed out, the General Accounting Office vigorously protested such methods. I shall not oppose the amendment tonight. I think I shall concentrate on the other amendment which has been under discussion and which is much more vulnerable.

Mr. RUSSELL. It has been found that approximately $103,000,000 worth of notes will be paid to the Treasury which

we did not think would be paid, and the Government is $103,000,000 better off than appeared by the figures submitted.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Vermont is very happy to learn that. He is almost ready to think the Commodity Credit Corporation did not need the $2,000,000,000 which we appropriated a while ago.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Is it not a fact that at the price at which cotton was selling it looked as if there might be losses on the 1948 crop, but with the increase in the price of cotton all the losses were wiped out by the realization that the Commodity Credit Corporation could sell its stocks at more than they cost, and if they closed the pool and took in some cotton they would actually sustain a profit instead of a loss? That applies to corn, wheat, and many other commodities. These stocks are not nearly so extensive as some people calculated. I think some of the money recently appropriated will not be used. I made a calculation and figured that probably the Corporation will not need all of the $2,000,000,000. But the wise thing was to appropriate it, but the desire would be that it would never require that amount of money.

Mr. AIKEN. If we find the Commodity Credit Corporation does not require the $2,000,000,000, the impression made on the public with regard to the farm program would be much better if we rescinded that authorization.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I agree with the Senator from Georgia that from the standpoint of the taxpayers it makes no difference whether we pay for this program through cancellation of notes or through appropriations, but I think the Senator will agree with me that this cancellation of notes in appropriation bills does have the effect of hiding from the American people the true cost of the program.

Mr. RUSSELL. I cannot see that it does. An appropriation would be more widely publicized than would the cancellation, but I do not think it hides the facts from anyone who wishes to get the facts.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I agree that it does not exactly hide them, but it does not give the publicity to the cost of the program that would be given through a direct appropriation by Congress.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think the use of the word "hide" was fortunate. If the appropriation were made for that purpose it probably would be a little more evident to the reader of a newspaper, but any person who went into the subject would find that on the cancellation theory it would be more widely recognized.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The reason I raised the point is because in one of the recent reports of the Secretary of Agriculture he pointed out the amount of money which Congress had appropriated for the Corporation since its inception in 1933. While he emphasized the amount of money which the Corporation had paid back into the Treasury, he failed to mention the $1,500,000,000 of note cancellations, nor did he mention the $2,000,000,000 which had automatically accrued to this Corporation under section 32 during the past 15 years, both of which were taxpayers' money. The inclusion of these items would make quite a difference in the ultimate answer as to the results of the program.

Mr. RUSSELL. That would make a difference, of course.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The so-called surpluses about which the Secretary of Agriculture has been boasting have been false and misleading. The Commodity Credit Corporation was never established with the thought of making money. No one thought it would make money. But the taxpayers have a right to know what losses are involved and that information has not been given them. I think the Senate should abandon this note-cancellation procedure and make direct appropriations. In that way the cost of the program would be evident to everyone.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, did I understand the Senator to say "several billions of dollars"?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not think it is a false profit. When the ECA has to buy cotton and buys it from the Commodity Credit Corporation at the market price, it does not cost the Treasury of the United States a penny more than it would if it went on the open market and bought the cotton. That transaction resulted in a profit of more than $200,000,000.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am not questioning the merits or demerits of the individual transaction. I directed a letter to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and asked him if he would review the operations of the Corporation for the past 13 years and give me the net result, from the standpoint of the taxpayer, of the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation since its inception. In his reply, which I have here, he said:

> In answer to your letter of February 1, 1949, the net loss sustained by the Commodiy Credit Corporation from its organization on October 17, 1933, through December 31, 1948, was $2,145,930,367 plus the around $2,000,000,000 which it had received under section 32.

He went on to point out——

Mr. ANDERSON. A portion of that is for the subsidization of food, and has nothing to do with the farm program.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am not breaking it down, but I am saying that the Corporation has not shown a profit. On the contrary, its loss is nearly $4,000,000,000 total.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I think it is as wrong as it can be to say that the Corporation has lost several billions of dollars, when we realize that the Congress of the United States voted that, instead of paying the full price of something, it could be taken, for convenience, from the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation——

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am not questioning here the merits or the demerits of the program authorized by Congress, nor am I questioning the program. But I do question the statement of the Secretary of Agriculture in a bulletin, from which I quote, when he said:

> Incidentally, Commodity Credit Corporation shows a lifetime profit rather than a loss.

That statement is not true. There is no use of our trying to conceal the fact that these support programs do cost money, and I think the true facts should be made known to the American taxpayers.

I shall not oppose the amendment, because it is immaterial whether we cancel the notes or whether we authorize an appropriation, but I do think the true picture should be presented in the report by the Secretary of Agriculture, and I think legislation should be enacted to correct this unsound procedure.

Mr. ANDERSON. I subscribe to that statement fully. I think one of the tragedies of the whole system of reporting is that the Comptroller General can issue a report and say the loss has been $2,000,000,000 on this program. If that is saddled on the farmer, it is a serious thing. I agree with the Senator from Delaware that if we could segregate those things which were subsidy programs in furtherance of the decision of the Congress itself to handle it that way we would be better off.

A great deal of money was used in the campaign against the foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico. The Government could have done that by direct appropriation by Congress, or it could have done it by the use of Commodity Credit Corporation funds. The amounts which were used from Commodity Credit Corporation funds should not be charged to the farm program.

I agree with the Senator that it would be desirable to have a complete and well-rounded picture of the Commodity Credit Corporation. I think it would show that the cost of the farm program has been extremely low. I think that a great many things which have been charged against the Commodity Credit Corporation make it look as though the farm program has been extremely costly. Whatever the figure is, we ought to have it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I merely say that the Commodity Credit Corporation as a corporation under the supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture has cost the taxpayers around $4,000,000,000, according to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. Perhaps that should not all be charged against the agricultural program. However, we do not have a breakdown of these items in view of the fact that we have never been able to get the books of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Without the books we do not know how we should assess these charges. The point I am raising is that the true cost of these programs would be clearer if Congress would get around to making a direct appropriation. The Secretary of Agriculture should come in and justify appropriations on the basis of the merits or demerits of the question involved. Then there would be no ques-

tion in the mind of the committee, Congress, or the country as to what it is costing. Furthermore, I say that when the Secretary of Agriculture puts out a bulletin in which he says this Corporation, the Commodity Credit Corporation, has shown a lifetime profit, rather than a loss, that statement is not true.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The quesion is on agreeing to the amendment on page 224, line 3.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title IV—General provisions," on page 229, after line 5, to insert a new section as follows:

SEC. 411. Of the funds appropriated in this chapter for travel expenses, $791,888 shall be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury on or before August 1, 1950; but such amount shall be credited toward any other reduction in amounts available for such travel expenses resulting from decreases in appropriations made by this act below the budget estimates.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I have heretofore sent an amendment to the desk relating to the Meat Inspection Service. I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment has not been offered. The Senator does not need to request unanimous consent to withdraw it.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold that motion so that I may ask a question of the Senator from Washington?

Mr. LUCAS. Very well.

Mr. WHERRY. I did not have an opportunity to read the Senator's amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I submitted an amendment which would have provided $2,500 for a part-time veterinarian to inspect meat at the Seattle stockyards. I have the assurance of those who are familiar with this program that out of the three-thousand-two-hundred-some-odd inspectors we ought to be entitled to at least one inspector at the union stockyards in Seattle.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am not sure that the Senator should withdraw his amendment. I am of the opinion that if his amendment is a good amendment it should be carried to conference. The Seattle Union Stockyards deal primarily, so far as the inspection of cattle is concerned, with cattle on the hoof. It is not a question of meat grading. The city of Seatle takes care of that by ordinance. It has to do with this cattle which come into the country from Canada. Shipments from Canada into the United States are not covered by the interstate commerce provisions. It is upon that basis that the Department of Agriculture has refused to place an inspector in the union stockyards at Seattle. I do not think it would be wholly out of order for the Senator from Washington to press his amendment and, of successful, to have the Senate conferees carry it to conference. If that is desirable to the Senator from Washington, I think the provision for $2,500 should be voted on by the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment is not in order at this time. The amendment was ordered to be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not want to embarrass the subcommittee, because the chairman assured me that there would be sufficient meat inspectors to provide one for Seattle. I make the point that this involves an international program.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not know that there will be a sufficient number of meat inspectors to take care of all demands from all over the country. Certainly if there is a slaughtering proposition involved, or if it involves a packing house, the Senator from Washington is entitled to an inspector. It would not make any difference whether the cow came from Canada or from the moon. The Government would be responsible, of course. If it is a question of inspecting cattle on the hoof, it is an entirely different proposition. Certainly we are inspecting cattle which comes into the country from Mexico, and certainly the rule which applies to the border of Mexico should apply to the border at Canada.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Would the Senator be willing to take the amendment to conference?

Mr. RUSSELL. I would have no objection to taking it to conference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington cannot offer his amendment now. It is not in order until all committee amendments have been disposed of.

UNJUSTIFIED INCREASES IN THE PRICE LEVEL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to take 3 or 4 minutes on an extraneous subject matter. I ask unanimous consent to have the remarks I shall now make printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of the debate today on the appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a cartoon which appeared in this morning's Washington Post. The cartoon is by Herblock; and in a very real sense I think it constitutes the finest, most penetrating "speech" I have observed thus far on the entire economic problem which confronts the country. Even though the "speech" is in cartoon form, it says a great deal; it says something to which the American people and, particularly, the administration, should give heed.

I understand from newspaper reports that the President of the United States perhaps will make a statement later this week in regard to our economic problems. If the President does, I am sure the speech he makes will demonstrate very careful study and thought in regard to what in my opinion is a current economic crisis.

The cartoon to which I have referred shows Uncle Sam in the process of being fitted to a new pair of shoes. The salesman, however, has gotten his boxes mixed, obviously, because he is presenting to Uncle Sam one shoe which is marked "War footing"—and that is shown as a high shoe—and another shoe marked "Partial mobilization"—and that shoe is shown in the cartoon as an oxford, whereas the shoe that Uncle Sam is shown to have taken off is marked "Business as usual."

Mr. President, I wish to present very briefly to the Senate a price problem which is becoming a great emergency in the United States as the hours go by. Over the week end and during most of today I have been gathering information in regard to what is happening to the price structure in the United States. Certainly there is no scarcity of foodstuffs. For that matter, there is no scarcity of a large quantity of the items which the fear of a spreading war have caused to rise to a price level which can honestly be characterized as a profiteering price level.

I happen to be one who thinks it too bad that in a period of hysteria which is sweeping our country, caused by fears which apparently many consumers entertain as to the possible scarcity of goods, once again great economic forces are collecting blood money from the American people; yet that is what they are doing because of the great inflationary changes in the price level which are occurring in the United States.

For instance, Mr. President, let us consider meat. There is no scarcity of meat. There is ample meat in the storage houses of the United States today. Let the great meat packers justify if they can—but they cannot—the increases in meat prices which the meat packers are guilty of imposing upon the American people in the last few days. Mr. President, its is profiteering. It is the collection of blood money. It is a tariff imposed upon the American consumers because the fear of a spreading war is creeping into the minds of many American consumers.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield for a question.

Mr. MAYBANK. I was going to ask the Senator whether in his judgment there is any scarcity of eggs, either. Yet only recently the price of eggs has been raised 3 cents a dozen.

Mr. MORSE. There is no scarcity, so far as I can determine from such research as I have been able to conduct; and I intend to continue it on a personal basis until the Congress does what I think it should do.

So far as I can determine, there is no scarcity in the case of any of the foodstuffs which have been subjected to the unconscionable price increases which have occurred in the past few days.

Again, Mr. President, the explanation is simply that certain economic forces are taking advantage of the American consumers. In my judgment it is time we took action to stop the profiteering which already is characterizing the price structure.

I think the meat packers have something to answer for in connection with the increases in meat prices which are occurring in the United States. I hope the President will have something to say about that, if it is true—as I judge from the ticker—that he is going to make a

statement on the over-all policy of the administration in regard to economic controls during this period of time.

Mr. President, in my judgment we have no right to sit here as a Congress and see the American consumers suffer the losses that this inflationary spiral, represented by the unconscionable increases in food prices during the last few days, is causing them at the present time. I think it is already a little late for the administration to be talking about imposing some reasonable checks which will have some power of restraint over the sources of supply of food. I think it is a little late for the administration to be taking such steps, but perhaps it is better to have it done late rather than not at all.

Mr. President, I do not like controls; but let us face the fact that we had better do some checking with respect to some of the basic commodities which determine the standard of living of our people. Let us realize that we must put in the stop now on the basic commodities—such as meat, for example. I think it is simply outrageous that the average housewife has been subjected to such price increases. For instance, this morning I received from my own State a report in regard to meat prices in Oregon. If we go into the matter, I think we shall find that there is a uniform national pattern, a jiggling up of the price structure on some of the basic food commodities. I think we must face the fact that we should establish some checks on a few of the basic commodities in the field of food.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. Yes, in a moment. After I yield to the Senator from South Carolina, I wish to say something about some other commodities, commodities outside the field of food.

I simply wish to say that it is no answer to talk about voluntary controls in the case of the basic commodities, Mr. President. Voluntary controls constitute a nice theory; but where are the voluntary controls? The meat packers certainly have it within their power to put some voluntary controls into operation. However, they have not done so. Perhaps after they get the prices up to an even more unconscionable level than the present price level, the meat packers may wish to try to stop us from doing what we should do in the interest of the people; at that time the meat packers may try to prevent such action by suggesting some voluntary controls. However, by that time we shall have to deal with a roll-back on prices, rather than a stabilization of the prices then existing—prices which, for example, the meat packers already will have gotten up.

Now I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon has said he does not like controls. Let me say that I do not like controls, either. Certainly I hope it will not be necessary to have a system of rationing.

I wish to say that I expect the Banking and Currency Committee to begin an investigation of price increases. As the Senator from Oregon knows, that committee is charged with the duty of making studies of all matters relating to prices. I have asked the committee to meet on Thursday, following the President's address on Wednesday to the Congress, and following his address on Wednesday night to the people. So our committee will be studying the price increases which have occurred in the last few days.

I hope it will not be necessary to have rationing. I have always been opposed to rationing.

However, I hope the American people will keep their heads clear and their feet on the ground, and will not be stampeded into hoarding sugar or other commodities—as has been reported recently in the newspapers—and I hope the producers of the various commodities will not attempt because of the tragedy occurring in Korea, to take advantage in the way the Senator from Oregon has discussed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have great confidence in the Senator from South Carolina and in the Banking and Currency Committee, and I am sure they will do what is desirable to be done on the basis of the facts presented to the committee. It is good news to hear that the Senator from South Carolina intends in his committee to proceed to investigate this matter, beginning next Thursday. However, I think it is time that a few of us on the floor of the Senate issued some warnings to the business forces in the United States which are taking advantage of the war situation by jacking up to unconscionable levels the prices of commodities which are not even scarce.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is quite correct.

Mr. MORSE. Certain business forces are attempting to take that step because they have control over the distribution of such commodities. For instance, this morning I talked to three butchers in Washington, D. C. They informed me that they cannot tell what their meat will cost them next week. One of them told me of the increases in the wholesale price of hams cited to him by his wholesaler since last week. Yet, as the Senator from South Carolina knows, there has been nothing to produce any scarcity in hams, nothing which would justify an increase in the price of hams in less than a week. There is only one word by which to describe that action, and it is a nasty word: It is the word "profiteering."

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is quite correct.

Mr. MORSE. It is profiteering at the expense of the fears of American mothers and fathers, and it is profiteering at the expense of the blood which is being shed by American boys in Korea.

Believe me, Mr. President, I am going to make my voice heard for a few minutes today on the floor of the Senate in opposition to that kind of unconscionable economic conduct on the part of any group within our citizenry—whether it be the meat packers or any others.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Let me point out that even the price of bread has been raised 1 cent.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. It is good news to me that the increase in prices is not charged to the price-support program. In fact, if we had had a price-support program in regard to meat, I think we would not be faced with the situation confronting us today as far as meat is concerned.

There is not a surplus of meat today. In fact, the reason we have a scarcity of meat now is that there has been no assurance to the producers that they would be protected against extreme losses. As a result, many livestock producers, and particularly feeders, have either cut down their operations or gone out of business, fearing there would be an extreme price collapse. So we now have many who are out of business who ought to be in business. I think this is a case where lack of a support-price program is more responsible for this price increase than if we have had one.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to say, to my good friend from North Dakota that there is no scarcity in meat, as between last week and this week, which would justify the tremendous increase in the price of meat. That is, the over-all supply of meat to which the Senator from North Dakota has directed attention in no way justifies the increase in the price of meat on the part of wholesalers as compared with the prices last week and the prices being quoted this week. That cannot be justified, and it can be explained only by the fact that those who have control over the channels of distribution of meat are taking a profiteering advantage of the Korean war. I do not like it. I am glad to hear the Senator from South Carolina point out that as chairman of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, he does not like it, and that he proposes to find out the causes for it.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I think the question of unreasonable price rises is quite as objectionable to the producer, to the farmer, and to the feeder as it is to consumers. I think it is uncalled for and very objectionable from a long-range farmer viewpoint. Producers are always hurt by extreme price fluctuations.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from North Dakota is absolutely right. If a poll were taken of the cattlemen, sheepmen, hog raisers, and other producers of livestock, they would express the same sort of resentment which the Senators from North Dakota, South Carolina, and Oregon are expressing this afternoon on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

RECORD for the information of the Senate.

There being no objection, the communications from Justice Bottomly were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF MONTANA,
SUPREME COURT,
Helena, June 1, 1950.

Re Waterton-Belly Rivers.

Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JIM: As you know, I have been working for over 2 years on the matter of getting a reference before the International Commission, American-Canadian Border, for a division and settlement of the waters of the Waterton-Belly Rivers.

These two rivers originate in Glacier National Park, in Montana, flow north between two ranges across the international border into Canada. The approximate flow is 400,000 acre-feet. If all this flow could be put on land for irrigation it would mean that it would cover 400,000 acres 1 foot deep. About 1 to 2 inches is all that is needed for irrigation for row crops, but three to five applications are needed during the growing season.

Now the Canadians started some 3 years ago to get going on putting this water on their land. They are now engaged in building a dam on the Belly. They have a canal surveyed to bring the water of the Waterton into the Belly above said dam. Then they will divert the water as far east through Alberta into Saskatchewan. Their Canadian Government has entered into the picture and has authorized expenditures for the whole project.

Our Reclamation Bureau has made some surveys—the idea is to make a treaty with Canada. Then the Bureau, if authorized, would build a high dam on the Belly with Canada and store all this water, then divert our equitable share through a natural sag or draw, a gravity flow canal into Montana about where Sweet Grass is, then take the water both east and west from there onto the land. Mr. Sloan has said this is the most feasible program.

I do not need to elaborate to you what an asset 200,000 acres of irrigated land would mean to Montana and the Nation in raising food and livestock. I am enclosing a copy of an editorial and news articles on that feature.

Either Canada gets this forever and our acres parch forever or we get an equitable share and we have a producing asset forever.

This matter has been before the International Commission for over a year. It has been charged by some that the Canadians are arbitrary in this matter; that they are dragging their feet and won't agree to anything, hoping to delay the matter without action until they get this water on their land—then it would be practically impossible for the United States to ever get a drop.

I don't think, at least I hope, that this is not the attitude of the Canadians. We have always had the most friendly relations with the Canadians, and I am confident that when we make this matter clear to them they will be fair to us, and the good-neighbor relations between our State and the Canadians across the border will continue as they have in the past.

The Commission is holding two meetings in Montana, in June, at Shelby June 12, then at Havre June 17, and two meetings at Canadian points. It is to be hoped that we may be able to work out this problem with our Canadian friends in a spirit of justice and fair play.

The other alternative for us to get this water is to drill an all-American tunnel through the mountains and also build a dam across Waterton Lake along the boundary line and bring the water to our parched land, but this is a very expensive proposition. Nevertheless, it is well known that we do not stop at expense when we recognize that a program is indispensable to the protection of our rights. A bill has been introduced in Congress to drill this tunnel, but I think we should delay action on that measure while we undertake to convince the Canadians of the justice of our position. If the Canadians act fairly in this matter, it will avoid a heavy expense on us which we would have to bear in order to protect our interests.

As you can see, JIM, time is of the essense, and a determination should be made soon if we expect any water. You know Mr. Valance, an attorney in the State Department who handles these matters, is here now gathering information and arranging for the meetings. He is keen and alert to the situation. I hope you can contact him upon his return to Washington after these hearings. I told him that the time had come to act firmly in this matter and let our neighbors across the border understand that we intend to insist on a fair division of this water, and that unless they acquiesce we will be compelled to take such action as is necessary to protect our interests.

I think some speeches should be made in both the House and Senate, explaining this situation in detail so that the public may understand the problem. I have written Senator LANGER as his State is interested in controlling the Red River, another border stream. All these questions clear across the country along the border should be handled together as one problem, not piecemeal. Am enclosing copy of my letter to him.

Thank you to give attention to this, JIM, as it appears to me to be not only an international question but one of the biggest matters for the good of Montana in particular and for the country as a whole.

Sincerely yours,

R. V. BOTTOMLY.

MAY 27, 1950.

Re Tidelands and Waterton and Belly Rivers.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: I am writing to you as I know you always recognize the equities in a case. You may not know but I was one of three attorneys general of the States who fought in every way I could the so-called tidelands steal, which you had a lot to do with in helping to defeat and in sustaining the President's veto. I notice you will again have the matter before you.

Two years ago while I was attorney general I prepared a brief on the subject and, thinking it might be of some use to you, I am enclosing a copy. I have just recently had a letter from Harold Ickes, to whom I had submitted a copy and asked him, if, as an administrator, he thought that my analysis was valid and correct as to the bill now in Congress. He answered, stating that it was as valid today as when written, in his opinion. I would like your reaction to my brief at your convenience.

Now as to the Belly-Waterton Rivers: These rivers arise in Glacier National Park, Mont., flow north into Canada between two ranges, and fed by the perpetual snows, glaciers, and rains, they flow into Canada at the crossing of the international boundary. There is a flow of approximately 400,000 acre-feet.

Montana has hundreds of thousands of acres of arid land, superior soils, just east of the Rocky Mountain range, which with this water would be converted into a perpetual, highly productive garden, producing row crops, fibers, alfalfa, and feed crops for livestock for all time to come.

The Bureau of Reclamation has reported that by building a high dam on the Waterton near Lethbridge, Alberta, diverting the Belly into the Waterton by short canal, the equitable share flowing from the United States could be diverted back into the United States by gravity through a natural depression at a very economical figure.

The other alternative is to drive a tunnel through the mountains and bring the water onto the lands, but at a very high cost. This matter is now before the International Commission for adjustment but the Canadians are arbitrary and are working feverishly to perfect an irrigation works, construct dams, and divert and put all this water on their lands before a decision can be reached through the Commission. The Commissioners are holding two hearings on this matter in Montana, one at Shelby, June 12, and one at Havre, June 17, and two in Canada.

Mr. Valance, attorney for the United States Department in Charge of United States-Canada Border Problems, is now here. I have known him for years. He is keen and knows the works.

I have been working for over 2 years on this matter. The magnitude of this problem is set forth in an enclosed editorial and article.

The reason I am writing is that time is of the essence herein. We don't want to lose this water which is a great national asset as well as a great benefit to Montana, as the editorial sets forth.

Now the Red River in Canada and your State needs controlling. From this side of the international line there isn't much that this country can do, but our Government could participate with Canada in building dams or other works to arrest the flood menace and as a part of the consideration Canada should consent to an equitable division of our Waterton-Belly waters. In other words, it is my theory that all waters of the international border should be considered as one problem clear across the board by the International Commission, instead of piecemeal and dealing with each matter separately.

The Canadians have been very arbitrary in this matter, bluntly telling the United States that if we think we can get this water go ahead and take it. They know the only way we can take it is by tunneling through the mountains. The cost would be terrific unless figured on a hundred-year basis. But with their consent we could, if the Senate approved by treaty, assist in building the high dam near Lethbridge and divert the water to our lands with very moderate expense.

Mr. Valance will return to Washington after these hearings, and I hope you can get together and go over this matter, as both projects are of utmost importance to the States concerned and to the United States also. This has been written hurriedly; hope you get my idea. I am also writing our Senator, JAMES E. MURRAY.

Sincerely yours,

R. V. BOTTOMLY.

JOHN J. MUCCIO, UNITED STATES AMBASSADOR TO KOREA

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I desire to have printed in the RECORD a release which the Secretary of State has authorized of a telegram sent by him, by direction of the President, to the Honorable John J. Muccio, United States Ambassador to the Republic of Korea. It gives me a special pleasure to ask for this insertion in the RECORD because of the fact that Ambassador Muccio is a personal friend of mine and a fellow Rhode Islander.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
July 13, 1950.

Secretary of State Dean Acheson has sent the following message to the Honorable John J. Muccio, United States Ambassador to the Republic of Korea:

"The President has asked me to extend to you and to your staff his appreciation and commendation for your courageous and effective performance of duty since the onset of the present emergency in Korea.

"Your prompt and accurate reporting of the situation, the dispatch and efficiency with which you carried out the evacuation of the many American citizens for whom you were responsible, and the confidence which you have inspired in the face of the unprovoked aggression against Korea are in the finest tradition of the Foreign Service."

ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate finishes its business today it stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

SUGGESTED 10-PERCENT ADDITION TO TAXES FOR MILITARY PURPOSES

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes to make a suggestion concerning the war effort.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the threat of becoming involved in a world war is now greater than the threat that confronted us in 1940. In that year the Congress authorized an expansion of our Military Establishment, provided for a draft of manpower, and passed a special tax bill to help finance that preparedness program.

That tax bill, which I helped frame, provided that commencing the first of the following calendar year and continuing for a period of 5 years all taxpayers should add 10 percent to their tax bills and that the funds so created should be placed in a special trust fund to be used exclusively for military purposes.

In this emergency I suggest reenactment of that law to become effective January 1, 1951, but exempting this time all excise taxes since they are still at the full war rate. Such a tax, applied only to personal and corporate income would raise in special defense money approximately $2,000,000,000 a year at the current rate of national income. It would not be retroactive on anyone because provision could be made for those reporting on a fiscal year basis to apply the increase only to that portion earned in calendar 1951.

At the present time the top effective personal income rate is 82 percent, but the 10-percent increase would not fall as heavily on those in the top brackets as might appear at first glance because of the law passed several years ago to permit husband and wife to divide the family income. That provision gave substantial tax relief to married persons with joint incomes up to $400,000. For those in that category the present top effective rate of 82 percent applies only to that portion of income above $200,000 and the additional 10 percent would not be a 10-percent addition to the rate, but merely 10 percent of the computed tax liability.

I have received letters and have read editorials in the Virginia newspapers indicating that Congress should act promptly to put the Nation on a full war footing. In my opinion, such a step is not now required, and would be calculated to do more harm than good. It was difficult enough to make OPA work during World War II. It was impossible to make it work a year after the war ended. There is an abundance of food, of clothing, and of many other consumer items, and no occasion to ration their distribution. It might be wise to give the President stand-by powers to allocate steel, which is so essential to the war effort, although I am confident that it can be accomplished by a voluntary agreement. It might be advisable to give the Federal Reserve Board stand-by powers to control consumer credit, which now is at an all-time high; but that likewise, to a large extent, could be accomplished by voluntary cooperation between banks and the merchants whose commercial paper they handle.

Undoubtedly, the best and safest way to control the issuance of too much new money through deficit financing and the inflationary pressure of that new money is to absorb at least a part of it through taxation. Aside from that desirable result, it will be inviting ultimate financial disaster if we run the national debt to such large proportions that confidence will be lost in Government bonds. In the budget now pending, there is a potential deficit of four or five billion dollars; and that budget carries no appropriation for more than $5,000,000,000 of E bonds or savings bonds which will mature next year, the assumption being that those now holding those bonds will buy new ones. Should that assumption not materialize, a terrific strain would be placed upon the commercial bond market in refinancing that obligation.

Although the time may come when we shall be forced to put our entire economy on a war footing, the first step in that direction undoubtedly is taxes; and many patriotic citizens will gladly pay additional taxes if the law imposing them provides that they shall be sequestered for military purposes only, and not made available for unnecessary domestic spending.

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now before the Senate is on agreeing to the amendment, which was passed over yesterday, in the Department of Agriculture section of the appropriation bill, on page 221, beginning in line 19.

ENDING THE COLD WAR—IV

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, for many weeks past I have addressed the Senate on the subject of winning and ending the cold war. The cold war has now become a hot one, which is the way in which we had every reason to believe the cold war would end, in view of the fact that we never fought it with intelligence and energy. Had we done so, the Politburo would have been weaker at home than it is now, and the free world would have been stronger in this emergency than it now shows itself to be.

We have ahead of us the long, grinding months of making up, by the expenditure of billions of dollars and how many lives we cannot estimate, for the lack of engaging the enemy on the field where he was deployed—the field of the minds and loyalties of men.

In concluding this series of observations I wish to refer briefly to two recent opportunities for successful engagement with the enemy from which some advantage may yet be salvaged, although the full advantage of the opportunity has been lost.

Let me first call attention to the semi-humorous but deadly serious charge of strewing potato bugs over the farms of eastern Germany, which charge, being practically uncontested, was later enlarged to include Czechoslovakia as well. I referred to this in a hearing on Senate Resolution 243 before the Foreign Relations Committee. I said:

> Why should not this accusation bring from us an offer to donate free of charge X tons of DDT to the potato growers of East Prussia? This chemical not only killed the bugs in Aroostook County, Maine, but it likewise destroyed other parasites and hindered the spread of most diseases the potato plant is afflicted with.
>
> We have nothing but good wishes and good will for the people of east Germany. Why not express it in this light-hearted and practical way. Undertakings of this sort should be part and parcel of the measures to be undertaken under Senate Resolution 243.

The serious and dangerous undertone to this silly accusation should be clear to all. Potato bugs and disease germs are too closely parallel to be ignored. To have let the accusation go with a simple denial, and without taking advantage of the possibilities for human appeal in the thing, leads us one step further toward new savageries in modern warfare. But there is still another lost battle of even greater significance.

Mr. President, I refer to a serious and effective offensive on the battlefield of ideas which was launched at the so-called World Peace Congress in Stockholm on March 15–19, 1950, held under the chairmanship of Frederic Joliot-Curie, the French Nobel prize winner. For the record, the American attendance at this so-called Peace Congress should be noted. The delegates were Mr. J. Rogge, former Assistant Attorney General of the United States and a vice chairman of the conference; the artist Rockwell Kent; the writer Albert Kahn; and Mr. Johannes Steel, vice president of the Progressive Party.

The ingeniousness of the work done by this Peace Congress is to be found in the wording of the manifesto which they produced. I quote:

> We demand the unconditional prohibition of the atomic weapon as a weapon of intimidation and mass extermination of people.

We demand the establishment of strict international control over the implementation of this decision.

We consider that the government which first uses the atomic weapon against any other country will commit a crime against humanity and shall be regarded as a war criminal.

We call upon all people of good will all over the world to sign this appeal.

Why should not such a manifesto appeal to people all over the world, and why should not millions and millions of people attach their signatures to it?

Mr. President, it was calculated some little time ago that something over 130,000,000 signatures have been attached to this manifesto. Since that time other millions have signed. A news item shortly before the invasion of South Korea indicated that one and one-half million had signed north of the thirty-eighth parallel. The Russians know how to devise a good idea, spread it, broadcast, and make it effective. We do not. As a result, millions of people behind the iron curtain and in the missionary areas where Communist propaganda is at work are led to class Russia as being a peace-loving country, and the United States becomes more firmly settled than ever in the popular mind as being the world's warmonger.

But now let us see where we can get hold of this Russian declaration whose possibilities we could turn to the advantage of the free world. The second paragraph of the manifesto reads:

We demand the establishment of strict international control over the implementation of this decision.

Is not this an acceptance of the United Nations plan?

Mr. President, let us take them up. Let us take them up. Let us take them up. Is not that exactly what we have been asking for? Talk about folly—how can we have the folly to allow these millions of signatures to be attached to a petition for doing what we have been trying to pursuade the Russians to do from the very start of our negotiations over the use of the atomic bomb? What is the matter with us? Are we thinking about something else than war or peace? Have we gone into senile decay?

It is not too late now for the State Department, by world-wide broadcast and direct diplomatic action, to take Russia up on her new and our old proposal for the control of the A-bomb.

Mr. President, we wait to see whether that Department remains a dangerous liability or charts for us a new course of effective service to our national interest and to the safety of the free nations of the globe.

So much for opportunities whose full possibilities have been missed but from which some advantage to the free world may still be drawn. In concluding, Mr. President, I wish to refer to earlier proposals of mine which become more timely, more necessary, now that the cold war has reached the boiling point.

Let me first refer to a highly significant piece of information. A friend of mine has in his employ on his farm, a family of Latvian DP's. Their history is incredible. The family itself escaped to western Germany some little time ago. The father, months before, had been seized and taken to a work camp in far Siberia. From that work camp he escaped and made his way mostly on foot over the thousands of miles of Russia, Poland, and eastern Germany until he crossed the border into western Germany and rejoined his family. In all those thousands of miles he sought and obtained nightly food and shelter wherever he might chance to find himself. In province after province of Russia itself as well as in Poland and eastern Germany he found everywhere families and farm houses who were willing to give shelter and aid to a fugitive.

What a story this is. It means that all along these weary miles there was no one so convinced of the virtues of the Politburo that it was felt to be a duty to give up a fugitive to the authorities. Only a strong sense of hostility to the existing Russian Government could have persuaded these hundreds of citizens to have risked reprisals and punishment in giving that shelter. Is not this one story, this single incident, and eye-opener as to the mental and spiritual background of the people against which the Russian Government has to operate within its own territories?

Another evidence is to be found in the great numbers of political prisoners which that government has found it necessary to put away from normal living. Reliable estimates have put these numbers at 9,000,000, excluding women and criminals. When we consider that the total adult male population—between the ages of 18 and 55—is somewhere around 90,000,000, we come up with the astonishing figure that about 15 percent of those adult males are in prison camps. Does that indicate that the Russian people are solidly behind the Russian Government?

If it was advisable to get in touch with the Russian people by the Voice of America and by other means while the cold war was still on, it is a thousand times more advisable now, when our only hope of getting out of this thing without great loss of treasure, lives, and liberties lies in giving the Politburo so much trouble at home as to seriously limit their ability to foment trouble abroad.

From now on the Voice of America must direct itself narrowly and sharply to the present emergency. It must go on the spiritual offensive. It must tell the Russian people that whereas the Western World has been giving freedom to its colonies and conquered peoples, we see their Government rolling over nation after nation, never daring to trust its cause to the choice of the people, but always capturing territory by subversive minorities and force of arms. Against this, in its latest and most flagrant form, the invasion of South Korea, the free world has had to rise in defense of free men everywhere.

The second point which must be hammered home is that there does not exist in the free world, any group anywhere which has anything but friendly feeling for the Russian people. Nowhere is there to be found a nation or a political party or any important individuals who want anything which the Russian people have. What we want for them is the blessings of freedom which we have been enjoying and of which their Government has deprived them and of which it now seeks to deprive the whole world.

We are friends of the Russian people. The insane lust for conquest which possesses their Government is going to impose on the Russian people new hardships, new dangers, new deprivation of the good things of life and of spiritual freedom. Their only enemy is their own Government.

Hitler knew and the Politburo knows how to affect the minds and hearts of men. They did it by the simple telling of simple lies over and over and over again. We can do as much. Rather, we can do more by adopting their technique but with a different message. We can tell the truth in simple, understandable, and straightforward terms over and over and over and over again. The time has come for that.

On this floor in the months past I have from time to time suggested the use of such unconventional means of reaching the Russian people as the employment of free balloons dropping messages of good will over the thousands of square miles of Russian territory. These messages will not lie rotting in the fields and streets. They will be passed from hand to hand. They likewise should be simple, primarily pictorial, and reiterate in varying form but with unvarying persistence the fact that we of the Western World have a common cause with the people of Russia. We are not against them. We are for them. Their hope for the future lies in our success. Our failure condemns them to permanent slavery.

Mr. President, when I have made this suggestion in times past it has been intimated to me strongly that this is not a proper diplomatic procedure—that a Nation which undertakes this is violating the sovereignty of the holy preserves of the Politburo. We have passed the period of striped-pantie etiquette. When the North Korean armies and armanent swept south over the thirty-eighth parallel, these rules of formal procedure went into the ash can. Does the State Department know that yet? If not, someone should tell them.

There is one final and tremendously powerful means of reaching the people of Russia, and of the satellite countries behind the curtain, which remains to be described. There are many thousands of liberty-loving patriots gathered on our side of the curtain. They are biting their nails and eating their hearts out. They will not serve for pay as employees of our Government. They will, with sufficient support and with missions to perform, risk their lives and the lives of their wives and children on missions into the heart of the Politburo country. These men must be put to work.

Mr. President, by means such as I have just described and by other means yet to be devised in the light of developments as they appear, we can shorten the hot war.

We can save billions in treasure, and an unknown number of lives of men in our own country and abroad who know what freedom is and who have found its taste so sweet that they are willing to die for it.

Mr. STENNIS and Mr. TAFT addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Mississippi is recognized.

THE KOREAN CRISIS AND MEASURES TO AVOID WORLD WAR III

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, we are being rapidly pushed toward a general war that will threaten our national existence. Neither diplomacy, negotiation, nor wishful thinking will avoid it. Our only hope is to show our utmost in strength, and a grim and unfaltering determination to see things through.

In my opinion there are two definite steps that can be taken that will greatly lessen the chances for a general world-wide war, and win it, should that war come anyway. Without these steps being taken, a general war of almost unbearable length and suffering is certain. The first step is all-out support in men and materials in the Korean war by every member of the United Nations who opposes Soviet aggression. The second step is to go on a wartime production basis in the United States. These two moves are dependent one on the other and will present a force in the world never before known.

The United States failed properly to support the League of Nations and we were thus charged with its failure, and the resulting debacle of World War II. Realizing our mistake, and also appreciating new world conditions, we launched forth in an entirely new and strong position in world affairs, and helped formulate the United Nations, and from its beginnings we have supported this great world movement without stint and without trying to play a dominating role. For this we do not deserve, nor do we claim any special credit.

Further, in recognition of the war-depleted conditions of many of our fellow members in the United Nations, we have sponsored for several years, and still sponsor an economic recovery program that covers most of western Europe. This has been at a cost of billions of dollars to us. Also, a like program has been extended to other areas of the world. For this we do not deserve, nor do we claim any special credit.

Further still, in recognition of their present need for assistance, and in reliance on their honor and integrity, we have sponsored and financed a huge military assistance program to all the Atlantic Pact nations and to other extended areas, including Korea. For all of this we do not deserve, nor do we claim any special credit.

At the call of the United Nations we immediately rushed men, planes, goods, and guns to far-distant Korea, to stop the brutal attacks of the communistic hordes. Our money is being spent, our material is being consumed, and more, our men are dying by the day, by the week.

This is the test. Where is the actual support from our United Nations allies? Where is the ground support? Where are even the firm promises of something tangible and definite that can be counted on? Week has followed week, but little definitely has been done, and little has been furnished. The call has gone forth to the United Nations members by Secretary General Lie. What is the response?

I know that over-all plans have to be made and then men and materials available have to be fitted into this plan in the most effective manner and places. This requires time. But firm pledges can be forthcoming immediately. I am not unmindful of the absolute necessity of having strong forces available at other strategic and in highly important areas of the world. As to other members of the United Nations, the impossible is not expected; the unreasonable is not demanded.

However, in this world crisis, no member nation of the United Nations should be the final judge of the extent of their obligations, nor of their ability to perform these obligations.

Each member nation can at least submit all the pertinent facts as to their ability and as to their surrounding situation to the over-all governing authorities of the United Nations, and let this over-all group decide what is reasonable support for each nation to furnish. Regardless of danger spots elsewhere, there would be a tremendous world-wide psychological power behind an all-out, all-flag, united effort in Korea. Let the other member-nation flags be unfurled and take their places alongside the Stars and Stripes, with the blue and white flag of the United Nations.

This is the test. We have met the call. Shall the United Nations continue as a reality, as an active force to be felt, or shall it continue only as a plan on paper? We, the people of the United States, are entitled to know. If we do not have an effective United Nations, then we are entitled to know that also. Then we shall make other plans. In the realm of practical affairs, we shall have little or no choice, except to abandon the United Nations, withdraw our own commitments, and travel along the road, the hard road of mere self-preservation.

But even granting the most hopeful results from the developments from other members of the United Nations, it is still a painful fact that we must go largely on a war economy. Time saved now in doing so will mean blood and misery and lives saved in months and years to come.

We hate controls, we hate regimentation. They hazard our freedom. I appreciate the fact that if we go into controls, it is possible we shall never come out from under controls. But if we do not go in, we may never come through as a nation. I appreciate the fact that in a long war, we could lose our form of government, even if we did not lose the war; and we could well lose the capitalistic system even if we did not lose the war. However, it seems clear to me that in order to preserve this very personal freedom, this capitalistic system, and this, our cherished form of government, it is absolutely necessary to have these hated controls, and the sooner, the better. By controls, I mean the effective control of wages, of prices, of materials, of manpower, and of production, and with an excess profits tax that actually chokes off excessive war profits.

The industrial production of the United States is the most powerful war factor in the world today. It turned the tide in World War II; to put it in motion will perhaps prevent an all-out world war III. Our failure to meet the obligation of effectively using this production as our most powerful war weapon will be nothing less than criminal negligence.

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 221, line 22, it is proposed to strike out the word "authorize" and to insert in line 23 the words "authorized by Congress."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, last night I raised the question with the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] as to whether the committee amendment would permit the preparation of motion-picture films and other propaganda in behalf of the Brannan plan. I was somewhat concerned about the words "relating to the authorized programs of the various agencies of the Department." They might refer to a propaganda program authorized by the Secretary of Agriculture. It seemed to me that we should make it perfectly clear that what we propose to do is with reference to programs authorized by Congress.

I may say that I have checked the statements made by the distinguished Senator from Georgia. It is true that this proviso has been in every appropriation bill for the past 4 or 5 years. In my opinion, if the committee amendment were not adopted, the power to make such motion pictures would exist in the Commodity Credit Corporation, anyway, in all probability, so that even if we strike out the amendment I doubt that we would change substantially the powers. But if the Senator from Georgia will be willing, by accepting my amendment, to make it clear, which I understand is his own position, that it is not intended in any way to authorize Brannan-plan propaganda, I myself should have no objection.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I stated on yesterday that it was my construction of the language that it permitted only the dissemination of information authorized by Congress. That is still my construction of the language. I have no objection to the amendment to the committee amendment. I find that films which have been made are those which deal principally with the farm program, such as the dissemination of information through the Extension Service. I think

the distinguished Senator from Ohio is unduly suspicious, but I am perfectly willing to accept his amendment.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. The point which the Senator from Georgia made last is that to which I was going to refer. As I understand, all these moving-picture films have been with respect to programs which have been authorized directly by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be glad to read a list of the motion pictures which have been produced up to this time:

Brucellosis, which portrays methods for eradicating the disease on the farms.

Outbreak, a historical documentary film recording how previous outbreaks of this dread plague have been eradicated and suggesting vigilence against the disease at all times.

Today's Chicks, a film to show the farmer how healthy baby chicks are produced by cooperating hatcherymen under the national poultry improvement plan.

Forest Fire Behavior, a film to convey knowledge of fire behavior and action which may be taken toward control.

Black Stem Rust, a film to explain the nature of stem rust, how it damages small grain, and how it may be controlled through elimination of barberry bushes.

It's No Picnic, dealing with the nature and damage by forest fires, the various causes thereof, and specific ways in which forest fires can be prevented.

Dead Out, a two-reel film on forest burning in the Southeast, showing how to burn brush and grass safely.

Blister Rust Control, a series of six pictures on this disease attacking the pine forests of the country, one picture dealing with the life history of the disease and its control in a general way, and one picture for each of five regions in the country on the value of the pine and the specific problems in each region.

I may say further, Mr. President, that I have an extract from the House report on the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1943 which was passed in the calendar year 1942. It states that the consolidation was a part of the economies to be effected in order to help the war effort, and that it was provided in the bill as an economy measure and not to propagandize the Brannan plan or any other controversial question. However, I have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Georgia if these moving pictures are made solely in the Office of Information. I should like to know whether or not any other moving pictures have been made by any other division besides the Office of Information. Does the Senator have the record on that point?

Mr. RUSSELL. As I understand, up to now all the pictures have been made by the Office of Information.

Mr. WHERRY. Can the Senator positively state that as a fact?

Mr. RUSSELL. No. That was my understanding. I do not know it to be a fact.

Mr. WHERRY. I am very much interested in this amendment. The House must have stricken out this provision for some reason. I agree it has been in the appropriation bill since 1943. However, this year the House deleted it.

Mr. RUSSELL. The House did not strike it out. It went out on a point of order. One Member of the House made a point of order against a number of provisions of the bill, and under the peculiar rules of the House of Representatives they were all subject to the point of order, and they all went out. We restored most of them. This is the only one as to which there has been any controversy up to now.

Mr. WHERRY. At page 267 of the House hearings justification is given for these programs. The Department of Agriculture makes this statement:

The primary functions of the Office of Information are (1) over-all coordination of all information work in the Department and (2) final editing and clearance of all publications and releases of information to the public. The Office provides a service to the Department and its constituent agencies designed to assist farmers, organizations, and institutions interested in agriculture, and the public at large, by providing factual information on results of agricultural research work, trends in agricultural production, prices, and consumption, the scope of agricultural programs and policies, and similar information which will assist farmers and the public to obtain useful knowledge pertaining to the Nation's agriculture.

It goes on to recount the work involved and emphasizes in detail some of it. It seems to me that the language is sufficiently broad to encompass not only the presentation of the Brannan plan, but any other plan which might be hatched by the Department of Agriculture, and it could be publicized not only by the Office of Information but material could be gathered and publicized by other divisions or bureaus, even though the Office of Information did not do so. What does the Senator think about that?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not see anything dangerous in the language to which the Senator has referred. When the Department of Agriculture was established it was designed to be an agency for the purpose of disseminating information pertaining to agriculture. That was its primary purpose. All that has been added to it since then, by way of farm-action programs, has been merely supplemental, because the primary purpose of the Department of Agriculture is to disseminate information pertaining to agriculture.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator will permit me to say so, I agree with him thoroughly in that statement. So far as research is concerned, I want to go as far as we possibly can. In fact, I should like to go even farther than we have gone. I think research results should be publicized throughout the country for the benefit of farmers.

Mr. RUSSELL. They certainly are not worth anything if they are not publicized.

Mr. WHERRY. This provision, however, raises an entirely different question. From the language read, which is the justification by the Department, not only the Brannan plan but any other policy which might be advocated by the Department of Agriculture, though not authorized by Congress, could be publicized to the public generally.

I should like to ask the Senator one more question. On page 358 of the House hearings appears a statement to which I should like to call attention. Has the Senator a copy of the House hearings?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am sorry to say that I have not. My assistant is endeavoring to get a copy of them.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall quote from page 358: "RMA project No. 205. General Economics of Marketing." In 1949 the appropriation was $13,000. In 1950 the appropriation was $134,850. I do not have the budget estimate or the amount allocated to 1951. This may be a perfectly legitimate appropriation. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator the reason for the expansion. What is the justification for an increase from $13,000 in 1949 to $134,850 in 1950. Does it have anything to do with the information we have been talking about?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not believe it has the slightest thing to do with it. All research which is carried on by the Research and Marketing Administration must be approved by an outside committee, which is appointed for the purpose of studying the whole research question. It has nothing to do with the Brannan plan, if that is what the Senator has in mind. All research projects which are being carried on in the Department of Agriculture are submitted to the committee. I did not read them to the last detail, but I did scan through the general objectives of the research projects. None of them related to the Brannan plan.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I think this is very important. Are these moving pictures brought up to date? Have any of them been made since those mentioned in the list the Senator read?

Mr. RUSSELL. The motion pictures set forth in the list constitute the entire number which have been produced since the information appropriations for the various bureaus of the Department were consolidated, as they were in 1942. I may say to the Senator that if we adopt the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], which I have agreed to accept so far as I could as chairman of the subcommittee handling the appropriation, there would be a restriction on all these items which would definitely prevent the publication of any propaganda for the Brannan plan. I have been suspicious that that was the purpose of my friend from Ohio.

Secretary Brannan has defended his plan with great vigor and industry all over the Nation. He has made any number of speeches for it, and there has been some question as to the manner in which some of the audiences were assembled. But I have never yet heard any specific

charge that any of the films which have been made were in anywise connected with the Brannan plan. If they had been, when we consider how controversial the Brannan plan is, undoubtedly someone would have written to the Senator from Nebraska or to the Senator from Georgia or someother Senator and said, "I saw a moving picture that is put out to publicize and to support the Brannan plan."

I am not a supporter of the Brannan plan. I am opposed to the philosophy of that plan sponsored by the Secretary of Agriculture, but I concede to him the right to go anywhere he pleases in the United States and make a speech any time he chooses in support of his plan. It may build up some support for the plan in my own State, and it may heap coals on my back in an endeavor to drive me to support the plan. But that is one of the things we will have to face when we come to it. I am not apprehensive that these films will support the Brannan plan, because I do not think the Secretary of Agriculture would adopt that policy, in view of the amendment, and I believe that if he did it would backfire on him.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am not contending that Secretary Brannan does not have a right to support any plan he desires to, on his own, and to go to the four corners of the United States and speak on it to the public. I am in total agreement with the Senator in that respect. But I do not want the Secretary to use the taxpayers' money in any informational service to publicize a plan he sponsors, unless it is authorized by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. RUSSELL. Neither do I.

Mr. WHERRY. That is my only apprehension in this matter. I certainly have a right, I believe, to try to make it as clear as I can that we do not want him to do that.

Mr. RUSSELL. No one challenges the Senator's right. I have merely pointed out that the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio limits this expenditure to programs approved by the Congress.

Mr. WHERRY. That leads to the next question. Does it limit it? It limits it, I think, only to the transfers.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, that is all it limits it to.

Mr. WHERRY. How about limiting it to the full amount. It seems to me that if we put a limit of $300,000 on the amount which might be transferred from the small agencies to the office of Information, it is just as important to limit the $1,265,800 which the Office of Information can use for the same purpose.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. My amendment deals only with the particular $300,000 of the committee amendment. I was dealing with the committee amendment only. If the Senator wants a general limitation, I think it should be offered in an amendment to the bill itself.

Mr. WHERRY. I was going to ask the Senator from Georgia another question. I understand the Senator is not worried about these funds, and I have a wholesome respect for his judgment, as he knows, so that I am inclined to go along with the Senator's statement. But we are writing in an amendment to limit the authorization for these purposes to $300,000. If that is wise is it not equally wise that possibly an amendment to the general provision should be inserted, affecting programs authorized by the Congress? Would there be any objection to that?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I think that would be splitting hairs to the *n*th degree. If it would afford any great solace to the Senator from Nebraska, I would not oppose it, but I think it is utterly unnecessary. No instances have been brought forward where the Secretary has used these particular funds for the purpose of propagandizing for the Brannan plan.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator answer m yquestion? If it is necessary for the $300,000, is it splitting any more hairs to apply it to the general provision?

Mr. RUSSELL. I accepted the amendment in order to allay the fears of the distinguished Senator from Ohio and others.

Mr. WHERRY. Would the Senator allay my fears by inserting——

Mr. RUSSELL. No; am not willing to say before we reach the point where an amendment would be in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator reflect on it?

Mr. RUSSELL. I certainly will.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator feel there is any difference, so far as the funds are concerned?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; and to be perfectly frank, my reason for accepting the amendment of the Senator from Ohio was to expedite the business of the Senate. I do not think the amendment makes a particle of difference one way or the other, but I thought it would be better to accept a harmless amendment than to spend 3 or 4 hours on the floor of the Senate discussing this proposition, and having ghosts raised, and the statement made that all this money was going to be used to propagandize the Brannan plan. I am not for the Brannan plan. I have been opposed to it from the day it was announced, but I am not going around with my lance all set to joust with windmills or to attempt to slay dragons which do not exist.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator is building up a pretty big bogeyman for me to slay. I ask, Is there any difference between limiting the $300,000 and the $1,265,000?

Mr. RUSSELL. Technically, I do not see that there is.

Mr. WHERRY. Then the dragon has already been slain, and I ask the distinguished Senator if he will accept an amendment, when the proper time comes, to offer such an amendment to the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be disposed to, if it would be any gratification to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator. I appreciate his statement.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not want to be committed to it now, until I have an opportunity to read all the language, to see where it is to be in the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator, and I hope he will look with favor upon it, because my opinion is that if we are to try to limit the $300,000 which may be transferred, it is just as important to apply it to the $1,265,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think it is necessary in either case.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand the Senator, but if it is necessary in one case and the Senator permits the amendment there, I ask the distinguished Senator to accept it in the other case.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be happy to look into it, but the amendment will not be in order until we complete action on the committee amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia if he remembers whether there is a limitation on the amount the Commodity Credit Corporation may spend for publicity purposes, and, if so, what the amount is.

Mr. RUSSELL. Answering off the cuff, without guaranteeing the correctness of the statement, I think the Commodity Credit Corporation is included within the $300,000 limit, and I think that funds could be transferred from the Commodity Credit Corporation up to that amount.

Mr. AIKEN. Would the Senator say that if this amendment were voted down and the sound pictures were not permitted to be made in the Secretary's office, he could direct them to be made through the Commodity Credit Corporation?

Mr. RUSSELL. They say as much. They say they have ample authority under the law. These funds are concentrated into the $300,000 for the purpose of simplifying the bookkeeping. This is a limitation. If we vote this provision out of the bill, they could spend any funds that were available for informational purposes. This amendment tends to achieve the result the Senator from Vermont seeks, in that it puts a limitation on the $300,000, on the funds which can be spent.

Mr. AIKEN. I hope the Senator from Georgia will be proved to be correct in that view, and that the officials will not exceed the authority.

I should like to call the attention of the Senator to just one other matter which I think he can clear up. It is in connection with the provision on page 204, line 21, where the language reads:

Provided further, That none of the funds herein appropriated or made available for the functions assigned to the Agricultural Adjustment Agency pursuant to the Executive Order No. 9069, of February 23, 1942, shall be used to pay the salaries or expenses of any regional information employees or any State information employees, but this shall not preclude the answering of inquiries or supplying of information at the county level to individual farmers.

As I understand, the prohibition which was inserted in the law in 1944 prohibits this information for such services at the levels down through the county and the community levels. In last year's appropriation bill, the references to the community and county were omitted. Does the Senator from Georgia understand that the proviso I have just read means that the community and county levels of the PMA are restricted to the answering of inquiries and the supplying of information which properly comes within the scope of their own work?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think that is correct. The Senator from Vermont knows well that that language has been in the appropriation bills for some 5 or 6 years. I do not recall exactly when it was first inserted.

Mr. AIKEN. I think it was slightly changed last year.

Mr. RUSSELL. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. AIKEN. I think it was changed last year, as I recall.

Mr. RUSSELL. No; the Senate undertook to change it, but the House refused to yield, and I think it finally went out of the bill. I do not recall the year, but 5 or 6 years ago the PMA was setting up a great many so-called information centers in its regional and State offices, and a violent controversy arose as between two of the major farm organizations as to the propriety of those offices and the information they were furnishing, one of the farm organizations taking the position that some of the information was designed to aid the other farm organizations. The general complaint was made that it was entirely too expensive. So that limitation was put in originally, as I recall, in the Senate, and it has been in the bill ever since then.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Georgia is chairman of the Subcommitee on Agriculture of the Appropriations Committee. It is not intended, is it, that this proviso should authorize the employment of county information specialists or propagandists, as they are commonly called?

Mr. RUSSELL. It certainly is not intended to employ any propagandists of any kind. It is intended to limit it to actual information as to farming information for the counties. Where they have the clear crop system in counties thousands of questions arise that are necessary to be answered, answers are compelled to be made, and we do not want to shut the farmer off if he will incur a penalty by overplanting by as little as 1 acre.

Mr. AIKEN. I was sure that is what the Senator from Georgia intended. I am happy he has made that point plain. I also want to assure the Senator from Georgia that no one is more concerned in making the PMA and other good agricultural programs work than is the Senator from Vermont. But we all know of instances of efforts being made to use local committees for political purposes, and I for one want to stop that practice so far as possible, regardless of in whose interests they may be used.

Mr. RUSSELL. If any program should be kept on a nonpartisan and nonpolitical basis it is the farm program. In my judgment the use of any county committee or the use of any farm program for partisan political purposes would be highly reprehensible, whether it was done to help a Republican, or Democrat, or Progressive, or States Righter, I might add.

Mr. AIKEN. I agree with the Senator from Georgia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I understand that concludes the committee amendments to this chapter of the bill. There are some three amendments which have been printed. I have discussed them with their authors and I should like to receive unanimous consent that the printed amendments to this chapter be considered at this time.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, would the Senator consider my amendment in that group?

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to obtain some information on the Senator's amendment before accepting it.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not want to object to the Senator's request because I should like to help expedite action upon the bill. I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. All committee amendments must be acted upon first, unless unanimous consent is obtained to take up other amendments out of order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the rule under which the Senate is now operating.

Mr. WHERRY. Inasmuch as we have proceeded in that manner with respect to the preceding chapters of the bill, it seems to me we should continue to follow that course unless the amendments in question are very slight. What is proposed to be done by the amendments in question?

Mr. RUSSELL. One of the amendments is to be proposed by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS]. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] has one, which has been the subject of discussion, and I have obtained information with respect to it. The other one is to be offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. That is a printed amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Is that the amendment dealing with meat inspection?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. I have had an opportunity to investigate those three amendments. I have not had an opportunity to investigate the amendment which the Senator from Nebraska intends to propose.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not know why my amendment would require very much investigation.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think it will require much investigation, but I should like to read amendments before I accept them. I should like to read the Senator's amendment before accepting it.

Mr. WHERRY. I should be glad to have my amendment offered last, and the Senator can withhold his consent to my amendment until he has had an opportunity to examine it.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Nebraska has a perfect right to object if he desires. What I just proposed was merely to accommodate Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the request of the Senator from Georgia that, by unanimous consent, the Senate proceed to take up the printed amendments which will be offered from the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, still reserving the right to object, I wish to say that I desire to be constructive about this matter. I am not acting in an arbitrary manner in order to have my amendment accepted. I should like to know, if I can be informed, what the first amendment would do. I know what the last amendment would do. I do not think it would be necessary to have a quorum call to let other Senators know what is to be taken up for consideration. I should like to ask the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] what his amendment is.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator will permit me, I will explain all three printed amendments. The first amendment, proposed by the Senator from Oklahoma, does not in any wise affect the amount of the appropriated funds. It does permit the Soil Conservation Service, in areas where work is now being carried on, to operate in connection with some lands which are not now eligible because they lie between private lands on which they are doing work and public lands in the area of a stream. The amendment would permit them to complete some phases of the projects which are essential to the operation of the whole. It involves no increase in expenditures. It merely clarifies the authority of the Soil Conservation Service.

Mr. WHERRY. Where are the projects located?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think they are located in Texas and Oklahoma. That is my recollection.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, there are 11 States involved: the States of New York, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, Georgia, Tennessee, Mississippi, Iowa, Minnesota, Texas, and California.

Mr. WHERRY. Would this be the beginning merely, and would completion of the work entail some appropriations next year?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, if I may, I shall make a brief statement. In the 1946 flood control act, section 13 authorized certain work on, I believe, 11 different projects. That included the projects recommended by the Department of Agriculture. In some of those projects they did not go far enough to permit of treatment of ditches and gulleys. My amendment gives the Department the right to treat ditches and gulleys.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection to that amendment, Mr. President. What is the next amendment?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] has an amendment which will increase the appropriation for research by $35,000, so as to deal with an outbreak of a disease at-

tacking the spruce and the beech trees in the White Mountains, as I understand. The Senator from New Hampshire does not have a budget estimate, but we have in the form of dead chestnut trees so many monuments to the delay in proceeding to attack these diseases at their source that I told the Senator from New Hampshire I was willing to accept his amendment and take it to conference.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection, Mr. President, to the consideration of the three amendments which have been referred to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous consent request for consideration of the three amendments? The Chair hears none, and unanimous consent is given.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I submit my amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia if he will not confer with the junior Senator from Nebraska? I should be glad to show him where in the bill I wish the language of my amendment to be inserted. I should like to do that so he may decide whether he will accept my amendment after the three others have been considered.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, my differentiation between these three amendments and the Senator's amendment is not due to any desire to resist the Senator's amendment. It is due to the fact that these three amendments have been printed. If the Senator offers his amendment, other amendments will be offered from the floor, and if we are to accept any such floor amendments we should accept all of them at one time so as not to make fish of one and fowl of the other.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator did for the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] exactly what he is speaking of now.

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no.

Mr. WHERRY. The amendment of the Senator from Ohio was not printed.

Mr. RUSSELL. The parliamentary situation in respect to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio was entirely different. His amendment was an amendment to a committee amendment which had to be passed upon. The Senator from Nebraska proposes to offer an amendment to the text of the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly.

Mr. RUSSELL. Which is not in order; whereas the amendment of the Senator from Ohio was in order, and there was nothing the Senator from Georgia could have done to prevent the Senator from Ohio from offering his amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand. But the Senator from Georgia has made a unanimous consent request for consideration of amendments which he will take to conference. I simply ask that my amendment also be taken to conference.

Mr. RUSSELL. I told the Senator from Nebraska I was disposed to accept his amendment, but I should like to look into such matters and at least reasonably understand what I am doing at the time I accept amendments.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Georgia needs no advice with respect to what he is doing. He is one of our most able Senators.

Mr. RUSSELL. I suppose I should accept the Senator's amendment after that statement.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes. I can see no difference between the one and the others. I would deeply appreciate it if the Senator would accept my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first printed amendment coming under the unanimous-consent agreement will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The amendment submitted by Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma and Mr. JOHNSON of Texas is as follows:

On page 200, line 14, before the period insert the following: ": *Provided further*, That of the funds available herein, not in excess of $7,£80,000 may be expended in watersheds heretofore authorized by section 13 of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944, for necessary gulley control, floodwater detention, and floodway structures in areas other than those over which the Department of the Army has jurisdiction and responsibility."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a brief statement explanatory of the amendment which has just been adopted.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. The amendment is recommended.

2. The Flood Control Act of 1936 provides that improvement of rivers and other waterways for flood control shall be under the jurisdiction of the Corps of Army Engineers and that measures for run-off and waterflow retention and soil erosion prevention on watersheds should be under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture. Obviously it was the intention of Congress at the time the Flood Control Act of 1936 was passed that work on main streams would be done by the Army Engineers and soil conservation and erosion work on the watersheds would be done by the Department of Agriculture. If this is true, the work authorized in the above amendment is already covered by general authorization.

3. In the Flood Control Act of 1944 11 watershed programs were specifically authorized for the Department of Agriculture and survey reports were adopted on each of them. Some of these reports such as the Little Sioux Watershed in Iowa, the Los Angeles watershed in California, and so forth, specificially called for authority for gully control, flood water detention, and floodway structures. Some of the other reports such as the Coosa River watershed in Georgia and the Trinity River watershed in Texas did not provide for gully control, flood water detention, and floodway structures specifically, and these measures are now found to be necessary. The Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture has held that these survey reports have the force of law and since the authority for floodway structures, and so forth is omitted from them, the Department of Agriculture, even though it has general authority in the Flood Control Act of 1936 over the alluvial lands, does not have authority beyond that specifically written into the survey reports on the 11 programs set forth in the Flood Control Act of 1944.

4. Of the $9,880,000 included in the omnibus appropriation bill for flood-control work of the Department of Agriculture, the department intends to expend approximately $4,300,000 for gully control, flood water detention, and floodway structures in the alluvial lands. Some of the expenditures are already authorized in the survey reports covering the projects, but unless this amendment is adopted money for this purpose will not be available for such work in the Potomac River watershed, Virginia, West Virginia, Maryland, and Pennsylvania; Coosa River watershed, Georgia and Tennessee, the Middle Colorado River watershed, Texas; the Trinity River watershed, Texas; and the Washita River watershed, Oklahoma and Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment coming under the unanimous-consent agreement.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The amendment submitted by Mr. BRIDGES is as follows:

On page 196, line 6, strike out "$2,995,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$3,030,000, of which $55,000 shall be available for such investigations and experiments at Bartlett Experimental Forest only."

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, unless some member of the committee objects, I am willing to take the amendment to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment coming under the unanimous-consent agreement.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The amendment submitted by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

On page 179, line 15, strike out "$7,950,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$7,952,500."

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], formerly the Secretary of Agriculture, has stated that he thinks adoption of this amendment is necessary. I was of the opinion that it was not. In the absence of full information, I am willing to take the amendment to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, let me inquire what the amendment will do.

Mr. RUSSELL. The amendment will add $2,500 to the $12,800,000 provided for meat inspection, to allow a part-time inspector at Seattle, Wash., where there is no meat inspector at the present time, according to the Senator from Washington and the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. WHERRY. The amendment also relates to transfers of livestock.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; it relates to the transfer of cattle brought in from Canada; in other words, it relates to the international trade in cattle from Canada.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, it seems to me that the additional amount provided by the amendment is not sufficient. Furthermore, it seems to me the subject matter of the amendment should have been handled by the committee in the course of its consideration of the bill in the first place. If the necessary amounts are not studied and recom-

mended by the committee in the course of its consideration of the bill in the first place, then we are mistaken in everything we do in connection with the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the amendment?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if I may make an observation at this point, let me say that it seems that under the amendment the inspection service relates to cattle in international shipment, for which it is claimed that sufficient authority is not available. Of course the amendment will not cure the difficulty if there is a lack of statutory authority.

Mr. CORDON. Of course not.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senate would have to recede under the circumstances, when the amendment came before the conferees.

However, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] formerly the Secretary of Agriculture, has said that he thinks adoption of the amendment is necessary.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I have no objection to the addition of $2,500 to the appropriation for meat inspection in order to make possible the employment of a meat inspector at Seattle, Wash., or at any other place, so far as that is concerned, where it is necessary. However, it is perfectly apparent to all Senators on the floor of the Senate, I think, that the addition of $2,500 for that purpose does not carry any statutory authority that is not available in the bill at the present time. The amendment would simply add $2,500 to the $12,800,000, as I recall, which already is available.

It seems to me that, if there is going to be any presumption in favor of any committee and its work in attempting to reach logical conclusions with respect to appropriations, the time to commence to do so is now. If the amendment was necessary, it should have been presented to the committee, and the committee should have been given an opportunity to consider it and to act upon it.

So I object to adoption of the amendment by unanimous consent.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection until I can make an explanation?

Mr. CORDON. I am glad to withhold the objection.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the shortage of inspectors for animals and also for plants imported into this country is not confined to the State of Washington alone. Trouble has been encountered in many sections of the country as well. It is due primarily, I would say, to the limitation on the number of hours during which an inspector can work. So, along the borders, instead of perhaps going out after supper and inspecting a truckload or a carload of cattle coming into the country, the inspectors are prohibited from doing so at the present time.

There has been a great deal of trouble along the Vermont border and along the coast of Florida in this respect. The Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] and I introduced a bill which would permit the Federal Government to allow the inspectors to work overtime, and, I suppose, to give them overtime pay, and then to recover the cost from the importers, who originally made this complaint, and who seemed willing to pay the additional cost incurred in that way. It was not a matter of cost, but a matter of accommodation, because sometimes the shipments would reach the border a few minutes after the inspector was required to stop work, according to the law; and the result would be that the cattle would have to be kept there all night until the inspector came on duty the next day.

The Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry unanimously reported the bill favorably the other day, and it is now on the calendar. The bill was previously approved by the Department of Agriculture.

So far as I know, there is no opposition to this proposal. Its enactment would alleviate much of the trouble which has been referred to by the Senator from Washington, so far as the shipment of cattle across the border is concerned.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes; if I now have the floor.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I wish to correct a statement I made a few moments ago. The Senator from Washington in discussing his amendment referred to it as a meat-inspection amendment. I thought he was referring to meat inspection at a stockyard; and yesterday I stated that I could not possibly understand how it made any difference whether a cow came from the moon or from Canada or from elsewhere, once the cow was slaughtered.

However, apparently the Senator was speaking of part-time inspectors on the border, rather than meat inspectors at slaughtering houses, because I find that the amendment does not relate to the $12,800,000 which is available for meat inspection, but relates to the $7,950,000 for the control and eradication of animal diseases, which means the inspection of animals on the hoof as they come across the border, to see whether they are free from disease.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct. No amount of appropriation would permit inspection after hours, so long as the inspectors cannot work after 4 o'clock in the afternoon. Even if 20 inspectors were available at a certain point, if they had to stop work at 4 o'clock in the afternoon, the difficulty would continue.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I indicated my objection to adoption of the amendment by unanimous consent. I was under a wrong impression, also, with reference to the identity of the portion of the bill proposed to be amended. Inasmuch as this amendment relates to the eradication and control of animal diseases, it is acceptable to me; I have no objection to it.

However, I should like to inquire of the distinguished Senator from Georgia as to how the legal authority to act in the way suggested, if that authority does not now exist, can be conferred by means of this amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think it can. In my own judgment, I doubt very seriously that it can. My doubt is increased by the fact that the committee clerk has handed me a statement from the Department of Agriculture, which I shall now read:

[U. S. Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Research Administration, Bureau of Animal Industry]

The amendment offered by Senator MAGNUSON increasing by $2,500 the item "Animal disease control and eradication" under the head "Salaries and expenses, Animal Industry," would provide for part-time service of an inspector at Seattle, Wash., for public stockyards inspection work. Under present import regulations, cattle imported from Canada for slaughter may be consigned to a public stockyard for sale, otherwise they must be consigned directly to a slaughtering establishment. Public stockyards are those yards covered by Federal inspection of livestock received at such yards. Seattle is not now a public stockyard.

If Seattle is not a public stockyard, I have very grave doubt that the Department could assign an inspector to it to enforce Federal regulations.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Can the Senator from Georgia advise the Senator from Oregon as to how a stockyard can become a public stockyard?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think a stockyard becomes a public stockyard when it is posted and brought under the operation of the inspection item.

Mr. CORDON. Is there a Federal law on the subject?

Mr. RUSSELL. There is.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, if the Senator from Georgia will yield, I might clear up the statement of the Department of Agriculture in regard to a public stockyard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I merely wanted to clear up that matter.

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield, if I do not thereby lose the floor.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It is not a public stockyard in the sense that it is operated by a public body. It is operated by the slaughterhouse which is adjacent to the stockyard, though all other slaughtering houses in the area use the stockyard. It is operated technically and jointly by all of them, but it is under the management of the slaughterhouse which is adjacent to the yard, and it is called the Union Stockyards. Anyone may ship to it. It is a sort of cooperative undertaking, managed, however, by the one slaughterhouse which is adjacent to the yard, because it happens to be located on the railroad sidings.

Mr. AIKEN. Did I not understand the Senator from Washington to say there was a shortage of border inspection?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No, this has nothing to do with border inspection.

Mr. AIKEN. It is not located on the border?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I desire to read a letter I have received from the persons

affected. I placed it in the RECORD yesterday. The letter is very short, and if the Senator from Georgia will permit, I should like to read it. It poses a problem, similar to the question here. The letter was addressed to me under date of June 30, by the Seattle Packing Co., which operates the yard in question, and it reads as follows:

MY DEAR SENATOR: Although the Department of Agriculture recognizes the need for restoring Federal inspection at the Seattle Union Stockyards, it is unable to do so because of a shortage of funds. The Department estimates, however, that only $2,500 is needed to restore the Federal inspection at Seattle as only the part-time services of one veterinarian is required. It is, therefore, suggested that you obtain an appropriation of $2,500 for this purpose. This is important to the Northwest for the following reasons:

Increased control of livestock diseases is a protection to the general public. With Federal inspection the Seattle Union Stockyards would be assured that a veterinarian would be in charge and that adequate inspection with regard to communicable diseases would be in effect.

Livestock producers will be better served under Federal inspection. At the present time the Northwest is served by only two Federal-inspected yards. These are located at Spokane and Portland. Under State law, health requirements are enforced by the Brand Division which require that all female stock be tested and tagged when sold, except when sold to a packer for slaughter or for resale at a federally inspected yard.

Since a federally inspected yard has a veterinarian on duty, the additional expense and delay required by testing female cattle is avoided. Inasmuch as the Seattle Union Stockyards are not now inspected, livestock producers tend to make their shipments either to Spokane or to Portland.

Slaughter in the Northwest area would increase. Since reductions in the tariff on meat from Canada to the United States from 6 to 3 cents per pound, effective January 1, 1948, and the termination of shipments from Canada to the United Kingdom, meat importations to the United States have been greatly increased. Dut to higher wage rates, expenses, etc., in the United States, most of this importation is now in the form of meat that is dressed. It would be desirable to have it come in the form of livestock so that the slaughter and processing could be performed here. Federal inspection at the Seattle Union Stockyards would therefore greatly facilitates the movement of livestock from Canada.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator will suspend a moment, the Chair observes that there is no opposition, apparently, to the pending amendment. The chairman of the subcommittee has accepted it. As the Chair understands, the Senator from Oregon has withdrawn his objection. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, a judge once said to me, "When the court is with you, sit down." I shall now follow that very wise counsel.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] on page 179, line 15.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes, for the time being, the amendments to chapter VI, and brings us to chapter VII, the Department of the Interior.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to return to chapter VI, the agricultural bill. I stepped off the floor of the Senate a moment, and while I was gone the chapter was evidently finished. My understanding from the distinguished Senator from Georgia had been that, if I requested unanimous consent, he would not object to the consideration of an amendment which I desired to offer, on page 220, in line 22, after the word "work" to insert "and programs authorized by Congress."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I do not think the proposed amendment would add to or take from the provision. I have no objection to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senate will temporarily return to the consideration of chapter VI, and will consider an amendment to be offered from the floor by the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I propose the following amendment: On page 220, line 22, after the word "work", to insert "and programs authorized by Congress."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I desire to thank the Senator from Georgia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now proceed to the consideration of chapter VII, and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] is recognized.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I will want to impose upon the patience of the distinguished Senator from Arizona. We are now taking up the chapter on the Department of the Interior, are we not?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Several Senators wanted me to notify them when this chapter was reached. If the distinguished Senator will permit me, and if he will yield for a quorum call, I think we at least ought to have a quorum call. Senators will then be on notice.

Mr. HAYDEN. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum is suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Flanders	Kerr
Anderson	Frear	Kilgore
Benton	Fulbright	Langer
Brewster	George	Leahy
Bricker	Gillette	Lehman
Bridges	Graham	Lodge
Butler	Green	Lucas
Byrd	Gurney	McCarran
Capehart	Hayden	McCarthy
Chapman	Hendrickson	McClellan
Chavez	Hickenlooper	McFarland
Connally	Hill	McKellar
Cordon	Hoey	Magnuson
Darby	Holland	Malone
Donnell	Humphrey	Martin
Douglas	Hunt	Maybank
Dworshak	Ives	Millikin
Eastland	Jenner	Morse
Ecton	Johnson, Colo.	Mundt
Ellender	Johnson, Tex.	Murray
Ferguson	Kem	Myers
Neely	Schoeppel	Thye
O'Conor	Smith, Maine	Tydings
O'Mahoney	Smith, N. J.	Watkins
Pepper	Stennis	Wherry
Robertson	Taft	Wiley
Russell	Thomas, Okla.	Williams
Saltonstall	Thomas, Utah	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

RECOGNITION OF COMMUNIST CHINA

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I have before me a scholarly study dealing with the Recognition of Governments, with special consideration of the current problem with regard to governments in China. The paper was written by Stanley K. Hornbeck and was presented at the forty-fourth annual meeting of the American Society of International Law in Washington, on April 29, 1950. The paper will be printed in the proceedings of the society, but its application to recent action in the United Nations Security Council on the Korean situation makes the study particularly timely now. To make it available to Congress now, I shall ask unanimous consent to have it printed at the close of my remarks.

Mr. Hornbeck is well known for his long service in the Department of State as Chief of the Division of Far Eastern Affairs and as United States Ambassador to the Netherlands.

After presenting the main principles of recognition of governments as developed by authoritative scholars, Mr. Hornbeck makes a reasoned and valuable application of them to the specific question of how the United States ought to deal with the attempt of Communist China to have its government recognized in the place of the Nationalist Republic of China. In the course of his paper Mr. Hornbeck gives strong reasons and argument why the United States need not and should not recognize the Communist Government of China at this time.

Mr. Hornbeck developed this material before the recent outbreak in Korea. Proceedings in the Security Council on the Korean situation offer powerful support to the wisdom of Mr. Hornbeck's conclusions. If the United States had recognized Communist China when we were pressed to do so, and if Communist China was then seated in the Security Council as Russia has tried to bring about by a form of parliamentary blackmail, the Security Council would have been prevented from taking the prompt and decisive action it did take in the Korean situation.

As far back as January 17 of this year I developed this question of recognition in great detail. On this floor I stated:

Recognition of Red China by any country which has been engaged in the fight to contain world communism is surrender on another front of the cold war. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Jan. 17, 1950, p. 492.)

Had we recognized Red China at that time, the tragedy would have proved to be a double one. First, it would have been a spiritual blow to the hopes of all people of the world, particularly those in southeastern Asia, who look to us for

81st Congress, 2d Session } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES { Document No. 646

SITUATION IN KOREA

MESSAGE

FROM

THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

TRANSMITTING

A REPORT ON THE SITUATION IN KOREA

JULY 19, 1950.—Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

To the Congress of the United States:

I am reporting to the Congress on the situation which has been created in Korea, and on the actions which this Nation has taken, as a member of the United Nations, to meet this situation. I am also laying before the Congress my views concerning the significance of these events for this Nation and the world, and certain recommendations for legislative action which I believe should be taken at this time.

At 4 o'clock in the morning, Sunday, June 25, Korean time, armed forces from north of the thirty-eighth parallel invaded the Republic of Korea.

The Republic of Korea was established as an independent nation in August 1948, after a free election held under the auspices of the United Nations. This election, which was originally intended to cover all of Korea, was held only in the part of the Korean peninsula south of the thirty-eighth parallel, because the Soviet Government, which occupied the peninsula north of that parallel, refused to allow the election to be held in the area under its control.

The United States, and a majority of the other members of the United Nations, have recognized the Republic of Korea. The admission of Korea to the United Nations has been blocked by the Soviet veto.

In December 1948 the Soviet Government stated that it had withdrawn its occupation troops from northern Korea, and that a local regime had been established there. The authorities in northern Korea continued to refuse to permit United Nations observers to pass the

thirty-eighth parallel to supervise or observe a free election, or to verify the withdrawal of Soviet troops.

Nevertheless, the United Nations continued its efforts to obtain a freely elected government for all of Korea and, at the time of the attack, a United Nations Commission, made up of representatives of seven nations—Australia, China, El Salvador, France, India, the Philippines and Turkey—was in the Republic of Korea.

Just 1 day before the attack of June 25, field observers attached to the United Nations Commission on Korea had completed a routine tour, lasting 2 weeks, of the military positions of the Republic of Korea south of the thirty-eighth parallel. The report of these international observers stated that the Army of the Republic of Korea was organized entirely for defense. The observers found the parallel guarded on the south side by small bodies of troops in scattered outposts, with roving patrols. They found no concentration of troops and no preparation to attack. The observers concluded that the absence of armor, air support, heavy artillery, and military supplies precluded any offensive action by the forces of the Republic of Korea.

On June 25, within a few hours after the invasion was launched from the north, the Commission reported to the United Nations that the attack had come without warning and without provocation.

The reports from the Commission make it unmistakably clear that the attack was naked, deliberate, unprovoked aggression, without a shadow of justification.

This outright breach of the peace, in violation of the United Nations Charter, created a real and present danger to the security of every nation. This attack was, in addition, a demonstration of contempt for the United Nations, since it was an attempt to settle, by military aggression, a question which the United Nations had been working to settle by peaceful means.

The attack on the Republic of Korea, therefore, was a clear challenge to the basic principles of the United Nations Charter and to the specific actions taken by the United Nations in Korea. If this challenge had not been met squarely, the effectiveness of the United Nations would have been all but ended, and the hope of mankind that the United Nations would develop into an institution of world order would have been shattered.

Prompt action was imperative. The Security Council of the United Nations met, at the request of the United States, in New York at 2 o'clock in the afternoon, Sunday, June 25, eastern daylight time. Since there is a 14-hour difference in time between Korea and New York, this meant that the Council convened just 24 hours after the attack began.

At this meeting the Security Council passed a resolution which called for the immediate cessation of hostilities and for the withdrawal of the invading troops to the thirty-eighth parallel, and which requested the members of the United Nations to refrain from giving aid to the northern aggressors and to assist in the execution of this resolution. The representative of the Soviet Union to the Security Council stayed away from the meeting, and the Soviet Government has refused to support the Council's resolution.

The attack launched on June 25 moved ahead rapidly. The tactical surprise gained by the aggressors, and their superiority in planes, tanks, and artillery, forced the lightly armed defenders to retreat.

The speed, the scale, and the coordination of the attack left no doubt that it had been plotted long in advance.

When the attack came, our Ambassador to Korea, John J. Muccio, began the immediate evacuation of American women and children from the danger zone. To protect this evacuation, air cover and sea cover were provided by the commander in chief of United States forces in the Far East, General of the Army Douglas MacArthur. In response to urgent appeals from the Government of Korea, General MacArthur was immediately authorized to send supplies of ammunition to the Korean defenders. These supplies were sent by air transport, with fighter protection. The United States Seventh Fleet was ordered north from the Philippines, so that it might be available in the area in case of need.

Throughout Monday, June 26, the invaders continued their attack with no heed to the resolution of the Security Council of the United Nations. Accordingly, in order to support the resolution, and on the unanimous advice of our civil and military authorities, I ordered United States air and sea forces to give the Korean Government troops cover and support.

On Tuesday, June 27, when the United Nations Commission in Korea had reported that the northern troops had neither ceased hostilities nor withdrawn to the thirty-eighth parallel, the United Nations Security Council met again and passed a second resolution, recommending that members of the United Nations furnish to the Republic of Korea such aid as might be necessary to repel the attack and to restore international peace and security in the area. The representative of the Soviet Union to the Security Council stayed away from this meeting also, and the Soviet Government has refused to support the Council's resolution.

The vigorous and unhesitating actions of the United Nations and the United States in the face of this aggression met with an immediate and overwhelming response throughout the free world. The first blow of aggression had brought dismay and anxiety to the hearts of men the world over. The fateful events of the 1930's when aggression unopposed bred more aggression and eventually war, were fresh in our memory.

But the free nations had learned the lesson of history. Their determined and united actions uplifted the spirit of freemen everywhere. As a result, where there had been dismay there is hope; where there had been anxiety there is firm determination.

Fifty-two of the 59 member nations have supported the United Nations action to restore peace in Korea.

A number of member nations have offered military support or other types of assistance for the United Nations action to repel the aggressors in Korea. In a third resolution, passed on July 7, the Security Council requested the United States to designate a commander for all the forces of the members of the United Nations in the Korean operation, and authorized these forces to fly the United Nations flag. In response to this resolution, General MacArthur has been designated as commander of these forces. These are important steps forward in the development of a United Nations system of collective security. Already, aircraft of two nations—Australia and Great Britain—and naval vessels of five nations—Australia, Canada, Great Britain, the Netherlands, and New Zea-

land—have been made available for operations in the Korean area, along with forces of Korea and the United States, under General MacArthur's command. The other offers of assistance that have been, and will continue to be made, will be coordinated by the United Nations and by the unified command, in order to support the effort in Korea to maximum advantage.

All the members of the United Nations who have endorsed the action of the Security Council realize the significance of the step that has been taken. This united and resolute action to put down lawless aggression is a milestone toward the establishment of a rule of law among nations.

Only a few countries have failed to support the common action to restore the peace. The most important of these is the Soviet Union.

Since the Soviet representative had refused to participate in the meetings of the Security Council which took action regarding Korea, the United States brought the matter directly to the attention of the Soviet Government in Moscow. On June 27, we requested the Soviet Government, in view of its known close relations with the North Korean regime, to use its influence to have the invaders withdraw at once.

The Soviet Government, in its reply on June 29 and in subsequent statements, has taken the position that the attack launched by the North Korean forces was provoked by the Republic of Korea, and that the actions of the United Nations Security Council were illegal.

These Soviet claims are flatly disproved by the facts.

The attitude of the Soviet Government toward the aggression against the Republic of Korea is in direct contradiction to its often expressed intention to work with other nations to achieve peace in the world.

For our part, we shall continue to support the United Nations action to restore peace in the Korean area.

As the situation has developed, I have authorized a number of measures to be taken. Within the first week of the fighting, General MacArthur reported, after a visit to the front, that the forces from North Korea were continuing to drive south, and further support to the Republic of Korea was needed. Accordingly, General MacArthur was authorized to use United States Army troops in Korea, and to use United States aircraft of the Air Force and the Navy to conduct missions against specific military targets in Korea north of the thirty-eighth parallel, where necessary to carry out the United Nations resolution. General MacArthur was also directed to blockade the Korean coast.

The attacking forces from the north have continued to move forward, although their advance has been slowed down. The troops of the Republic of Korea, though initially overwhelmed by the tanks and artillery of the surprise attack by the invaders, have been reorganized and are fighting bravely.

United States forces, as they have arrived in the area, have fought with great valor. The Army troops have been conducting a very difficult delaying operation with skill and determination, outnumbered many times over by attacking troops, spearheaded by tanks. Despite the bad weather of the rainy season, our troops have been valiantly supported by the air and naval forces of both the United States and other members of the United Nations.

In this connection, I think it is important that the nature of our military action in Korea be understood. It should be made perfectly clear that the action was undertaken as a matter of basic moral principle. The United States was going to the aid of a nation established and supported by the United Nations and unjustifiably attacked by an aggressor force. Consequently, we were not deterred by the relative immediate superiority of the attacking forces, by the fact that our base of supplies was 5,000 miles away, or by the further fact that we would have to supply our forces through port facilities that are far from satisfactory.

We are moving as rapidly as possible to bring to bear on the fighting front larger forces and heavier equipment, and to increase our naval and air superiority. But it will take time, men, and material to slow down the forces of aggression, bring those forces to a halt, and throw them back.

Nevertheless, our assistance to the Republic of Korea has prevented the invaders from crushing that nation in a few days—as they had evidently expected to do. We are determined to support the United Nations in its effort to restore peace and security to Korea, and its effort to assure the people of Korea an opportunity to choose their own form of government free from coercion, as expressed in the General Assembly resolutions of November 14, 1947, and December 12, 1948.

In addition to the direct military effort we and other members of the United Nations are making in Korea, the outbreak of aggression there requires us to consider its implications for peace throughout the world. The attack upon the Republic of Korea makes it plain beyond all doubt that the international Communist movement is prepared to use armed invasion to conquer independent nations. We must therefore recognize the possibility that armed aggression may take place in other areas.

In view of this, I have already directed that United States forces in support of the Philippines be strengthened, and that military assistance be speeded up to the Philippine Government and to the Associated States of Indochina and to the forces of France in Indochina. I have also ordered the United States Seventh Fleet to prevent any attack upon Formosa, and I have requested the Chinese Government on Formosa to cease all air and sea operations against the mainland. These steps were at once reported to the United Nations Security Council.

Our action in regard to Formosa was a matter of elementary security. The peace and stability of the Pacific area had been violently disturbed by the attack on Korea. Attacks elsewhere in the Pacific area would have enlarged the Korean crisis, thereby rendering much more difficult the carrying out of our obligations to the United Nations in Korea.

In order that there may be no doubt in any quarter about our intentions regarding Formosa, I wish to state that the United States has no territorial ambitions whatever concerning that island, nor do we seek for ourselves any special position or privilege on Formosa. The present military neutralization of Formosa is without prejudice to political questions affecting that island. Our desire is that Formosa not become embroiled in hostilities disturbing to the peace of the Pacific and that all questions affecting Formosa be settled by

peaceful means as envisaged in the Charter of the United Nations. With peace reestablished, even the most complex political questions are susceptible of solution. In the presence of brutal and unprovoked aggression, however, some of these questions may have to be held in abeyance in the interest of the essential security of all.

The outbreak of aggression in the Far East does not, of course, lessen but, instead, increases the importance of the common strength of the free nations in other parts of the world. The attack on the Republic of Korea gives added urgency to the efforts of the free nations to increase and to unify their common strength, in order to deter a potential aggressor.

To be able to accomplish this objective, the free nations must maintain a sufficient defensive military strength in being and, even more important, a solid basis of economic strength, capable of rapid mobilization in the event of emergency.

The strong cooperative efforts that have been made by the United States and other free nations, since the end of World War II, to restore economic vitality to Europe and other parts of the world, and the cooperative efforts we have begun in order to increase the productive capacity of underdeveloped areas, are extremely important contributions to the growing economic strength of all the free nations, and will be of even great importance in the future.

We have been increasing our common defensive strength under the Treaty of Rio de Janeiro and the North Atlantic Treaty, which are collective security arrangements within the framework of the United Nations Charter. We have also taken action to bolster the military defenses of individual free nations, such as Greece, Turkey, and Iran.

The defenses of the North Atlantic Treaty area were considered a matter of great urgency by the North Atlantic Council in London this spring. Recent events make it even more urgent than it was at that time to build and maintain these defenses.

Under all the circumstances it is apparent that the United States is required to increase its military strength and preparedness not only to deal with the aggression in Korea but also to increaseour common defense, with other free nations, against further aggression.

The increased strength which is needed falls into three categories:

In the first place, to meet the situation in Korea, we shall need to send additional men, equipment, and supplies to General MacArthur's command as rapidly as possible.

In the second place, the world situation requires that we increase substantially the size and matériel support of our Armed Forces, over and above the increases which are needed in Korea.

In the third place, we must assist the free nations associated with us in common defense to augment their military strength.

Of the three categories I have just enumerated, the first two involve increases in our own military manpower, and in the matériel support that our men must have.

To meet the increased requirements for military manpower, I have authorized the Secretary of Defense to exceed the budgeted strength of military personnel for the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and to use the Selective Service System to such extent as may be required in order to obtain the increased strength which we must have. I have also authorized the Secretary of Defense to meet the need for military

manpower by calling into active Federal service as many National Guard units and as many units and individuals of the Reserve forces of the Army, Navy, and Air Forces as may be required.

I have directed the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff to keep our military manpower needs under constant study, in order that further increases may be made as required. There are now statutory limits on the sizes of the armed forces and, since we may need to exceed these limits, I recommend that they be removed.

To increase the level of our military strength will also require additional supplies and equipment. Procurement of many items has already been accelerated, in some cases for use in Korea, in others to replace reserve stocks which are now being sent to Korea, and in still others to add to our general level of preparedness. Further increases in procurement, resulting in a higher rate of production of military equipment and supplies, will be necessary.

The increases in the size of the armed forces, and the additional supplies and equipment which will be needed, will require additional appropriations. Within the next few days, I will transmit to the Congress specific requests for appropriations in the amount of approximately 10 billion dollars.

These requests for appropriations will be addressed to the needs of our own military forces. Earlier, I referred to the fact that we must also assist other free nations in the strengthening of our common defenses. The action we must take to accomplish this is just as important as the measures required to strengthen our own forces.

The authorization bill for the Mutual Defense Assistance Program for 1951, now before the House of Representatives, is an important immediate step toward the strengthening of our collective security. It should be enacted without delay.

But it is now clear that the free nations of the world must step up their common security program. The other nations associated with us in the Mutual Defense Assistance Program, like ourselves, will need to divert additional economic resources to defense purposes. In order to enable the nations associated with us to make their maximum contribution to our common defense, further assistance on our part will be required. Additional assistance may also be needed to increase the strength of certain other free nations whose security is vital to our own.

In the case of the North Atlantic area these requirements will reflect the consultations now going on with the other nations associated with us in the North Atlantic Treaty. As soon as it is possible to determine what each nation will need to do, I shall lay before the Congress a request for such funds as are shown to be necessary to the attainment and maintenance of our common strength at an adequate level.

The steps which we must take to support the United Nations action in Korea, and to increase our own strength and the common defense of the free world, will necessarily have repercussions upon our domestic economy.

Many of our young men are in battle now, or soon will be, Others must be trained. The equipment and supplies they need, and those required for adequate emergency reserves, must be produced. They must be made available promptly, at reasonable cost, and without disrupting the efficient functioning of the economy.

We must continue to recognize that our strength is not to be measured in military terms alone. Our power to join in a common defense of peace rests fundamentally on the productive capacity and energies of our people. In all that we do, therefore, we must make sure that the economic strength which is at the base of our security is not impaired, but continues to grow.

Our economy has tremendous productive power. Our total output of goods and services is now running at an annual rate of nearly 270 billion dollars—over 100 billion dollars higher than in 1939. The rate is now about 13 billion dollars higher than a year ago, and about 8 billion dollars higher than the previous record rate reached in 1948. All the foregoing figures have been adjusted for price changes and are, therefore, a measure of actual output. The index of industrial production, now at 197, is 12 percent higher than the average for last year, and 81 percent higher than in 1939.

We now have 61½ million people in civilian employment. There are 16 million more people in productive jobs than there were in 1939. We are now producing 11 million more tons of steel a year than in the peak war year 1944. Electric power output has risen from 128 billion kilowatt-hours in 1939, to 228 billion hours in 1944, to 317 billion hours now. Food production is about a third higher than it ever was before the war, and is practically as high as it was during the war years, when we were sending far more food abroad than we are now.

The potential productive power of our economy is even greater. We can achieve some immediate increase in production by employing men and facilities not now fully utilized. And we can continue to increase our total annual output each year, by putting to use the increasing skills of our growing population and the higher productive capacity which results from plant expansion, new inventions, and more efficient methods of production.

With this enormous economic strength, the new and necessary programs I am now recommending can be undertaken with confidence in the ability of our economy to bear the strains involved. Nevertheless, the magnitude of the demands for military purposes that are now foreseeable, in an economy which is already operating at a very high level, will require substantial redirection of economic resources.

Under the program for increasing military strength which I have outlined above, military and related procurement will need to be expanded at a more rapid rate than total production can be expanded. Some materials were in short supply even before the Korean situation developed. The steel industry, for example, was operating at capacity levels, and even so was not able to satisfy all market demands. Some other construction materials, and certain other products, were also under pressure and their prices were rising, even before the outbreak in Korea.

The substantial speed-up of military procurement will intensify these shortages. Action must be taken to insure that these shortages do not interfere with or delay the materials and the supplies needed for the national defense.

Further, the dollars spent now for military purposes will have a magnified effect upon the economy as a whole, since they will be added to the high level of current civilian demand. These increased pressures, if neglected, could drive us into a general inflationary situation. The best evidence of this is the recent price advances in many raw

materials and in the cost of living, even upon the mere expectancy of increased military outlays.

In these circumstances we must take action to insure that the increased national-defense needs will be met, and that in the process we do not bring on an inflation, with its resulting hardship for every family.

At the same time we must recognize that it will be necessary for a number of years to support continuing defense expenditures, including assistance to other nations, at a higher level than we had previously planned. Therefore, the economic measures we take now must be planned and used in such a manner as to develop and maintain our economic strength for the long run as well as the short run.

I am recommending certain legislative measures to help achieve these objectives. I believe that each of them should be promptly enacted. We must be sure to take the steps that are necessary now, or we shall surely be required to take much more drastic steps later on.

First, we should adopt such direct measures as are now necessary to assure prompt and adequate supplies of goods for military and essential civilian use. I therefore recommend that the Congress now enact legislation authorizing the Government to establish priorities and allocate materials as necessary to promote the national security; to limit the use of materials for nonessential purposes; to prevent inventory hoarding; and to requisition supplies and materials needed for the national defense, particularly excessive and unnecessary inventories.

Second, we must promptly adopt some general measures to compensate for the growth of demand caused by the expansion of military programs in a period of high civilian incomes. I am directing all executive agencies to conduct a detailed review of Government programs, for the purpose of modifying them wherever practicable to lessen the demand upon services, commodities, raw materials, manpower, and facilities which are in competition with those needed for national defense. The Government, as well as the public, must exercise great restraint in the use of those goods and services which are needed for our increased defense efforts.

Nevertheless, the increased appropriations for the Department of Defense, plus the defense-related appropriations which I have recently submitted for power development and atomic energy, and others which will be necessary for such purposes as stockpiling, will mean sharply increased Federal expenditures. For this reason we should increase Federal revenues more sharply than I have previously recommended, in order to reduce the inflationary effect of the Government deficit.

There are two fundamental principles which must guide us in framing measures to obtain these additional revenues:

(*a*) We must make every effort to finance the greatest possible amount of needed expenditures by taxation. The increase of taxes is our basic weapon in offsetting the inflationary pressures exerted by enlarged Government expenditures. Heavier taxes will make general controls less necessary.

(*b*) We must provide for a balanced system of taxation which makes a fair distribution of the tax burden among the different groups of individuals and business concerns in the Nation. A balanced

tax program should also have as a major aim the elimination of profiteering.

At an appropriate time, as soon as the necessary studies are completed, I shall present to the Congress a program based on these principles to assure the financing of our needs in a manner which will be fair to all our citizens, which will help prevent inflation, and which will maintain the fiscal position of the Nation in the soundest possible condition.

As a further important safeguard against inflation, we shall need to restrain credit expansion. I recommend that the Congress now authorize the control of consumer credit and credit used for commodity speculation. In the housing field, where Government credit is an important factor, I have directed that certain available credit restraints be applied, and I recommend that further controls be authorized, particularly to restrain expansion of privately financed real-estate credit. These actions will not only reduce the upward pressure on prices, but will also reduce the demand for certain critical materials which are required for the production of military equipment.

Third, we must take steps to accelerate and increase the production of essential materials, products, and services. I recommend, therefore, that the Congress authorize, for national-defense purposes, production loan guaranties and loans to increase production. I also recommend that the Congress authorize the making of long-term contracts and other means to encourage the production of certain materials in short supply.

In the forthcoming Midyear Economic Report, I shall discuss in greater detail the current economic situation, and the economic measures which I have recommended. If these measures are made available promptly, and firmly administered, I believe we will be able to meet military needs without serious disruption of the economy.

If we are to be successful, there must be sensible and restrained action by businessmen, labor, farmers, and consumers. The people of this country know the seriousness of inflation, and will, I am sure, do everything they can to see that it does not come upon us. However, if a sharp rise in prices should make it necessary, I shall not hesitate to recommend the more drastic measures of price control and rationing.

The hard facts of the present situation require relentless determination and firm action. The course of the fighting thus far in Korea shows that we can expect no easy solution to the conflict there. We are confronted in Korea with well-supplied, well-led forces which have been long trained for aggressive action. We and the other members of the United Nations who have joined in the effort to restore peace in Korea must expect a hard and costly military operation.

We must also prepare ourselves better to fulfill our responsibilities toward the preservation of international peace and security against possible further aggression. In this effort, we will not flinch in the face of danger or difficulty.

The free world has made it clear, through the United Nations, that lawless aggression will be met with force. This is the significance of Korea—and it is a significance whose importance cannot be overestimated.

I shall not attempt to predict the course of events. But I am sure that those who have it in their power to unleash or withhold acts of armed aggression must realize that new recourse to aggression in the

world today might well strain to the breaking point the fabric of world peace.

The United States can be proud of the part it has played in the United Nations action in this crisis. We can be proud of the unhesitating support of the American people for the resolute actions taken to halt the aggression in Korea and to support the cause of world peace.

The Congress of the United States, by its strong, bipartisan support of the steps we are taking and by repeated actions in support of international cooperation, has contributed most vitally to the cause of peace. The expressions of support which have been forthcoming from the leaders of both political parties for the actions of our Government and of the United Nations in dealing with the present crisis, have buttressed the firm morale of the entire free world in the face of this challenge.

The American people, together with other free peoples, seek a new era in world affairs. We seek a world where all men may live in peace and freedom, with steadily improving living conditions, under governments of their own free choice.

For ourselves, we seek no territory or domination over others. We are determined to maintain our democratic institutions so that Americans now and in the future can enjoy personal liberty, economic opportunity, and political equality. We are concerned with advancing our prosperity and our well-being as a nation, but we know that our future is inseparably joined with the future of other free peoples.

We will follow the course we have chosen with courage and with faith, because we carry in our hearts the flame of freedom. We are fighting for liberty and for peace—and with God's blessing we shall succeed.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 19, 1950.*

○

Mr. WATKINS. We would have to keep within our possibilities; but I would reduce the long-range reclamation projects and power projects we are building for Europe at the present time, and put the money in our projects at home. Certainly that would strengthen us more than putting the money in Europe would benefit us. At least we know it would be for our use, and it would not be put in the hands of a possible enemy by virtue of the desertion of a third or fourth of the population who are Communists at heart.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Has the Senator concluded?

Mr. WATKINS. I wanted to know whether the Senator had taken all these things into consideration in making his estimate of the value of irrigation in the West under the present program.

I should like also to call to the Senator's attention the fact that in World War II many reclamation projects were under way. There was one in Utah. It had not been quite finished, but along came a program for building a steel plant in Utah. One was desired there for making steel plates for the Navy. It was found the plant could not be operated without water, and it was fortunate we had a project halfway finished. Mountain water was necessary in making the steel. Other water would not do, because it would leave defects in the steel. The Government went ahead and finished the project so that the steel plant could be completed. Then they brought in thousands of people, and they found there was a shortage of water in the cities and towns. If there had been a drought many of the installations, the Army stores, the Navy camps, and the like, in that State, would have had to move out. It was fortunate we had a reclamation project under way which could be finished to such a degree that they could get water. So that the overall picture is favorable to the development of reclamation projects.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I hope the Senator from Utah will forgive me if I say that his argument reminds me of a passage in Benjamin Franklin's autobiography, in which he said that—

So excellent a thing it is to be a reasonable creature because one can then find a reason for what one wants to do.

Mr. President, I had not intended to take up as much time as I have taken. I think the RECORD will show that a vast portion of the time has been consumed in cross-examination.

I now move that the figure "$294,713,000" in line 5, on page 247, be stricken out and the figure "$204,000,000" be substituted in its stead.

I ask unanimous consent that there may be inserted in the RECORD at this point a brief justification and summary which I have prepared for this reduction, and which I have tried to state orally on the floor.

Mr. LANGER. Will the Senator tell me who prepared the justification?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. McCulloch, my assistant, and I. The two of us prepared it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois?

There being no objection, the justification was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR PAUL H. DOUGLAS IN SUPPORT OF SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT TO REDUCE CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION APPROPRIATIONS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BUREAU OF RECLAMATION, TO $204,000,000

Page 247, lines 4 and 5: House bill, $297,467,000; Senate bill, $294,713,000; budget estimate, $325,966,500.

The Bureau of Reclamation projects for which construction and rehabilitation appropriations are included in the present bill, include a number of new starts and items on which so little will apparently be completed by the end of fiscal 1950 that they may be considered essentially new starts. In line with the general policy against appropriations for such new construction starts this year, these should be omitted.

In view of the President's message today, the general need for reduction in Federal expenditures and the higher priority which other items in this omnibus bill should be accorded, the rate of expenditure for projects now under construction should be substantially reduced for 1951. I am suggesting in general that this reduction be in the amount of 25 percent of the proposed expenditure in the Senate committee bill.

Not only the general budget situation of the Federal Government, but also the certain expansion in the demand for funds and materials for other more essential Government work and for the crucial defense work which the President has outlined in the months ahead should persuade us to make reductions at least to the extent I have suggested.

With certain other decreases, which I shall note below, the suggested reduction in this appropriation is $90,713,000, and the new figure which I propose that the Senate adopt by way of a substitute amendment to the committee amendment (of $294,713,000) in line 5 on page 247 is $204,000,000.

While I have itemized these new starts, weak projects and percentage reductions, it is not the intention of this amendment to bind the Bureau of Reclamation to these particular amounts. I recognize that it is preferable to leave discretion in this matter to the Bureau, so that it may cut back more sharply those projects that may best be deferred and accelerate those projects which in the national interest are most essential.

A. NEW, OR SUBSTANTIALLY NEW, STARTS

The new starts which my amendment proposes should be dropped from the bill are the following:

	Senate appropriations
Gila project:	
Wellton canal	$30,000
Wellton lateral unit	70,000
Dome lateral unit	10,000
	110,000
Colorado River front work and levee system	950,000
Central Valley:	
Sly Park Dam	250,000
Folsom power facilities	750,000
	1,000,000
Colorado-Big Thompson:	
Brush substation	1,000,000
Flatiron, Fort Collins, Greeley tap line	377,000
	1,377,000
Paonia project: Spring Creek Dam	$800,000
Fort Peck: Glendive Williston transmission line	350,000
Eden project: Big Sandy Dam and Reservoir	206,000
Kendrick project: Seminol-Baroil line	150,000
Missouri Basin:	
Jamestown unit	750,000
Missouri Souris	1,000,000
	1,750,000
Total	6,593,000

It is also interesting to note that the total estimated costs of the foregoing projects, for which we shall be asked to make increasing appropriations in the next few years if these starts are permitted now, is $166,404,000.

A table showing the total estimated costs of these projects, the amount estimated to be spent on them to June 30, 1950, and the pages of the House hearings where these figures and construction facts are given, follows:

Project name	Total estimated costs	To be spent through fiscal 1950	House hearings reference (pt. 4) page —
Gila:			
Wellton Canal	$1,570,000	$15,291	657
Wellton lateral unit	2,358,000	25,537	
Dome lateral unit	1,919,000	7,516	
Colorado River front and levee system	16,295,000	414,428	681
Central Valley:			
Sly Park Dam	6,220,000	0	698
Folsom power facility	47,800,000	0	
Colorado-Big Thompson:			
Brush substation	2,513,500	431,795	733–735
Flatiron, Fort Collins, Greeley tap line	799,100	28,758	
Paonia: Spring Creek Dam	3,300,500	272,200	743–744
Fork Peck: Glendive-Williston transmission line	1,783,000	0	759–760
Eden: Big Sandy Dam and Reservoir	2,000,000	42,025	817–818
Kendrick: Seminol-Baroil line	242,000	25,000	821–822
Missouri Basin:			
Missouri-Souris, Jamestown unit	10,749,000	214,573	[1] 150
Missouri-Souris-Missouri diversion unit	68,855,000	1,218,174	905–906
Total	166,404,100		

[1] Senate report.

In the case of the last project, the Missouri-Souris Division, Missouri Diversion Unit, according to the testimony, there has been no final decision on the location of the canal to lead off from the diversion dam. (House hearings, pp. 907, 910.) And in reference to the related work of this division now in phase B, Mr. Warne, of the Bureau, frankly stated (House hearings, p. 911):

"There is a great deal of work that needs to be done before ultimate feasibility of the irrigation plans can be worked out for the Crosby-Mohall unit or the Jamestown unit or any of the distant units."

Since the estimated cost of phase A aspects of Missouri-Souris is $68,855,000, and the Crosby-Mohall and Devils Lake units in phase B will cost $268,953,000 and $21,077,000, respectively, in addition to $10,749,000 for the Jamestown unit, it sems wiser to halt this construction now (with only $1,432,747 spent on this phase A section through fiscal 1950), until all doubts have been removed concerning the economic feasibility of the project. How can we justify starting out on a road that leads to such enormous expenditures with so many significant questions unanswered? I suspect, although the record

is not clear at this point, that provisions for repayment of the irrigation costs of the project are likewise most incomplete.

B. ELIMINATE CERTAIN SENATE INCREASES

In addition, I am suggesting that the following Senate increases over the House committee figures ought to be dropped. No adequate reason is given in the report for these increases:

Provo River project	$2,245,000
Riverton project	200,000
Missouri Basin project	3,000,000

C. FORTY-PERCENT REDUCTION IN COLORADO-BIG THOMPSON

My amendment also assumes a 40-percent, instead of a 25-percent, cut-back in the appropriation for the Colorado-Big Thompson project.

In justification for this higher cut-back, I note that the original estimate of the cost of this project was $44,000,000. The present estimated cost is $150,503,000 (House hearings, p. 662). A repayment contract, however, was made which provided that the water users should repay one-half of the cost of the project, but not to exceed $25,000,000 (House hearings, pp. 733; 738–741).

In other words on the basis of present figures the Government will be repaid for only about one-sixth of the cost of the project and the balance must be repaid, if at all, by electric-power revenues. While the Bureau's justification states that negotiations are underway for an amendatory or supplemental repayment contract, I believe it might help to persuade the water users that this is desirable if the rate of construction were sharply cut back.

This seems to be another example of a case where rising costs and project changes result in enormous increases in total costs, far beyond the estimates made at the time of the original authorization by Congress.

D. OTHER MISSOURI BASIN DEDUCTIONS

In connection with the Missouri Basin project, I would also urge elimination of further appropriations for the following projects for the reasons stated below:

(a) Cheyenne division—Key Hole unit $3,179,000

The Senate committee report (p. 152) states:

"The 1951 estimate for this project appears under phase A in the amount of $3,179,000, which has been allowed by the committee. However, representations have been made to the committee that the water supply on the Belle Fourche River is such that under the Wyoming-South Dakota compact of February 18, 1943, it may be difficult to fill this proposed reservoir. Under the terms of the compact between the two States, there is no limitation upon the number of small reservoirs which may be built in Wyoming. It is the opinion of the committee that a comprehensive study of the future water supply should be made before construction is undertaken."

The best way to guarantee that there will be no wasteful new construction until the availability of water is assured is to omit further appropriations.

(b) Phase B items $5,154,000

The total estimated cost of the Missouri Basin items listed in "Phase A" ("Units selected for construction") is $769,157,884. Starts have been made on all elements of this phase A. Although the total amount of appropriations authorized by law for the Missouri Basin program of the Bureau is only $350,000,000, the Government would appear to be effectively committed by the starts that have been made to the total of expenditures of $769,000,000.

Until phase A is more fully authorized and completed, it would appear to me unwise by this appropriation bill to permit expenditures on phase B ("Units being prepared for construction") which involves projects, the total estimated cost of which is an added $944,933,000.

In view of the serious questions as to the adequacy of water supply for the whole basin project and in view of the relatively small part of the total irrigation costs which it is estimated that water users will be able to repay, it seems to me that we should not only eliminate all items in phase B but possibly make even more drastic reductions in phase A.

I believe the Senate should also take note of the extent to which project costs in general far out run original cost estimates, as I pointed out above in connection with the Colorado-Big Thompson project. As listed by the Bureau the original estimate of the projects included in the current bill was $1,682,487,174. The present estimated cost is $5,252,404,105. (House hearings, p. 662.)

E. SUMMARY

A complete tabulation of the project reductions which I am suggesting in this substitute amendment is as follows:

Summary of proposed reductions (with discretion left to Bureau for item revisions), Bureau of Reclamation—construction and rehabilitation

Project name	25 percent	New starts, etc.	Total reduction from Senate committee figure
Gila	$1,552,000	$110,000	$1,662,000
All-American Canal	412,000		412,000
Columbia River front		950,000	950,000
Boulder Canyon	1,525,000		1,525,000
Davis Dam	3,405,000		3,405,000
Central Valley	10,515,000	1,000,000	11,515,000
Santa Barbara	[1] 1,454,000		1,454,000
Colorado-Big Thompson	[1] 7,849,000	1,377,000	9,226,000
Paonia	50,000	800,000	850,000
San Luis Valley	459,000		459,000
Boise-Payette	51,000		51,000
Buffalo Rapids	40,000		40,000
Fort Peck		250,000	250,000
Hungry Horse	7,375,000		7,375,000
Fort Sumner	170,000		170,000
Tucumcari	43,000		43,000
Rio Grande	260,000		260,000
W. C. Austin	65,000		65,000
Deschutes	125,000		125,000
Klamath	222,000		222,000
Provo River:			
Senate increase	2,245,000		2,782,000
25 percent of balance	537,000		
Columbia Basin	12,375,000		12,375,000
Yakima	56,000		56,000
Eden		206,000	206,000
Kendrick	200,000	150,000	350,000
Riverton:			
Senate increase	200,000		
25 percent of balance	750,000		950,000
Shoshone	29,000		29,000
Missouri Basin:			
Senate increase	3,000,000		
25 percent of balance	20,086,000		
Total	23,086,000		
Jamestown Unit		750,000	
Keyhole unit		3,179,000	
Missouri-Souris		1,000,000	
Phase B		5,154,000	
Total		10,083,000	33,169,000
Rehabilitation and betterment	750,000		750,000
Total			90,726,000

[1] 40 percent.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Bridges	Chavez
Anderson	Butler	Connally
Benton	Byrd	Cordon
Brewster	Capehart	Darby
Bricker	Chapman	Donnell
Douglas	Johnson, Colo.	Neely
Dworshak	Johnson, Tex.	O'Conor
Eastland	Kem	O'Mahoney
Ecton	Kerr	Pepper
Ellender	Kilgore	Robertson
Ferguson	Langer	Russell
Flanders	Leahy	Saltonstall
Frear	Lehman	Schoeppel
Fulbright	Lodge	Smith, Maine
George	Lucas	Smith, N. J.
Gillette	McCarran	Sparkman
Graham	McCarthy	Stennis
Green	McClellan	Taft
Gurney	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Hayden	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Hendrickson	Magnuson	Thye
Hickenlooper	Malone	Tobey
Hill	Martin	Tydings
Hoey	Maybank	Watkins
Holland	Millikin	Wherry
Humphrey	Morse	Wiley
Hunt	Mundt	Williams
Ives	Murray	Young
Jenner	Myers	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois to the committee amendment on page 247, in line 4.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement about the amendment, and then I shall ask for the yeas and nays.

The amendment I have submitted to the committee amendment proposes that the appropriation for construction projects in the Bureau of Reclamation be reduced from approximately $295,000,000 to approximately $204,000,000, thus effecting a saving of approximately $91,000,000. In the discussion which has occurred, I have indicated that that reduction would be made, for example, by stopping all new construction starts and all essentially new starts, and by slowing up to the extent of 25 percent on projects already under way, with the exception of the Big Thompson-Colorado project, as to which I suggest a slowing-up rate of 40 percent. In the statement I have inserted, I have suggested several other possible reductions. However, the apportionment of the reduction to be made under my amendment to the committee amendment would be left in the hands of the Bureau of Reclamation, as is the case at the present time; and the Bureau of Reclamation could apportion the reduction to the extent of $91,000,000 in the same way the Bureau would apportion the proposed appropriation of $295,000,000—in other words, among the various projects; and the Bureau could do so in a way which would benefit those which are needed in the war effort.

Thus, Mr. President, the adoption of my amendment to the committee amendment would result in a reduction in the consumption of materials, and to that extent my amendment would aid the war effort.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois to the committee amendment on page 247, in line 4.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I should like to be heard on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Illinois to the committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Service-wide supply and finance," on page 416, line 8, after the word "salaries", to strike out "$200,000,000" and insert "$209,292,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Service-wide operations," on page 417, line 1, after the word "salaries", to strike out "$94,261,000" and insert "$100,281,000."

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, to the committee amendment I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated, and I also have an amendment to offer to the next committee amendment. After action on the amendments I shall explain their effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma to the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 417, line 2, it is proposed to strike out "$100,281,000" and insert "$99,281,000."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Island governments," on page 417, line 6, after the word "Islands", to strike out "$1,500,000" and insert "$785,000."

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, to that amendment I offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 417, line 6, it is proposed to strike out "$785,000", and insert "$1,785,000."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, the effect of the two amendments to the committee amendments just agreed to is to reduce the appropriations for service-wide operations by $1,000,000, and to increase the appropriations for island governments by the same amount.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title V—Department of the Air Force—Acquisition and construction of real property," on page 419, after line 12, to strike out:

For liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority granted under this head in the "Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1950," or authorized to be transferred to this head by the "National Military Establishment Appropriation Act, 1950," to remain available until expended, $25,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 419, after line 18, to insert:

For construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations, and facilities for the Air Force, as authorized by the act of March 30, 1949 (Public Law 30, 81st Cong.), the act of October 27, 1949 (Public Law 415, 81st Cong.), the act of May 11, 1949 (Public Law 60, 81st Cong.), and the act of June 17, 1950 (Public Law 564, 81st Cong.), without regard to sections 1136 and 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended, including hire of passenger motor vehicles, to remain available until expended, $164,784,000, of which $25,000,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority granted under this head in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1950, or authorized to be transferred to this head by the National Military Establishment Appropriation Act, 1950.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Maintenance and operations," on page 422, line 4, after the word "otherwise", to strike out "$1,010,000,000" and insert "$1,027,662,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Air National Guard," on page 426, line 16, after the word "owned", to insert "or State-owned"; in line 17, after the word "any", to strike out "State or"; and in the same line, after the word "subdivision", to strike out "thereof" and insert "of a State."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Salaries and expenses, administration," on page 427, line 18, after the word "station", to strike out "$55,620,000" and insert "$58,545,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title I—General provisions," on page 441, after line 23, to strike out:

SEC. 626. No payment shall be made from appropriations in this chapter to any officer on the retired lists of the Regular Army, Regular Navy, Regular Marine Corps, or Regular Air Force, who for himself, or for others is engaged in the selling of, or contracting for the sale of, or negotiating for the sale of, to any agency of the Department of Defense, any war materials or supplies.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 442, line 6, to change the section number from "627" to "626."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 442, line 10, to change the section number from "628" to "627."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 442, line 22, to change the section number from "629" to "628."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 443, line 3, to change the section number from "630" to "629."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, we have now finished, I think, the chapter which we have been considering this morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That was the last committee amendment in chapter X.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I believe most people will agree that the best way to reduce expenditures is to reduce individual items. A general across-the-board percentage cut hits all agencies affected equally even though there is bound to be more fat in some agencies than in others. This method is called a meat-ax approach because the cutting is done with a broad blade and the actual severing is accomplished by brute force. You cannot trim off excess fat with a meat ax—it cuts in a straight line across the lean as well as the fat.

CUTTING APPROPRIATIONS SHOULD BE DONE CAREFULLY—WITH A SURGEON'S KNIFE

Trimming selected items more closely resembles the use of a surgeon's knife. A surgeon's knife is extremely sharp and fat can be trimmed neatly without cutting into the lean. Thus the fat in an individual bureau can be cut back without harming the bureau itself.

The surgeon's knife method is the one I have been trying to use. In trying to be selective, I have made 68 separate proposals for reductions so far. The amounts of these cuts have ranged from $1 to $263,483,000. When added together they would have made a total reduction of three-fourths of a billion dollars below the amounts in the bill before us and nearly a billion below the budget. I have not finished these efforts to make selective cuts. I will have a great many more proposals before we finish this bill. And yet almost every time I start to apply the knife, sharp and delicate though it is, the Senate has gently but no less definitely placed a sheath over the blade. "Put that thing down," they say, "you're liable to hurt somebody."

First, may I say that I blame myself most of all for my failure to get the Senate to accept the many selective cuts which I have proposed. The cause, I think, has been a good one but there has apparently been something in my manner and methods which has offended many of my colleagues. If I have shown any smug self-righteousness, may I assure the Senate that it was unintentional and I most sincerely beg the pardon of my colleagues. I happen to dislike self-righteousness most of all, because it shuts off the possibility of growth and is essentially uncharitable to others and if I have sinned in this respect, as some of my colleagues obviously think, I shall try to rid myself of this fault in the future.

I can only wish that abler, better, more conciliatory, and more experienced men than I had taken up this battle who could have carried it through with greater success and who would not have aroused the hard feelings which I apparently have done. There are very many such men in the Senate, but, unfortunately, they have not come forward in this instance. As is too often the case, the team has had to depend on a scrub and second-rater who has failed to do justice to the cause which he tried to represent. I only hope that the burden will be assumed next year by better men and then I shall be glad to step back and let them take the lead and serve myself only as a dishwasher and possibly a factual hod-carrier for their efforts. I would do this all the more gladly because it has been extremely unpleasant for me to get up again and again to move a reduction in appropriations and to feel that I was incurring the displeasure of colleagues whom I respect.

But while I wish to take my full share of the blame for the failure of our body to make selective economies, I am in-

clined to believe that the causes for this failure lie far deeper than my own personal faults, real though these are.

ORGANIZATION OF SENATE MAKES SELECTIVE CUTS DIFFICULT

In the first place, it is clear that the very organization of the Senate makes selective economies difficult, if not impossible. For the members of the Appropriations Committee, having thrashed these issues out and having arrived at a recommendation, feel bound in loyalty to each other to defend the items for which big appropriations are being asked. We have seen many times ranking minority members of the Appropriations Subcommittees rising to defend specific figures and insisting that the appropriations cannot be cut by a single dollar. Then I have also noticed that the Senators who are interested in the appropriations under a given chapter in the bill are generally on the floor in force when that chapter is up for consideration. Thus, the Senators from the farming States were present in large numbers when the appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, chapter VI, came up and overwhelmingly defeated my proposal to reduce these appropriations. I was similarly bowled over as I tried to reduce specific items for roads by $100,000,000 in this time of great stress. Similarly, when the appropriations for the Interior Department, chapter VII, were under consideration and I tried to cut $90,000,000 for reclamation and reduce other items, I saw large numbers of Senators on the floor from the mountain and semiarid States who naturally resisted these cuts. When the rivers and harbors section, chapter IX, which is euphoniously referred to as the civil functions of the Army appropriation came up, I looked about me and saw the serried ranks of the Senators from the regions of the Gulf, the lower Mississippi, the Missouri, and the Arkansas Rivers. These men believe in all good faith in the projects which would benefit their communities and were strong in their support of the recommended appropriations.

On the other hand, the Senators whose interests were not immediately involved in the making of the specific appropriations, and whose interests were only general in that they primarily represented taxpayers tended not to be on the floor—with many honorable exceptions, of course—when these items came up for consideration. This was perfectly natural, excusable, and perhaps inevitable. For them to have stayed on the floor and joined in the fight item by item would have required not only many hours but actually may days of dull, dreary work, besides the weeks of study and preparation required. In the meantime, they would have had to miss many vital committee meetings, fall behind on their heavy correspondence, arouse the ire of constituents by not seeing them when they called, and go through a very unpleasant process to no apparent avail. The special interests were therefore concentrated and determined, while the general interests were scattered, diffused, and unorganized. It is small wonder, therefore, that no cuts were made.

Secondly, our procedures in the Senate make it very difficult for us to consider an appropriations bill intelligently on the floor. For again and again, while we were considering specific chapters, Senators would rise and speak at length for hours on some perfectly extraneous subject. This wore out and discouraged many who were anxious to take part. I would humbly suggest—and as a new Member I do so humbly—that we would make more progress if we were to accept a rule of germaneness so that up to a given hour, say 5 o'clock, we would only consider and speak upon the subject before the House and then after that hour, let any Senator speak on any subject about which he felt a concern, whether that question be sex perverts in the Government, Formosa, Kamchatka, or Timbuctoo. We would get infinitely more work done under such a rule and yet Senators would still have the right of free and unlimited debate.

Finally—and I say this with timidity—I have come to suspect that those who urge the superiority of selective cuts to the meat-ax method of general cuts tend to lose some of their enthusiasm for the selective method when it is actually employed. The suspicion occurs to me also that possibly one reason why some Senators prefer the method of general cuts is because if they vote for specific cuts, they incur the wrath of special interest groups while if they vote for general cuts, they get popular credit for standing for economy and thus compel the President and the executive departments to bear the popular opprobrium of making the specific economies to carry out the broad sweeping and indefinite reductions of 10 percent, 15 percent, or 20 percent, for which the swingers of the meat ax have voted. If I am uncharitable in these surmises, I hope that my colleagues and the public will pardon me.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a list of the proposals for reductions which I have proposed, their amounts, and references to their explanations.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Itemized reductions in omnibus appropriations bill (H. R. 7786) proposed by Senator Douglas

Department, agency, and purpose of funds	Appropriation for fiscal year 1950	Amount voted by House	Amount in Senate bill	Budget estimate	Proposed reduction		For reasons see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. No. —
					Below Senate bill	Below budget	
Legislative branch: New Senate Office Bldg	None	None	$10,000,000	$10,000,000	$10,000,000	$10,000,000	10096
Department of State:							
Salaries and expenses	$78,152,000	$77,300,000	78,300,000	78,731,000	1,000,000	1,431,000	(1)
Institute of Inter-American Affairs:							
Expenses:							
Cash	4,751,600	5,500,000	5,000,000	6,500,000	500,000	2,000,000	10221
Contract authorization	None	None	7,000,000	14,000,000	2,000,000	9,000,000	10221
Department of Commerce:							
Civil Aeronautics Administration: Salaries, expenses	94,402,000	97,000,000	99,775,000	104,250,000	2,775,000	7,250,000	10222
Civil Aeronautics Board	3,620,500	3,400,000	4,000,000	4,323,000	600,000	923,000	10223
Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce: Salaries and expenses	4,923,500	5,000,000	5,300,000	5,620,000	300,000	620,000	10224
Field Office Service	2,079,500	2,050,000	2,155,000	2,155,000	105,000	105,000	10224
Patent Office: Salaries and expenses	10,825,000	11,300,000	11,530,000	11,760,000	230,000	460,000	10224
Bureau of Public Roads: Postwar highways	385,000,000	405,000,000	385,000,000	426,000,000	100,000,000	141,000,000	10225
Weather Bureau: Salaries and expenses	24,179,000	24,447,000	24,897,000	26,100,000	450,000	1,653,000	10234
Department of Treasury:							
Office of Administrative Services: Salaries	1,150,000	1,160,000	1,207,000	1,207,000	47,000	47,000	10298
Bureau of Accounts: Salaries and expenses	1,725,000	1,875,000	2,029,000	2,029,000	154,000	334,000	10299
Bureau of Customs: Salaries and expenses	35,150,000	36,500,000	36,806,360	36,973,000	306,360	473,300	10299
Bureau of Narcotics: Salaries and expenses	1,610,000	1,750,000	1,908,000	1,933,000	158,000	183,000	10299
Bureau of Engraving and Printing: Salaries and expenses	15,660,000	15,500,000	16,835,000	16,935,000	1,335,000	1,435,000	10300
Reconstruction Finance Corporation: Salaries and expenses	25,775,000	26,000,000	26,700,000	27,100,000	6,700,000	7,100,000	10323
Federal Security Agency, Office of Education: Salaries and expenses	1,900,000	1,900,000	2,023,420	2,168,600	123,420	268,600	11012
Public Health Service, Hospital Construction Service: Salaries and expenses	1,132,257	1,357,000	2,107,000	2,807,000	750,000	1,450,000	11013
Bureau of Federal Credit Union: General fund appropriation	200,000	200,000	300,000	375,000	100,000	175,000	11013
General Counsel: Salaries and expenses	455,068	511,100	535,100	567,100	24,000	56,000	11014

Footnotes at end of table.

Itemized reductions in omnibus appropriations bill (H. R. 7786) proposed by Senator Douglas—Continued

Department, agency, and purpose of funds	Appropriation for fiscal year 1950	Amount voted by House	Amount in Senate bill	Budget estimate	Proposed reduction: Below Senate bill	Proposed reduction: Below budget	For reasons see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. No. —
Department of Agriculture:							
Bureau of Agriculture Economics (economy investigation)	$2,621,000	$2,600,000	$2,720,000	$2,915,000	$120,000	$315,000	10534
Crop and livestock estimate and data on farm construction	2,817,900	2,725,000	2,904,000	3,378,000	179,000	653,000	10534
Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics: Salaries and expenses	1,749,200	1,500,000	1,763,200	2,217,200	263,200	717,200	10536
Bureau of Animal Husbandry: Salaries and expenses	2,248,200	2,250,000	2,319,000	2,519,700	69,000	269,700	10536
Bureau of Dairy Industry	1,613,300	1,600,000	1,735,000	1,899,300	135,000	299,300	10538
Bureau of Agriculture and Industrial Chemistry	8,395,625	7,750,000	8,500,000	8,818,800	750,000	1,068,800	10539
Forest development: Roads and trails	10,348,000	10,348,000	12,000,000	12,465,000	6,000,000	6,465,000	10541
Flood control	9,500,000	10,750,000	9,850,000	11,700,000	1,000,000	2,850,000	10541
Sugar Act	60,000,000	60,000,000	63,750,000	67,500,000	3,750,000	7,500,000	10542
Bureau of Plant Industry: Field crops	3,446,800	3,400,000	3,475,000	3,638,300	75,000	238,300	10539
Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine: Insect and plant disease control	4,651,000	4,185,900	4,651,000	4,752,000	465,100	566,100	(1)
Forest Service: Protection and management	26,360,000	26,890,000	29,320,500	30,270,500	2,430,500	3,380,500	(1)
Forest Service: Acquisition of land	401,000	100,000	401,000	700,000	301,000	600,000	(1)
Marketing Service: News service	[1] 1,900,000	2,050,000	2,187,000	2,274,300	137,000	224,300	(1)
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation: Operating and administrative expenses	5,054,000	6,854,000	7,204,000	7,450,000	350,000	596,000	(1)
Commodity Credit Corporation: Administrative expenses	15,000,000	16,000,000	16,350,000	16,750,000	350,000	750,000	(1)
Farmers Home Administration: Salaries and expenses	26,149,000	27,700,000	29,000,000	30,000,000	1,300,000	2,300,000	[1] 10547
Office of Solicitor	2,364,000	2,450,000	2,675,000	3,070,000	225,000	620,000	10549
Department of Interior:							
Bureau of Land Management: Management of land	6,215,200	6,756,800	7,127,810	8,650,000	371,010	1,893,200	10665
Construction	[2] 200,000	600,000	800,000	[3] 1,000,000	200,000	[3] 200,000	10666
Bureau of Indian Affairs: Welfare	32,535,906	37,929,000	40,252,328	40,483,975	2,323,328	2,554,975	10667
Bureau of Reclamation: General investigations	4,950,000	5,150,000	6,500,000	7,800,000	2,150,000	3,300,000	10732ff.
Construction	[4] 333,961,638	297,467,000	[5] 294,713,000	325,966,500	90,713,000	121,966,500	10737ff.
Bureau of Reclamation: General administrative expenses	4,300,000	7,000,000	7,400,000	7,800,000	400,000	800,000	11008
National Park Service: Maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities	6,990,262	7,250,000	7,448,100	7,470,000	198,100	220,000	11009
Construction	14,595,813	20,542,000	19,667,000	22,737,000	4,667,000	7,767,000	11009
Fish and Wildlife Service: Investigation of resources	3,324,200	3,900,000	4,125,000	3,900,000	800,000	575,000	11009
Construction	1,797,100	2,401,000	2,423,450	2,376,000	623,450	576,000	11010
Executive Office, Bureau of Budget: Salaries and expenses	3,300,000	3,386,000	3,412,000	3,486,000	26,000	100,000	11159
Philippine Alien Property Administration: Salaries and expenses	250,000	160,000	215,000	215,000	55,000	55,000	11159
Civil Service Commission: Salaries and expenses	16,000,000	15,261,913	15,761,913	16,560,000	500,000	1,298,087	11159
General Services Administration:							
Advance, planning of public works, contract authority	17,000,000	32,000,000	27,000,000	40,000,000	10,000,000	23,000,000	11159
Operating expenses		76,500,000	82,725,000	84,725,000	6,225,000	8,225,000	11159
Interstate Commerce Commission: General expenses	9,600,000	9,889,600	10,002,000	10,002,000	113,000	113,000	11159
Securities and Exchange Commission: Salaries and expenses	5,750,000	6,130,000	6,330,000	6,425,000	200,000	295,000	11159
Smithsonian Institution: Salaries and expenses	2,300,000	2,606,499	2,770,000	2,770,000	163,510	163,510	11159
Maritime Commission: Ship-construction subsidies (contract authority)	[6]	[6]	64,875,000	[7]	41,100,000	[8] 41,000,000	11160
Operating differential subsidies		[9] 26,450,000	[9] 30,108,000	93,380,000	3,658,000	11,721,000	11159
Rivers, harbors, and flood control and navigation projects: Limitation on additional technical expenses	[7]	1,450,000	1,600,000	[7]	960,000	[7]	11360
Rivers and harbors projects	197,985,690	185,878,000	221,244,500	240,714,000	130,495,000	149,964,000	11336-11337; 11359-11360; 11363-11366
Flood control and navigation projects	366,406,400	341,055,000	436,933,000	478,447,000	263,483,000	304,997,000	11336-11337; 11359-11360; 11363-11366
Flood control:							
Mississippi River	67,000,000	65,000,000	66,778,000	72,000,000	40,078,000	45,300,000	11336-11337; 11359-11360; 11363-11366
Sacramento River	3,600,000	2,700,000	2,524,500	2,805,000	1,514,500	1,795,000	11336-11337; 11359-11360; 11363-11366

[1] Motion for reconsideration pending.
[2] Contract authorization.
[3] Plus $300,000 in contract authorizations.
[4] Plus $8,339,700 in contract authorizations.
[5] Plus $3,000,000 in contract authorizations.
[6] Extended contract authority.
[7] No comparable figure.
[8] Approximate—no comparable figure.
[9] Plus $55,209,000 in reappropriations.

On other proposals for limitations, amounts cannot be computed. Total number of items, 68; total amount of proposed reductions below Senate committee recommendations, $746,574,478. Total amount of proposed reductions below budget estimates, $943,426,972.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Now, Mr. President, I am well aware of the fact that knives are dangerous. But, with a deficit of $5,000,000,000 facing us even before the Korean situation, a major surgical operation was even then in order. With the present international crisis, which is not a possibility but actually upon us, such an operation is already well under way and, while increasing taxes are needed, we simply must cut civilian expenses as well. For we are confronted with needs far greater than combatting inflation. Manpower and resources are needed for our very security, and if we precommit ourselves to huge expenditures for nonessential items, what happens when we find we should have been using these resources to protect our own safety?

MAY HAVE TO RESORT TO A MEAT AX

For this reason, since I have not had what would be called marked success in my attempts to use a surgeons' knife, I shall probably be forced to resort to the good old meat ax.

In my office this morning I looked at a surgeons' scalpel and at a meat ax, and I debated for some time whether I should bring those two instruments to the floor of the Senate. I decided that it would be somewhat undignified to do so. Therefore, following the example of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] I will say that I have them here in a suitcase. If anyone wishes to look at them, I shall be very happy to show them, and admission will be by ticket only.

The use of the surgeon's knife requires great care and I can certainly vouch for its being difficult and time consuming. The meat ax is easy. Just raise it above your head and come down on the bureaus with a resounding whack. But before doing this—being reluctantly

pushed into wielding an unscientific meat ax—

A "SHARP MEAT AX WIELDED WITH CARE"

I intend to try one more approach; namely, a very sharp meat ax wielded with care.

I send to the desk an amendment for myself and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] which I shall call "The sharp meat ax wielded with care." It is a substitute for the committee amendment striking out the Thomas-Taber features of the House bill.

Section 1001 of this amendment reads:

Reductions in appropriations contained in this act are hereby made in the sum of $1,000,000,000. Such reductions shall be made in the following manner:

I may say that the amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] proposes a reduction of $800,000,000 across the board. Our amendment proposes a reduction of $1,000,000,000, and orders those reductions to be made in selected areas.

This I quote from the first part of this amendment:

(a) Funds appropriated in this act for supplies and materials, for lands and structures, and for Federal aid postwar highways, shall be reduced by $500,000,000: *Provided*, That the Director of the Bureau of the Budget is empowered to make such reductions among the departments and agencies in the executive branch of the Government in such a manner as to provide for the most efficient use of the Nation's manpower and resources consistent with prevailing needs for an adequate national defense and a sound national economy.

FIVE-HUNDRED-MILLION-DOLLAR REDUCTION IN CONSTRUCTION ITEMS

Thus, the one-half of the reduction would be made on civilian construction. Most of it, of course, would have to be taken from rivers, harbors, navigation, flood control, reclamation projects, and highways, but not necessarily all of it. Throughout the bill we find a great many construction items which could be reduced. Furthermore, part of these reductions would be made from supplies and materials, most of which go for construction, but by no means all of it.

Paragraph (a) therefore specifically gives to the Bureau of the Budget the power to make these cuts, but it also specifies the areas whom which reductions are to be made. Paragraph (a) also charges the Budget Bureau with the responsibility to see that these cuts are made in such a manner as to provide for the most efficient use of the Nation's manpower and resources consistent with prevailing needs for an adequate national defense and a sound national economy.

The total amounts budgeted for construction—and on this point Members of the Senate should consult page 13 of Summary of Obligations by Objects, prepared by the Bureau of the Budget—for nonexempt items, the exemptions being listed in section 1002 of my amendment, is about $1,040,000,000.

Total budgeted amounts for supplies and materials which are nonexempt in my amendment is about $820,000,000. The total amount in the bill for Federal aid postwar highways will be between $405,000,000 and $385,000,000 depending on the final figure adopted in conference. This makes a total of about $2,225,000,000 from which the $500,000,000 reduction provided for in paragraph (a) would be drawn. This is a 22-percent reduction below the budget although since some reductions have already been made in the bill before us, the actual cut would amount to about 25 percent in this area.

FIVE-HUNDRED-MILLION-DOLLAR REDUCTION IN ADMINISTRATIVE EXENSE

The rest of the billion-dollar reduction or the other five hundred million is made in pragraph (b), which reads:

(b) Funds appropriated in this act for personal services, travel, transportation of things, communications services, rents and utilities, printing and reproduction, other contractual services, and equipment shall be reduced by $500,000,000 which reduction shall be made among the departments and agencies in the executive branch of the Government on a pro-rata basis: *Provided*, That reductions in personnel shall, where practicable, be made by eliminating a total of 5 percent of the personnel provided for in the President's budget and the filling of a total of not more than one-half of all vacancies which occur by reason of death, resignation, or otherwise: *Provided further*, That the reductions provided for in this subsection among the departments shall be made on a department-wide basis and the secretaries of the departments are empowered by means of transfer and adjustments, to keep the agencies within their respective departments at a maximum of efficiency: *Provided further*, That the Director of the Bureau of the Budget is empowered, by means of transfers and adjustments to administer the reductions provided for in this subsection among the nondepartmental and independent agencies in such a manner as to provide for a maximum of efficiency: *Provided further*, that hereafter, the amount of annual leave for Government employees, including employees of the Postal Service, shall be at the rate of 20 days per year and the amount of sick leave shall be at the rate of 12 days per year for classified and wage-board employees (except that no annual leave nor sick leave shall be granted to any Government employee who has not been in continuous Government service for at least 1 calendar year).

This paragraph apportions a $500,000,000 reduction among the departments and agencies on a pro-rata basis. But it specifies the areas where the reductions are to be made so that Congress would not be completely abdicating the power of appropriations.

Paragraph (b) would empower the secretaries of the various departments, however, to maintain a maximum of efficiency by means of transfers and adjustments between the various bureaus within the respective departments. The Bureau of the Budget would have this power with respect to the nondepartmental and independent agencies, some of which may be too small to completely absorb these cuts by themselves while others can absorb more than their prorated share.

The total amounts budgeted for those items in the nonexempt agencies in the categories from which reductions would be made are approximately as follows:

Personnel	$3,560,000,000
Travel	138,000,000
Transportation of things	42,000,000
Communications	35,000,000
Rent and utility services	103,000,000
Printing and reproductions	28,000,000
Other contractual services	347,000,000
Equipment	298,000,000
Total	4,551,000,000

Thus, the $500,000,000 reduction would amount to a cut of about 11 percent of the total amounts budgeted for these purposes. However, since the amounts provided for in the bill before us are somewhat less than the budgeted amounts the actual reduction would be closer to 12 or 12½ percent.

PERSONNEL REDUCTIONS

Reductions in personnel are to be made by eliminating 5 percent and then filling only one-half the vacancies to accomplish further reductions.

This amendment differs very sharply from the Thomas-Taber and the Jensen amendments, because the combination of the Thomas-Taber and Jensen amendments in the House provided for filling only one-tenth of the vacancies, with a cut of 10 percent superimposed upon this. This would mean a reduction in personnel of over 30 percent by the end of the year and an average cut for the year of over 20 percent. My proposal is for a cut of 5 percent, and then for filling only one-half of the vacancies.

I may say that my initial estimate of a cut of 5 percent is built up from two items, first, eliminating the 2 percent of Government employees who are the most inefficient; then, if we cut the leave of classified and wage-board employees from 26 working days to 20, or a cut of from five and a half calendar weeks to four calendar weeks, and reduce sick leave from 3 weeks to 2⅖ weeks, we effect a saving of around 3 percent in the number of governmental employees. So that by dismissing the most inefficient 2 percent, and reducing Government leave, which will save 3 percent, we can effect a personnel reduction of 5 percent, and, in addition to that, fill only half the vacancies which occur.

With increasing needs for manpower in the Defense Establishment and war production, I cannot believe this would work any great hardship on the workers themselves. The displaced workers would be able to find jobs elsewhere. They would be transferred from the departments which are overstaffed into agencies of the national defense or into private jobs which will be understaffed. The net result would be a transfer from places where the employees are less efficient into places where they are more efficient.

This is especially true since only 5 percent are to be subject to a reduction in force while other personnel reductions would be made by filling only one-half of the vacancies which occur because of

death, resignation, or otherwise. Personnel turn-over is about 26 percent so that filling one-half of the vacancies which occur during 1 year would amount to about 7 percent.

When this is combined with the 5 percent eliminated by a reduction in force we would have a total over-all reduction for the first year of 12 percent. The paragraph contains the qualifications "insofar as practicable" to allow for exceptional cases where turn-over is at an unusually high rate or where the provision would work a hardship on agencies in keeping staffed with key personnel. Meanwhile, personnel generally is only one of several categories where reductions would be made. It may be that some agencies would prefer to make greater cuts in travel or other categories and less in personnel. This flexibility would operate with respect to all the areas selected for reductions since the location of soft spots may vary from agency to agency.

REDUCE AND EQUALIZE ANNUAL AND SICK LEAVE

While reductions in personnel would ordinarily be made to the extent of 12 percent, actual manpower would be reduced only about 10 percent. This is true because reducing the annual and sick leave of classified and wage-board employees to 20 days would mean that each employee so reduced would put in about 3 percent more actual working time. Since postal workers' leave would be increased, however, the net gain in actual hours worked per employee would be only about 2 percent, which can be subtracted from the cut of 12 percent to make a net manpower reduction in the civilian agencies of 10 percent. Furthermore, the leave provision would apply to all Government employees, whether they work for agencies in the exempt or nonexempt categories. This would increase the manpower in the Defense Establishment and other agencies which are doing work vital to national defense.

I have previously presented the case for setting annual leave at 20 days, and I will not burden the Senate with further arguments on this point. I will simply say that 20 working days, or 1 month with week ends, is long enough for a vacation, and is still very liberal in comparison with that given by private employers. This would still be better than the leave given by 99 44/100 percent of private employers. The present 26 days of leave is excessive, because that number of days, on a basis of a 5-day week, is 5⅕ weeks. When there are added 15 days of sick leave, which makes 41 days, and 8 holidays, making 49 days, plus the other days of leave on the occasions of visits of Brazilian and other Presidents and when the weather is hot, the total leave given to Government workers is much larger than appears on its face. It is unjustified at any time, and certainly in the period which is close to a national emergency.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. I merely wish to ask a question. I did not hear the beginning of the Senator's address. Is the proposal the Senator is now speaking of a general over-all cut in the bill?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes. I shall be glad to furnish the Senator a copy of my address.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to have it. Does the distinguished Senator set out item by item what he intends to cut?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. In all the chapters?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Oh, no; it is a general cut, but it is to be applied to specific areas. In brief, it calls for a reduction of $500,000,000 on construction, supplies, and materials, and $500,000,000 on transportation, personal services, communications, and so forth. The cuts are divided in that manner. The total cut is $1,000,000,000, or approximately $200,000,000 greater than that provided in the so-called Bridges-Byrd amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not want to belabor this matter. I am trying to get the picture. Would the proposed cut apply to all construction projects throughout all the chapters of the bill?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. And the same is true with respect to transportation?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Personnel and transportation and other areas. I hope the Senator will be given a copy of my address.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield for one more question, please?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Is the cut to be made by the department heads, or does the Senator in his amendment provide for the cuts?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Within the departments the personnel and other cuts are to be made by the departments. For the nondepartmental and independent agencies the Bureau of the Budget will make the apportionment of the personnel and other cuts. The Bureau of the Budget will make the cuts for construction materials and supplies. But there are certain standards which we lay down which will direct them in doing this, namely, on the personnel item a 5 percent cut in the number of persons aided by a reduction in annual leave and then filling only one-half of the vacancies which occur.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield for another question.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the head of the department be the one who can use his best judgment as to where the cut is to be applied?

Mr. DOUGLAS. On everything except construction.

Mr. WHERRY. That is what I want to know. Does the Senator provide for the cut on construction by items then, or does the department head with respect to each chapter of the bill make the cuts?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Bureau of the Budget makes the construction cut of $500,000,000. The Bureau is directed to cut materials, construction and supplies for the nondefense and the nonexempt agencies $500,000,000.

Mr. WHERRY. So the Senator's amendment applies only to appropriations for construction outside of military needs?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Oh, yes. As a matter of fact, the list of exemptions is very similar to that provided for in the so-called Bridges-Byrd amendment, with one or two exceptions which I shall mention later.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. As I understand, the Senator's amendment provides for a cut of $500,000,000 in construction, and so forth, and a cut of $500,000,000 on transportation and personal services and so forth.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. So the amendment provides for a total cut of $1,000,000,000?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank my genial friend from Nebraska for his inquiries.

Mr. President, as I said the present 26 days of leave is excessive, because it is not measured by calendar days but by work days. It amounts therefore to 5⅕ weeks. It should be lowered in normal times, but our manpower needs to maintain adequate defense make it especially imperative that we make this change immediately.

The leave provision also increases the postal workers from 15 to 20 days. In the future, the national manpower situation will force postal workers to work harder and I believe it worth while to give them a month's vacation. Leave provisions should be equalized anyway within the Government service.

CONGRESS WOULD DECIDE WHERE TO CUT WHILE ALLOWING ADMINISTRATIVE FLEXIBILITY

The reduction provided by paragraphs (a) and (b) of my amendment are made while providing two safeguards. First. The areas where the rereductions are to be made are determined by Congress. Thus Congress determines where the reductions are to be made. It does not merely turn the problem over to the administrative agencies. Second. Flexibility to allow efficient administration is allowed. I do not assert that this is any final answer. Reducing expenditures should be carried out selectively item by item.

That is what I have been trying to do without much success, but to the best of my ability, during the past two weary weeks. But I assert that this amendment is preferable to an across-the-board percentage cut, and that, if it is a meat ax, it is a sharp meat ax wielded with care.

EXEMPTIONS

The exemptions provided are the obvious ones. They are similar to those provided for in the Bridges-Byrd amendment with a few important exceptions. Foreign aid, which is, in my judgment, a defense expenditure, is exempt. The Post Office is only exempt in its expenditures for railroad transportation of the mail. The Post Office is included ex-

cept for railway mail transportation. I shall, however, if others of my colleagues do not do so, offer a specific amendment on the question of railway mail transportation costs.

I would also exempt subsidies where the amounts paid are set by law. This will prevent agencies from making their reductions in subsidies and then coming back for deficiency appropriations. I would also exempt the Coast Guard, which is now an agency of war and national defense, and not merely an agency of domestic administration.

I have made no provisions for reducing loans. I am afraid that under the Bridges-Byrd amendment, a department might make its total 10 percent reduction by holding up 2 or 3 large loans such as those given by REA or the Farm Credit Administration. If this were done, no waste would be eliminated at all.

I would, however, urge that all loans be scrutinized very carefully and that only those which will be in the national interest be given.

The Thomas-Taber and Jensen amendments have been thoroughly discussed and I will not burden the Senate with further talk about them. They are both too inflexible and they would be administratively difficult.

In appealing to the Senate favorably to consider my amendment, I ask that Senators read the amendment. I have additional copies at my desk. I shall also be happy to talk to anyone who desires more information and will welcome all who care to join me in sponsoring it. Any Senator who wants to add his name to the amendment will be welcome.

In closing I will simply say that I have spent a great deal of time studying these appropriations, and while the surgeon's knife approach of carefully cutting individual items is best, I believe this amendment, which is a sharp meat ax wielded with care is preferable to a blunt meat ax of an across-the-board percentage cut.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment offered by myself, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered printed as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken on pages 444, 445, and 446 by the committee amendment, insert the following:

"CHAPTER X–A—GENERAL REDUCTION IN APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 1001. Reductions in appropriations contained in this act are hereby made in the sum of $1,000,000,000. Such reductions shall be made in the following manner:

"(a) Funds appropriated in this act for supplies and materials, for lands and structures, and for Federal aid postwar highways shall be reduced by $500,000,000: *Provided*, That the Director of the Bureau of the Budget is empowered to make such reductions among the departments and agencies in the executive branch of the Government in such a manner as to provide for the most efficient use of the Nation's manpower and resources consistent with prevailing needs for an adequate national defense and a sound national economy.

"(b) Funds appropriated in this act for personal services, travel, transportation of things, communications services, rents and utilities, printing and reproduction, other contractual services, and equipment shall be reduced by $500,000,000 which reduction shall be made among the departments and agencies in the executive branch of the Government on a pro rata basis: *Provided*, That reductions in personnel shall, where practicable, be made by eliminating a total of 5 percent of the personnel provided for in the President's budget and the filling of a total of not more than one-half of all vacancies which occur by reason of death, resignation, or otherwise: *Provided further*, That the reductions provided for in this subsection among the departments shall be made on a department-wide basis and the secretaries of the departments are empowered, by means of transfers and adjustments, to keep the agencies within their respective departments at a maximum of efficiency: *Provided further*, That the Director of the Bureau of the Budget is empowered, by means of transfers and adjustments to administer the reductions provided for in this subsection among the nondepartmental and independent agencies in such a manner as to provide for a maximum of efficiency: *Provided further*, That hereafter, the amount of annual leave for Government employees, including employees of the postal service, shall be at the rate of 20 days per year and the amount of sick leave shall be at the rate of 12 days per year for classified and wage-board employees (except that no annual leave nor sick leave shall be granted to any Government employee who has not been in continuous Government service for at least one calendar year).

"SEC. 1002. The reductions provided for in this chapter shall not apply to the following (except that the annual- and sick-leave provisios shall apply to all classified and wage-board employees and postal workers).

"(a) Chapter X, chapter X–B and the amount appropriated to the General Services Administration for carrying out the provisions of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act of July 23, 1946;

"(b) Appropriations in title I of chapter VIII for the Executive Office of the President under the headlines "Compensation of the President," "The White House Office," "Emergency Fund for the President," and "Executive Mansion and Grounds."

"(c) Appropriations for the atomic-energy program;

"(d) Trust funds;

"(e) Funds of Government corporations excluding those made available in this act (1) for administrative expenses and (2) by appropriation from the general fund of the Treasury;

"(f) Amounts (other than under the Veterans' Administration) for furnishing medical and hospital services and domiciliary care, excluding (1) administrative expenses not directly connected with the operation of a specific hospital, dispensary, or clinic, and (2) expenses for employee health service programs;

"(g) Amounts provided in this act for payment of obligations incurred under prior appropriations or authorizations, and obligated balances of reappropriations;

"(h) Appropriations of, or measured by, receipts;

"(i) Amounts appropriated by this act for the operation of law-enforcement agencies, including the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Bureau of Customs, Immigration and Naturalization Services, and the Secret Service; or for the payment of compensation and expenses of agents and auditors of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, and such other officers and employees of other agencies whose duties primarily pertain to intelligence operations (including funds transferred pursuant to section 6 (a) of the act of June 20, 1949; 63 Stat. 211), or to the investigation, apprehension, prosecution, or detention of persons suspected or convicted of offenses against the criminal laws of the United States;

"(j) Amounts provided for any program of the Veterans' Administration, excluding (1) administrative expenses not directly connected with the operation of a specific hospital, dispensary, clinic, or facility, and (2) expenses for employee health service programs;

"(k) Grants (other than those for Federal-aid postwar highways), subsidies, and contributions where amounts are determined by laws;

"(l) Amounts provided to make payment of or contributions toward pensions, retirement and disability annuities and benefits, employee's death or injury benefits, or other items of a similar nature;

"(m) Appropriations for refunds, awards, and indemnities.

"(n) Appropriations for the Coast Guard, and

"(o) The amount appropriated to the Post Office Department for railroad transportation of the mail."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I move to insert in lieu of the matter stricken by the committee amendment on pages 444, 445, and 446, an amendment which I have sent to the desk, which I now ask to have read and made the order of business.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry first, please.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. Is unanimous consent required to have the amendment made the pending business in view of the fact that the amendment runs into another chapter?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; it would be out of order to consider the amendment in its present form, because it relates both to the chapter which we are just finishing and the following chapter, which has not been stated and is not before the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes. I have no objection to the amendment being printed and to have it lie on the table to be offered at the proper time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The proper time will come in just about a fraction of a second.

Mr. WHERRY. I make the point of order, Mr. President, that the amendment is not in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment would not be in order as a portion of it relates to the next chapter, which is not now before the Senate.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield for a question.

Mr. KEM. I should like to associate myself with what the Senator from Illinois has stated about the necessity of reducing the nonmilitary expenses of the Government. I have voted for most, if not all, of the selective amendments proposed by him. In my opinion, the Senator from Illinois has performed a fine public service in his effort to make a selective reduction in the appropriation bill. I think he has some qualms about the results to some of his colleagues of what he has done, but I wish to say that, in my judgment, the way in which he has used the scalpel has been so skillful that it has left no scars. I think there can be no doubt about that.

So I hope he will continue his efforts. I believe that time will show the great necessity for the Congress to do what the junior Senator from Illinois is seeking to have done.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have the floor; and in order that the Senator may propound a parliamentary inquiry, I have to yield first.

Mr. President, no chapter of the appropriations bill is now before the Senate at this time, I believe. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate pass over chapter X–A and proceed to the consideration of chapter X–B.

I shall be glad to yield now to the Senator from Illinois for a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me inquire why the Senator wishes to pass over chapter X–A, which logically would come before the Senate at this time.

Mr. WHERRY. I am merely asking that it be passed over temporarily.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would it not be well to consider chapter X–A now?

Mr. WHERRY. The reason why I think the subject matter of chapter X–A or the subject matter the Senator from Illinois, himself, has been discussing should properly be taken up by us at the end of the bill is that before an amendment such as the Bridges-Byrd amendment or the so-called Douglas amendment is considered by the Senate it seems to me the Senate should proceed to consider the foreign-aid section of the bill, and should see whether a cut is to be made in that section of the bill. Then we can consider as the last chapter, the one to which, really, either the so-called Douglas amendment or the Bridges-Byrd amendment would apply.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the foreign-aid section of the bill can be dealt with by means of amendments offered either to chapter X–A or chapter X–B.

I may say that I am very much pleased with what the Senator from Missouri has said. Unless I am abusing his compliments, I wish to say that I think the amendment should not be know solely as mine, but should be known as the Kem-Williams-Douglas amendment. Then we shall have awaiting our consideration both the Bridges-Byrd amendment and the Kem-Williams-Douglas amendment—thus indicating that a fine spirit of nonpartisanship urge for economy pervades this Chamber.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in that spirit, I ask unanimous consent that chapter X–A of the bill be passed over temporarily, for the reasons already stated.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I am not satisfied in my own mind that that would be the proper course. It pains me very much to have to object, but I am afraid I shall have to object.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I think my request is an absolutely constructive one. There are many Members of the Senate who would like to have all the chapters of the bill considered before the amendment now known, as the Senator from Illinois has said, as the Douglas-Kem amendment or before the Bridges-Byrd amendment is considered and adopted, if one of them is adopted, depending upon whichever one is considered by the Senate to have merit.

It seems to me that the proper time to consider them is after the bill has been amended in all other respects, at which time we shall have before us the bill in its entirety, and then we can consider whether to make an over-all cut.

Mr. President, if I am not able to obtain unanimous consent for the purpose I have requested, I shall move that the Senate temporarily pass over chapter X–A of the bill, and proceed to the consideration of the chapter X–B. I suppose that I must include in the motion a date, so as to provide that chapter X–A be taken up at a time certain.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Arizona, if he wishes to propose a modification of my request or make a motion.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I hope the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois will not object to the request that we temporarily pass over chapter X–A of the bill, because before we pass upon the amendments calling for over-all reductions, I believe we should know just what other provisions the bill is going to contain.

So, Mr. President, personally I think we should take up the ECA chapter of the bill, and then should proceed to consider the amendment which the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] has proposed, and should dispose of it. After having done that, and after we know what other provisions the bill is going to contain, we shall be better able to pass upon other amendments which may be offered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have the floor. I yielded to the Senator, did I not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska has the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Illinois, if I may do so without prejudice to my right to the floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Illinois is certainly welcome.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I think I should state what is the real issue behind this parliamentary maneuvering: We are really jockeying to see whether the Bridges-Byrd amendment shall be acted on first or whether the Kem-Douglas amendment shall be acted on first.

I have no personal feeling about this matter, but I have going on within me a real mental and ethical struggle, which I wish to have resolved in the easiest manner possible.

I regard the Bridges-Byrd amendment as the worst possible way in which to cut the budget. However, the need for cutting the budget is so great that if all other methods fail, then, with certain qualifications, I shall be compelled to vote for the Bridges-Byrd amendment. But I do not wish to do so unless first we have exhausted every other alternative.

I am approaching the Bridges-Byrd amendment with the same alacrity that a cat exhibits when it is grabbed by the tail and is pulled backward across a thick rug, at which it claws energetically, doing its utmost to resist. In short, as each amendment is defeated, I find myself nearer and nearer the rapids and nearer and nearer the Bridges-Byrd amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Then, Mr. President——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska permit me to continue?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator for not imposing the guillotine upon me; I thank him for his characteristic courtesy. The point I want to make is this: I have tried selective cuts and have not been successful. However, I think a blunt, meat-ax approach like the Bridges-Byrd amendment is wrong. With reservations, however, I will be forced to vote for it if we fail in all other attempts to reduce expenditures. But before voting for it I would like to present my general amendment which calls for a larger cut, and which specifies the areas where the cuts are to be made. That is why I wish to have my amendment called up first. I think it is a much better way for Congress to make reductions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the Chair state to the Senator from Illinois that if the unanimous-consent request is agreed to, the amendment of the Senator from Illinois will occupy exactly the same position which it will occupy otherwise.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would it be the first to be acted upon?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; the first to be acted upon——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, that is the whole issue. If that is the case, I am satisfied.

Mr. WHERRY. Oh, no, Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In order for the amendment of the Senator from Illinois to be first considered, the Senator from Illinois would have to be the first Senator to obtain the floor at that time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, that is a very important point. So the question will be which Senator obtains the floor first.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have the floor, have I not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska has the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. If my motion is acted upon favorably, that will mean that the Senate will proceed to take up the ECA

chapter of the bill. So the amendment of the Senator from Illinois will not be prejudiced in that case. In such event he will be just as well off at the time when he wishes to present his amendment as he is now. He does not have the floor now. If he agrees to the unanimous-consent request, then it will simply be a question of which amendment comes up first. If the Bridges-Byrd amendment is offered first, the Senator from Illinois can move to strike out the language of the amendment and insert the language of the Douglas-Kem amendment; or if the Douglas-Kem amendment is offered first, the Bridges-Byrd amendment could be offered as a substitute for it.

So, Mr. President, I hope the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois will not object to the requested unanimous-consent agreement, for he is always charitable and courteous, and wishes to go along in a good bipartisan spirit.

However, the motion already has been made to postpone until Wednesday of next week, for final consideration, chapter X–A of the bill.

So far as the handling of the amendments is concerned, that will depend on which Senator obtains the floor and which amendment prevails, either the so-called Douglas-Kem amendment or the Bridges-Byrd amendment.

Mr. President, I have made the motion.

Now I shall be glad to yield for a question.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the acting majority leader. Let me say now that if I may obtain unanimous consent, I shall withdraw the motion.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I do not wish to be classified as associated with any jockeying in favor of one side or another side, so far as the amendments are concerned. I did not have that in mind. I supported the course suggested by the Senator from Nebraska because I thought it was the most orderly way to proceed.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. McFARLAND. Although I favor temporarily laying aside chapter X, I certainly would resist a motion to take it up at a definite time. I do not think that would be the proper procedure.

I think we should lay it aside temorarily, and then proceed.

Of course, the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois is just about as quick on the jump as is the minority leader——

Mr. WHERRY. He is better, Mr. President. [Laughter.]

Mr. McFARLAND. In other words, the Senator from Illinois should be able to obtain the floor.

So I hope the Senator from Illinois will agree to the request to temporarily lay aside this chapter of the bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wish to be very obliging. I have a very cooperative mood at all times, and particularly this afternoon.

If we can reach a unanimous-consent agreement that when we take up chapter X–A of the bill, my amendment will be the first order of business, I shall be very glad, indeed, to agree to the requested unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. President, I believe I have the floor now——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have the floor; I yielded for a question or, if there was no objection, for a comment. Do I not have the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska has the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I wish to be fair——

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wish to be fair to the Senator.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, why do not both Senators be fair to me, and yield to me?

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be glad to yield once again to the junior Senator from Illinois, providing I do not prejudice my rights to the floor. I ask unanimous consent that I may do so.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. LANGER. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Washington for a question.

Mr. MAGNUSON. As the Senator knows, there are two very important amendments pending.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. As to those amendments, it was generally understood we would finish the committee amendments and would then consider the two amendments because they are in the nature of new matter. They are probably the two most important amendments, and I was wondering whether, under this arrangement, we would go on with the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Oh, certainly.

Mr. MAGNUSON. And finish the committee amendments?

Mr. WHERRY. My motion is to temporarily pass over chapter X–A, and I feel that the majority leader should then bring up the so-called Douglas-Kem amendment, at the conclusion of the bill, for the reasons I have already stated—that if cuts are made in the ECA items, it will then be necessary to adjust the so-called over-all cut amendment, whichever one prevails.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It makes a difference.

Mr. WHERRY. The only time that could be done would be following the conclusion of the bill, at which time each and every Senator will have his right to the floor. I have to make a motion, however, to postpone it to a day certain. I did so Wednesday. I should like to modify that motion to, say, Monday, and when Monday comes, if we are not ready for it, we shall have to modify it, I presume, and extend it for a longer period. I do not want to delay passage of the pending bill, but the motion necessitates a day certain. I shall make the motion on Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator first want to let the Chair put the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Illinois objected to it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I desire to be thoroughly obliging, thoroughly cooperative in all respects on these matters, and I am willing to withdraw my objection.

Mr. WHERRY. That is fine.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But I hope that the Chair or whoever may be occupying the chair, will cast his glance all around the Chamber when it comes time to recognize Senators, when this matter comes up.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I withdraw the motion I made, and I thank the Senator from Illinois for his cooperation. But I do not want the glancing part of the argument to prevail upon the occupant of the chair when the time comes to consider chapter X–A.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I merely said I hoped the eyes of the Presiding Officer would describe a semicircle—an arc, so to speak, and that he would not ignore the junior Senator from Illinois when the proper time came.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Chapter X–A will be passed over.

CONTROL OF ANCHORAGE AND MOVEMENT OF FOREIGN-FLAG VESSELS IN UNITED STATES WATERS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3859) to authorize the President to control the anchorage and movement of foreign-flag vessels in waters of the United States when the national security of the United States is endangered, and for other purposes, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 1 of title II of the act of June 15, 1917 (40 Stat. 217; U. S. C., title 50, sec. 191), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"Whenever the President finds that the security of the United States is endangered by reason of actual or threatened war, or invasion, or insurrection, or subversive activity, or of disturbances or threatened disturbances of the international relations of the United States, the President is authorized to institute such measures and issue such rules and regulations—

"(a) to govern the anchorage and movement of any foreign-flag vessels in the territorial waters of the United States, to inspect such vessels at any time, to place guards thereon, and, if necessary in his opinion in order to secure such vessels from damage or injury, or to prevent damage or injury to any harbor or waters of the United States, or to secure the observance of rights and obligations of the United States, may take for such purposes full possession and control of such vessels and remove therefrom the officers and crew thereof, and all other persons not especially authorized by him to go or remain on board thereof;

"(b) to safeguard against destruction, loss, or injury from sabotage or other subversive acts, accidents, or other causes of similar nature, vessels, harbors, ports, and waterfront facilities in the United States, the Canal Zone, and all territory and water, continental or insular, subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

testified before the Senate Appropriations Committee and said:

I am happy to tell the Appropriations Committee that, in my judgment, the trend of events in South Korea is more favorable than it has been at any time since the liberation of that country in 1945. The reasons for optimism are military, political, and economic. It is my considered opinion that in the face of great difficulty the Government of the Republic of Korea is now steadily gaining strength in each of these three sectors. (1) A rigorous training program has built up a well-disciplined army of 100,000 soldiers, one that is prepared to meet any challenge by North Korean forces, and one that has cleaned out the guerrilla bands in South Korea in one area after another.

Twelve days later the North Koreans invaded South Korea and, with virtually no effort or resistance, captured a large part of the country. Had the South Koreans, who, Mr. Foster said, had a well-disciplined army of 100,000 soldiers prepared to meet any challenge by North Korean forces, courageously resisted, our reinforcements would have been spared the tremendous casualties which have resulted from lack of time to prepare an expeditionary force.

At the proper time it will be appropriate for Congress to investigate upon what grounds Mr. Foster, the Deputy Administrator of the Economic Cooperation Administration, made this statement, and why the South Koreans in the first days of the invasion failed to resist.

I call attention further to the fact that since the American occupation forces were taken from Korea, there has been a substantial military mission there to train the South Korean army.

Still further, Gen. William L. Roberts, head of the United States Military Commission to Korea, told a news conference a few days ago that the South Koreans were not adequately armed because our leaders feared they would attack North Korea and thereby embarrass the United States. He said:

The South Koreans believed the best method was to attack. To prevent them from attacking we gave them no combat air force, no tanks, and no heavy artillery.

So we have two American leaders, one, Mr. Foster, who said the South Korean army was well trained and equipped and prepared to meet any challenge; the other, the head of the United States Military Commission, who said America did not adequately equip the South Koreans because they might attack the North Koreans.

It is just such contradictions and incompetence as this that have precipitated a crisis of great magnitude. In due time those responsible will be held accountable by the verdict of American public opinion. What we have done in Korea is to demonstrate the ineffectiveness of that part of the Truman doctrine in the protection of small or isolated nations by arming those who are not prepared or willing to fight when the issue comes, and thereby accepting on the part of the United States a commitment to fight such wars wherever and whenever they may occur. I repeat, a dozen sideline wars may occur without Russia showing her hand.

Since the end of World War II we have spent hundreds of millions of dollars in South Korea for relief, occupation and military training. In addition we have transferred great quantities of military equipment, which has not been evaluated. The war that Russia is conducting against America is a war of economic attrition. We have walked into her trap. We have committed ourselves to be involved in civil wars throughout the world and to exhaust our resources, regiment and tax our people while Russia can, and I believe will, remain on the outside.

The free-enterprise system cannot long operate under drastic police controls inefficiently administered. A democracy cannot remain on a war basis for a long period of time and still preserve the stimuli of free enterprise and fiscal solvency.

But today we are faced with facts. We have been driven into a situation in Korea from which we must not retreat, but in all prudence we must consider the possibility, if not the probability, that similar wars will be started elsewhere.

It is for these compelling reasons that I will vote for the Baruch proposals for stand-by power to the President, limited to July 1, 1951. This does not mean, of course, that Congress cannot renew these powers, but such dictatorial economic power over the lives of our citizens should be subject to review by Congress at stated periods.

We are in another emergency which is developing some of the aspects of hysteria, and we hear much about huge new taxes, about all-out regimentation, huge additional expenditures, but we hear little about a reduction in nondefense spending. Reduction of nondefense spending should be placed No. 1 on our mobilization program. Financial preparedness is the source of all preparedness.

Mr. President, I offer the amendment, to lie on the table and to be considered when the proposed legislation comes before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico has requested unanimous consent to take up at this time for immediate consideration an amendment to section 1111 on page 468 of the bill. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. Will the Senator offer his amendment?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and myself I offer the amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 473, after line 23, it is proposed to insert:

(5) grants to the States under title I, IV, or X of the Social Security Act, or under any other public assistance title in such act.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, this amendment would make definite and certain, in a way which I think the House language perhaps does not, that the Federal contributions to the States for old-age assistance, for the blind, and for dependent children, will not be subject to any finding or determination or any action by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, but that such contributions, being fixed specifically by statute, by statutory formulas, will be paid to the States in the future just as they have been paid in the past.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In substance the amendment provides that where Federal statutes guarantee that the Federal Government will match certain funds for old-age assistance, and matters of that character, such as mothers' aid, and health matters, the antideficiency provision shall not apply?

Mr. HILL. No; it simply applies to the three categories, of old-age assistance, dependent children, and the blind. But it says where there is a statutory commitment to the States, where the amounts are fixed and determined by statutory formulas, such commitments will be met, and shall not be subject to any finding or any determination by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As one who was on the other end of the stick for some time in the capacity of Governor, and because of the uncertainty of the Federal appropriations, not always knowing what we should do in the States, I should say that I certainly approve of the amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR].

Mr. McKELLAR. I have no objection to the adoption of the amendment and to taking it to conference. I have not gone into it yet, and will have to go into it and see what it would do, but I shall be glad to study it. The amendment is certainly very praiseworthy in its purpose. It seems to me at first blush it should be adopted. But before finally agreeing to it, I should like to look at it.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] for himself and other Senators on page 473, after line 23.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter XI—General provi-

sions," on page 469, line 13, after the word "in", to strike out "requirements", and insert "requirements or"; and in line 14, after the word "operations", to strike out the comma and "or other developments."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 473, line 7, after "(f)", to insert "(1)"; and in line 9, after the word "apportionments", to insert "trust funds and working funds expenditures from which have no significant effect on the financial operations of the Government, working capital and revolving funds established for intra-governmental operations."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 473, after line 23, to strike out:

(5) contingent expenses of the Senate or of the House of Representatives.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator from Alabama whether the figure "(5)" in line 24 should not be included in order to cover his amendment. That is on page 473.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The figure "(5)" is included in the amendment adopted a few minutes ago.

Mr. HILL. Yes; it is included in that amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 474, to insert:

(2) The provisions of subsection (c) of this section shall not apply to appropriations to the Senate or House of Representatives or to any Member, committee, Office (including the office of the Architect of the Capitol), officer, or employee thereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 474, line 15, after the word "any", to strike out "other"; in line 17, after the word "obligations", to insert "or expenditures"; and in line 21, after the word "obligation", to insert "or the making of any expenditure."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 474, line 24, after the word "obligation", to insert "or make any expenditure."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 475, line 23, after the word "act", to insert "including the government of the District of Columbia"; and on page 476, line 1, after the word "on", to strike out "December 31, 1950" and insert "June 30, 1951."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I understand we are now considering section 1112, beginning on page 475.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. We have just adopted a committee amendment at the top of page 476 in that section.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I have at the desk an amendment to that section, and I offer it at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Unanimous consent is required in order to have the amendment considered at this time.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may offer the amendment for consideration at this time.

This section deals with annual leave, and places a limitation on the amount of leave which can be accumulated. My amendment will take care of paying for annual leave when a civilian employee of the Government goes into the armed services.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the amendment?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say that I have not had time to go over the amendment. However, I shall be glad to let it go into the bill at this time, and very carefully examine it and consider it in conference.

Mr. GURNEY. I may say that I have taken up the amendment with the staff of the Appropriations Committee. I am very sorry that I did not have the idea at the time when this section was being considered by the Appropriations Committee. However, at that time the Korean situation had not developed.

I should like to have the Members of the Senate now present hear the amendment stated, if that may be done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 475, in line 25, before the word "officer", it is proposed to insert "civilian."

On page 476, before the period in line 4, it is proposed to insert a colon and the following: *"And provided further,* That this section shall not apply with respect to the payment of compensation for accumulated annual leave in the case of officers or employees who leave their civilian positions for the purpose of entering upon active military or naval service in the Armed Forces of the United States."

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I move the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator briefly explain the purpose of the amendment and what is intended to be accomplished by it?

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, the section as reported by the committee limits the amount of annual leave which can be accumulated. If a civilian employee of the Government leaves that service to enter the armed services, then, as I would have the section written, it would allow such a civilian employee to be paid, before he enters the armed services, for the amount of leave he has accumulated.

Mr. BRIDGES. That would be done in view of the fact that he would not be able to take the leave. Is that correct?

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct. The amendment would give such employee the money before he enters the armed services.

Mr. McKELLAR. What would be the cost of putting the amendment into effect?

Mr. GURNEY. I do not know, and I do not think anyone can tell, because I do not believe anyone can say how many civilian employees of the Government will enter the armed services. However, I know that if a person enters any branch of the armed services, he has many extra financial obligations. If he enters the armed services, he will not have time in which to take annual leave.

I know such a person would like to leave a little money at home, and I believe that the Government wants to pay him in cash for leave he cannot take under such circumstances.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Let me ask the Senator if he has considered whether the language used in his amendment would permit a civilian employee simply to fail to take his leave during the period mentioned in the amendment—that is to say, up to the middle of next year, and perhaps go into the next year, as well—and then at the time when he entered the armed services, he purged of any obligation which would rest upon others.

It seems to me the language of the amendment is broad enough to permit that to be done. I shall not object to the amendment, but I hope it will be carefully considered in conference, and I hope there is included in the amendment language which will effectuate the purpose as outlined by the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, let me say that we shall carefully consider it in the conference.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, the purpose is not to give the privilege the Senator from Oregon has mentioned, but only to permit the payment of accumulated leave in case such a person joins the armed services at any time between now and June 30, 1951.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, what is the amount of accumulated leave which such a person might have?

Mr. GURNEY. Whatever is now provided under Federal law in that respect. I believe it is either 60 or 90 days.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I think the amendment is a worthy one. I think accumulated leave should be paid for under such circumstances. I think a person in that situation will need the money.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the amendment of the Senate from South Dakota?

Without objection, the amendment is considered and agreed to.

The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 476, after line 20, to strike out:

SEC. 1114. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or position under the United States Government which may become vacant during the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1950: *Provided,* That this inhibition shall not apply—

(a) to not to exceed 10 percent of all such vacancies in any agency caused by separation from such agency,

(b) to positions filled from within the agency,

(c) to offices or positions required by law to be filled by appointment of the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate,

(d) to scientific and technical positions in the Atomic Energy Commission and the Armed Services,

(e) to nurses, doctors, or other medical personnel, including orderlies, in the Public Health Service and the Veterans' Administration,

(f) to law enforcement officers,

(g) to temporary, emergency, seasonal, or cooperative positions,

(h) to commissioned, commissioned warrant, warrant, and enlisted personnel, and cadets of the Coast Guard, and the undergraduates of the United States Military and Naval Academies, or

(i) to any agency in the legislative or judicial branches of the Government, or the municipal government of the District of Columbia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, there is at the desk an amendment which I should like to call up for consideration. The amendment is proposed by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] for himself and 35 other Senators. I wish to call it up at this time, with the following modification: At the bottom of the first page, instead of the words "in lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out on pages 444, 445, and 446," insert "in lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out on pages 476 and 477."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I should like to call the Senator's attention to the fact that this is not the proper time to take up that amendment, at this point in the bill. That amendment comes in chapter X.

Mr. BYRD. However, I am offering it to this section.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia has offered the amendment heretofore prepared to chapter X of the bill; and it is now offered as an amendment to section 1114, beginning on page 476.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, certain technical changes will be necessary in order to change the chapter numbers appearing on pages 2, 3, and 4 of the amendment.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, does this amendment take the place of the committee amendment on page 477?

Mr. BYRD. It takes the place of the part of it which would be stricken out by the committee amendment on pages 476 and 477.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is offered to take the place of the committee amendment which is designed to strike out section 1114 as it appears in the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. In other words, it amends that committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly; and it does so by including the language which is proposed to be stricken out by the committee amendment.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, this amendment is in order, I am sure. Although it contains legislation, yet it amends a provision which contains legislation, that provision having been placed in the bill by the House of Representatives.

I should like to have a ruling by the Chair as to whether or not the amendment is in order. I am advised by the Parliamentarian that the House provision, which is thus proposed to be stricken, is legislation, and likewise this amendment contains legislation.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, of course, this amendment will take some time to dispose of. It was not known that it would be offered today. I think the amendment should go over.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. There is no objection to having the amendment go over until tomorrow and be considered then. But I think the ruling of the Chair should be made now.

Mr. McFARLAND. I do not know about that, Mr. President. I have not had an opportunity to study the amendment. I may wish to offer a point of order. So I think the ruling on the amendment should go over until tomorrow. I do not propose that it be ruled upon at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the Chair calls attention to the fact that he is one of the sponsors of this amendment, as originally offered; and he would prefer to have the ruling on it made by the Vice President.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BYRD. As I understand, the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia is before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's amendment has been offered, and the amendment will come up at such time as the Senator may request the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. BYRD. Under the unanimous-consent agreement adopted today, when will this amendment come up?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment just offered by the Senator from Virginia will come up immediately after the disposal of the so-called McCarran amendment, relating to aid to Spain.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. This afternoon I asked that very question. The majority leader stated that he intended to finish the ECA chapter, not only to vote on the McCarran amendment, but also to vote on the entire chapter, before returning to the pending chapter. It so happens that the point of order which has been raised is the pending question. But certainly it would be my understanding of the request of the majority leader, before we entered into the unanimous-consent agreement, that the chapter on ECA, including the McCarran amendment, would be completed before we returned to the pending chapter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that, under the new unanimous-consent agreement entered into today, after the disposal of the McCarran amendment, the Senate will then immediately dispose of chapter X–B, as amended.

Mr. WHERRY. That is according to the understanding of the Senator from Nebraska, who also understands that the Senate will thereafter return to the chapter now pending.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. After which time the amendment just offered by the Senator from Virginia would become the order of the business.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly. So as I understand the statement of the present occupant of the Chair, what he said a moment ago was correct, except that the complete chapter on ECA would be voted on, as amended, and the Senate would then return to the point where it leaves off tonight.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. McFARLAND. That was not what the Chair stated. The Chair stated that we would return to chapter X–B, after completing the chapter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. X–B is the chapter on ECA, the Chair will state to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McFARLAND. Is it not chapter X–A?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; it is X–B.

Mr. McFARLAND. Has not chapter X–A been disposed of?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Chapter X–A has gone over for later consideration. The Chair feels it is only fair to state that his understanding is that the McCarran amendment will be voted on first, under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into this afternoon, which is a modification of the earlier unanimous-consent agreement; that, following that, the entire section, chapter X–B, which deals with ECA and allied subjects, will be disposed of, and that, thereafter, the pending question will be on the proposal made by the Senator from Virginia to amend section 1114 of chapter XI of the bill.

REDUCTION OF EXCISE TAXES—AMENDMENT

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment to the pending tax bill. I should like to call this amendment the Korean Excess-Profits Tax Amendment. The purpose of the provision which I am now offering is to help the Government of the United States pay as it goes on the very expensive adventure upon which it has been launched by the aggressive actions of the Communists in Korea. I do not need now to take the time of the Senate to explain the amendment. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the amendment, together with a copy of the statement which I am releasing to the press this evening, may be printed at length in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Finance; and, without objection, the amendment and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment and statement are as follows:

At the end of the bill add the following new title:

"TITLE VII—EXCESS-PROFITS TAX

"SEC. 701. Reapplication of excess-profits tax.

"(a) Reapplication: Section 122 (a) of the Revenue Act of 1945 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(a) In general: The provisions of subchapter E of chapter 2 shall not apply to any

taxable year beginning after December 31, 1945, and ending prior to January 1, 1950. The provisions of part III of such subchapter shall not apply to any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1945.'

"(b) Rate of tax: Section 710 (a) (1) (A) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended to read as follows:

"'(A) Sixty five percent of such part of the adjusted excess profits net income as exceeds 75 percent but is less than 90 percent of the excess profits credit determined under section 712, plus

"'Seventy-five percent of such part of the adjusted excess profits net income as exceeds 90 percent but is less than 100 percent of the excess profits credit determined under section 712, plus.

"'Ninety percent of such part of the adjusted excess profits net income as exceeds 100 percent but is less than 125 percent of the excess profits credit determined under section 712, plus

"'One hundred percent of the adjusted excess profits net income as exceeds 125 percent of the excess profits credit determined under section 712; or.'

"(c) Exemption: Section 710 (b) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(1) Specific Exemption.—A specific exemption of $25,000.'

"(d) Excess profits credit: Subsections (a) and (b) of section 712 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to allowance of excess profits credit) are hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(a) Domestic Corporations.—In the case of a domestic corporation which was in existence before January 1, 1950, the excess profits credit for any taxable year shall be computed under section 713 or section 714, whichever amount results in the lesser tax under this subchapter for the taxable year for which the tax under this subchapter is being computed. In the case of all other domestic corporations, the excess profits credit for any taxable year shall be an amount computed under section 714.

"'(b) Foreign corporations: In the case of a foreign corporation engaged in trade or business within the United States, the first taxable year of which under this subchapter begins on any date in 1950, which was in existence on the day 36 months prior to such date and which at any time during each of the taxable years in such 36 months was engaged in trade or business within the United States, the excess-profits credit for any taxable year shall be an amount computed under section 713 or section 714, whichever amount results in the lesser tax under this subchapter for the taxable year for which the tax under this subchapter is being computed. In the case of all other foreign corporations the excess-profits credit for any taxable year shall be an amount computed under section 714.'

"(e) Definition of unused excess-profits credit: Section 710 (c) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code is hereby amended by striking out the last two sentences thereof and by inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'For the purposes of the determination of the taxes imposed by this subchapter for taxable years beginning before January 1, 1946, there shall be no unused excess-profits credit for a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1946. The unused excess-profits credit for a taxable year beginning in 1946 and ending in 1947 shall be an amount which is such part of the unused excess-profits credit determined under the preceding provisions of this paragraph as the number of days in such taxable year prior to January 1, 1947, is of the total number of days in such taxable year. For the purposes of the determination of the taxes imposed by this subchapter for taxable years ending after December 31, 1949, there shall be no unused excess-profits credit for a taxable year ending before July 1, 1950. The unused excess-profits credit for a taxable year beginning in 1949 or 1950 and ending after June 30, 1950, shall be an amount which is such part of the unused excess-profits credit determined under the preceding provisions of this paragraph as the number of days in such taxable year after June 30, 1950, is of the total number of days in such taxable year.'

"(f) No carry-back to 1946, 1947, 1948, or 1949: Section 710 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'(5) No carry-back to 1946, 1947, 1948, or 1949: For purposes of the determination of the taxes imposed by this subchapter for taxable years ending after December 31, 1949, the term "preceding taxable year" and the term "preceding taxable years," as used in this subsection, do not include any taxable year ending prior to January 1, 1950.'

"(g) Amount of excess profit credit: Section 713 (a) (relating to the amount of excess profits credit) is amended by striking out '95 percent' wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "75 percent."

"(h) Definition of 'base period': Section 713 (b) (1) is amended to read as follows:

"'(1) Definition: As used in this section the term "base period"—

"'(A) If the corporation was in existence during the whole of the 36 months preceding the beginning of its first taxable year under this subchapter after December 31, 1949, means the period commencing with the beginning of its first taxable year beginning after December 31, 1946, and ending with the close of its last taxable year beginning before January 1, 1949; and

"'(B) In the case of a corporation which was in existence during only part of the 36 months preceding the beginning of its first taxable year under this subchapter after December 31, 1949, means the 36 months preceding the beginning of its first taxable year under this subchapter.'

"(i) Taxable years beginning in 1949 or 1950 and ending prior to June 30, 1951: Section 710 (a) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"'(8) Taxable years beginning in 1949 and ending in 1950: In the case of a taxable year beginning in 1949 and ending in 1950, the tax shall be an amount equal to that portion of a tentative tax, computed as if the law applicable to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1949, were applicable to such taxable year, which the number of days in such taxable year after June 30, 1950, bears to the total number of days in such taxable year.

"'(9) Taxable years beginning after December 31, 1949, and ending prior to June 30, 1951: In the case of a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1949, and ending prior to June 30, 1951, the tax shall be an amount equal to that portion of a tentative tax which the number of days in such taxable year after June 30, 1950, bears to the total number of days in such taxable year.'

"(j) Technical amendments: The following sections of the Internal Revenue Code are restored to read as such sections read immediately prior to the enactment of the Revenue Act of 1945, to be effective as so restored, with respect to taxable years ending after December 31, 1949, as if section 122 (g) of the Revenue Act of 1945 had not been enacted:

"(1) Section 26 (a) (relating to the credit for income subject to the excess-profits tax);

"(2) Section 102 (d) (1) (defining terms for the purpose of the tax imposed by section 102);

"(3) Section 131 (b) (prescribing certain limitations on the foreign tax credit);

"(k) Taxable years to which amendments applicable: The amendments made to the Internal Revenue Code by this title shall be applicable with respect to taxable years ending after December 31, 1949.

"(l) Technical changes: The Commissioner is authorized to make such changes in the dates and the periods of time appearing in subchapter E of chapter 2 of the Internal Revenue Code as may be necessary to conform to the amendments made by this title."

On page 50, line 18, before the period insert the following: "reduced by the credit for income subject to the tax imposed by subchapter E of chapter 2 provided in subsection (e)."

On page 88, strike out lines 24 and 25 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(A) the credit for income subject to the tax imposed by subchapter E of chapter 2 provided in section 26 (e) and the credit for dividends received provided in section 26 (b).'

On page 89, strike out lines 24 and 25 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(1) The credit for income subject to the tax imposed by subchapter E of chapter 2 provided in section 26 (e) and the credit for dividends received provided in section 26 (b) (computed by limiting such credit to 85 percent of the net income reduced by the credit for income subject to the tax imposed by subchapter E of chapter 2 in lieu of 85 percent of the adjusted net income so reduced)."

On page 94, strike out lines 22 through 25, and on page 95, strike out lines 1 through 3, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(7) Section 204 (a) (2) (relating to definition of normal tax net income and corporation surtax net income of foreign insurance companies other than life or mutual) is amended to read as follows:

"'(2) Normal-tax and corporation surtax net income of foreign insurance companies other than life or mutual and foreign mutual marine: In the case of a foreign insurance company (other than a life or mutual insurance company) and a foreign mutual marine insurance company, and a foreign mutual fire insurance company described in paragraph (1) of this subsection, the normal-tax net income shall be the net income from sources within the United States minus the credit provided in section 26 (a), the credit provided in section 26 (b), and the credit for income subject to the tax imposed by subchapter E of chapter 2 provided in section 26 (e), and the corporation surtax net income shall be the net income from sources within the United States minus the credit provided in section 26 (b) (computed by limiting such credit to 85 percent of the net income reduced by the credit for income subject to the tax imposed by subchapter E of chapter 2 in lieu of 85 percent of the adjusted net income so reduced) minus the credit provided in section 26 (j), and minus the credit for income subject to the tax imposed by subchapter E of chapter 2 provided in section 26 (e).'"

At the end of the table of contents, on page 7, insert the following:

"TITLE VII—EXCESS PROFITS TAX

"SEC. 701. Reapplication of excess-profits tax.

"(a) Reapplication.

"(b) Rate of tax.

"(c) Exemption.

"(d) Excess-profits credit.

"(e) Definition of unused excess-profits credit.

"(f) No carry-back to 1946, 1947, 1948, or 1949.

"(g) Amount of excess-profits credit.

"(h) Definition of base period.

"(i) Taxable years beginning in 1949 or 1950 and ending prior to June 30, 1951.

"(j) Technical amendments.

"(k) Taxable years to which amendments applicable.

"(l) Technical changes."

The CHIEF CLERK. The amendment, as modified, reads as follows:

On page 448, line 7, after the word "specified", insert the following:

"*Provided further*, That the Administrator is authorized and directed to issue notes from time to time during the fiscal year 1951 for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury, who is hereby authorized and directed to make such purchases, in an amount not exceeding in the aggregate $100,000,000 for the purpose of assistance to Spain, to be extended upon credit terms as provided in section 111 (c) (2) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Minnesota was wondering whether, with the offering of the O'Mahoney amendment, additional time would be allowed for debate on that particular amendment, in view of the fact that the unanimous-consent agreement which was entered into pertained to the McCarran amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The O'Mahoney amendment having been offered before the time for debate expired, it is the opinion of the Chair that there is no time now for debate on the O'Mahoney amendment. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming, for himself and other Senators, to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] is absent because of the death of a close personal friend.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN] and the Senators from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE and Mr. NEELY] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN] is paired on this vote with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea," and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay."

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] is paired on this vote with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea," and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. DARBY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] who is absent by leave of the Senate is paired with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Washington would vote "yea" and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay."

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] is absent by leave of the Senate, and if present would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 27, as follows:

YEAS—52

Aiken	Holland	Murray
Brewster	Hunt	Myers
Capehart	Ives	O'Conor
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	Pepper
Cordon	Kefauver	Robertson
Eastland	Kerr	Russell
Ferguson	Knowland	Saltonstall
Flanders	Leahy	Smith, Maine
Fulbright	Lodge	Smith, N. J.
George	Lucas	Sparkman
Green	McCarran	Stennis
Gurney	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Hayden	McKellar	Thye
Hendrickson	McMahon	Tydings
Hickenlooper	Magnuson	Wiley
Hill	Maybank	
Hoey	Millikin	

NAYS—27

Anderson	Frear	Malone
Benton	Gillette	Martin
Bricker	Graham	Morse
Bridges	Humphrey	Mundt
Butler	Kem	Taft
Byrd	Langer	Watkins
Douglas	Lehman	Wherry
Dworshak	McCarthy	Williams
Ecton	McClellan	Young

NOT VOTING—17

Cain	Jenner	Taylor
Chapman	Johnston, S. C.	Thomas, Okla.
Darby	Kilgore	Tobey
Donnell	Long	Vandenberg
Downey	Neely	Withers
Ellender	Schoeppel	

So the amendment offered by Mr. O'MAHONEY for himself and other Senators to Mr. MCCARRAN'S amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now recurs on the amendment of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] as amended by the O'Mahoney amendment.

Mr. WHERRY and other Senators requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] is absent because of the death of a close personal friend.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN], and the Senators from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE and Mr. NEELY] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN] is paired on this vote with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea," and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay."

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] is paired on this vote with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea," and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. DARBY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 65, nays 15, as follows:

YEAS—65

Aiken	Hunt	Millikin
Brewster	Ives	Mundt
Bricker	Johnson, Colo.	Murray
Bridges	Johnson, Tex.	Myers
Butler	Kefauver	O'Conor
Capehart	Kem	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Kerr	Pepper
Connally	Knowland	Robertson
Cordon	Langer	Russell
Dworshak	Leahy	Saltonstall
Eastland	Lodge	Smith, Maine
Ellender	Lucas	Smith, N. J.
Ferguson	McCarran	Sparkman
Fulbright	McCarthy	Stennis
George	McClellan	Taft
Gillette	McFarland	Thye
Gurney	McKellar	Tydings
Hayden	McMahon	Watkins
Hendrickson	Magnuson	Wherry
Hickenlooper	Malone	Wiley
Hoey	Martin	Young
Holland	Maybank	

NAYS—15

Anderson	Flanders	Humphrey
Benton	Frear	Lehman
Byrd	Graham	Morse
Douglas	Green	Thomas, Utah
Ecton	Hill	Williams

NOT VOTING—16

Cain	Johnston, S. C.	Thomas, Okla.
Chapman	Kilgore	Tobey
Darby	Long	Vandenberg
Donnell	Neely	Withers
Downey	Schoeppel	
Jenner	Taylor	

So Mr. MCCARRAN'S amendent, as amended, was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 3380) to amend the act of August 9, 1939, to redefine the term "contraband article" with respect to narcotic drugs and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2160) to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize annual and sick leave with pay for commissioned officers of the Public Health Service, to authorize the payment of accumulated and accrued annual leave in excess of 60 days, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2591) to amend the Public Health Service

Act to support research and training in arthritis and rheumatism, multiple sclerosis, cerebral palsy, epilepsy and blindness, and other diseases, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 1293. An act for the relief of the Franco-Italian Packing Co.; and

H. R. 5074. An act to promote the national defense by authorizing specifically certain functions of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 7695. An act to provide a 5-day week for officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the United States Park Police force, and the White House Police force; and

H. R. 8909. An act to authorize the District of Columbia government to establish an Office of Civil Defense, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2234) for the relief of Mrs. Gladys J. Senyohl McCarthy; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. BYRNE of New York, Mr. DENTON, and Mr. KEATING were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the committee amendment, chapter X–B, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What is the question before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question before the Senate is the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and other Senators as a substitute for the language proposed to be stricken by the committee beginning on line 21, at page 476.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In lieu of the language proposed to be stricken on pages 476 and 477 by the so-called Byrd-Bridges amendment as a substitute for the language proposed to be stricken by the committee I move to insert the following language, which I send to the desk. I have been joined in this amendment by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], and also the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] and the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS]. I should like to have the amendment read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In lieu of the language proposed to be inserted by Mr. BYRD (for himself and others) as a substitute for the language proposed to be stricken out by the committee on pages 476 and 477 (embraced in sec. 1114), insert the following:

SEC. 1114. Reductions in appropriations contained in this act are hereby made in the sum of $1,000,000,000. Such reductions shall be made in the following manner:

(a) Funds appropriated in this act for supplies and materials, for lands and structures, and for Federal-aid postwar highways shall be reduced by $500,000,000: *Provided*, That the Director of the Bureau of the Budget is empowered to make such reductions among the departments and agencies in the executive branch of the Government in such a manner as to provide for the most efficient use of the Nation's manpower and resources consistent with prevailing needs for an adequate national defense and a sound national economy.

(b) Funds appropriated in this act for personal services, travel, transportation of things, communications services, rents and utilities, printing and reproduction, other contractual services, and equipment shall be reduced by $500,000,000, which reduction shall be made among the departments and agencies in the executive branch of the Government on a pro rata basis: *Provided*, That reductions in personnel shall, where practicable, be made by eliminating a total of 5 percent of the personnel provided for in the President's budget and the filling of a total of not more than one-half of all vacancies which occur by reason of death, resignation, or otherwise: *Provided further*, That the reductions provided for in this subsection among the departments shall be made on a department-wide basis and the Secretaries of the Departments are empowered, by means of transfers and adjustments, to keep the agencies within their respective departments at a maximum of efficiency: *Provided further*, That the Director of the Bureau of the Budget is empowered by means of transfers and adjustments to administer the reductions provided for in this subsection among the nondepartmental and independent agencies in such a manner as to provide for a maximum of efficiency: *Provided further*, That hereafter the amount of annual leave for Government employees, including employees of the postal services, shall be at the rate of 20 days per year and the amount of sick leave shall be at the rate of 12 days per year for classified and wage board employees (except that no annual leave nor sick leave shall be granted to any Government employee who has not been in continuous Government service at at least one calendar year).

SEC. 1115. The reductions provided for in this chapter shall not apply to the following (except that the annual- and sick-leave provisions shall apply to all classified and wage board employees):

(a) Chapter X, chapter X–B, and the amount appropriated to the General Services Administration for carrying out the provisions of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act of July 23, 1946;

(b) Appropriations in title I of chapter VIII for the Executive Office of the President under the headings "Compensation of the President," "The White House Office," "Emergency Fund for the President," and "Executive Mansion and Grounds.";

(c) Appropriations for the atomic energy program;

(d) Trust funds;

(e) Funds of Government corporations, excluding those made available in this act (1) for administrative expenses and (2) by appropriation from the general fund of the Treasury;

(f) Amounts (other than under the Veterans' Administration) for furnishing medical and hospital services and domiciliary care, excluding (1) administrative expenses not directly connected with the operation of a specific hospital, dispensary, or clinic, and (2) expenses for employee health service programs;

(g) Amounts provided in this act for payment of obligations incurred under prior appropriations, or authorizations, and obligated balances of reappropriations;

(h) Appropriations of, or measured by, receipts;

(i) Amounts appropriated by this act for the operation of law-enforcement agencies, including the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Bureau of Customs, Immigration and Naturalization Services, and the Secret Service; or for the payment of compensation and expenses of agents and auditors of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, and such other officers and employees of other agencies whose duties primarily pertain to intelligence operations (including funds transferred pursuant to section 6 (a) of the act of June 20, 1949; 63 Stat. 211), or to the investigation, apprehension, prosecution, or detention of persons suspected or convicted of offenses against the criminal laws of the United States;

(j) Amounts provided for any program of the Veterans' Administration, excluding (1) administrative expenses not directly connected with the operation of a specific hospital, dispensary, clinic, or facility, and (2) expenses for employee health service programs;

(k) Grants (other than those for Federal-aid postwar highways), subsidies, and contributions where amounts are determined by law;

(l) Amounts provided to make payment of or contributions toward pensions, retirement and disability annuities and benefits, employee's death or injury benefits, or other items of a similar nature;

(m) Appropriations for refunds, awards, and indemnities;

(n) Appropriations for the Coast Guard; and

(o) The amount appropriated to the Post Office Department for transportation of the mail.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, this is the same amendment that was offered last Friday, July 28, and at that time I made a brief statement explaining the nature and purposes of the amendment. It is not my purpose to speak at any great length today, but for the benefit of those Senators who were not here at the time the amendment was offered, or who perhaps have not read the RECORD, I may say that this is a proposal to make a total reduction in the appropriations of $1,000,0000,000.

This reduction is divided evenly between two portions. Five hundred million dollars of the reduction is to be on construction, materials, and supplies, and $500,000,000 on personnel, transportation of persons and things, equipment, communications, printing, and so forth.

Mr. President, the need for an appreciable reduction should, I think, be evident to all. The budget was out of balance by from four to five billion dollars before the Korean hostilities broke out. Even had there been no war in Korea it would have been necessary for us to have reduced our expenditures in order to decrease the deficit and in order to diminish the need for Government borrowing, and therefore to reduce the danger of inflation. But the coming of the Korean war,

with its added expenses—how great, we do not know—has intensified the need for governmental economy.

Thus far in my attempts to make selective cuts there have been virtually no reductions. I have only goose eggs to show for my efforts. It now appears, therefore, that the only possibility for an effective reduction in the budget is through some general cut of the type now proposed.

The reduction in outlay of a billion dollars, would put us in a much better condition of financial health, and it would be a reassurance to the people that we mean business, and want to take in the slack. If this were accompanied by a vigorous tax program which would meet the added cost caused by the hostilities in Korea, we might well be able to get through the difficult months and the difficult year ahead of us without appreciable price inflation. If we do not take in sail, if we do not tax, the governmental deficit will be large. We will be forced to borrow from the banks, the banks will create more credit, and the amount of money and credit in relationship to goods will grow greater and greater. The result inevitably will be a large rise in prices, with all the difficulties which that causes to people with fixed incomes, and with all the unsettling effect it has upon labor relations.

Therefore, Mr. President, it seems to me that we should reduce our expenditures and this reduction of a billion dollars in our civilian budget is aimed in that direction. We have made this general reduction as careful in nature as possible. No reductions are to apply for anything connected with the national defense.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am very glad to yield for a question.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Many of us share the desire to cut down at this time some nondefense expenditures, and the junior Senator from Tennessee would like very much to join in support of the amendment.

There is one matter which bothers me, namely, that in connection with the expenditures, there is an appropriation for the Tennessee Valley Authority, for a steam plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn., and one at Widow's Creek, Ala., and for three or four hydroelectric dams, some of which are under construction. These are vitally necessary, and they have been certified as necessary in order to furnish power for the atomic energy plant at Oak Ridge, and for the Arnold Air Engineering Development Center at Tullahoma, Tenn., for the Aluminum Co. at Alcoa, the Reynolds Metals Co., at Listerhill, Ala., the Red Stone Arsenal at Huntsville, and many other vital defense establishments in that section of the country.

Looking at the language at the end of page 1 and the beginning of page 2, where it is provided the Director of the Budget must first take into consideration the defense of the country in considering reductions of appropriations. I wonder if the Senator thinks that these necessary defense expenditures by the TVA would be exempted from the proposed cut.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Tennessee for his question. He has very properly called attention to the language beginning on line 9, page 1, and continuing to line 5, on page 2, namely, "the Director of the Bureau of the Budget is empowered to make such reductions among the departments and agencies in the executive branch of the Government in such a manner as to provide for the most efficient use of the Nation's manpower and resources consistent with prevailing needs for an adequate national defense and a sound national economy."

Therefore, while the decision on any particular project would have to be in the hands of the Director of the Budget, where power is needed for atomic energy and for other war needs, it would certainly seem to me that that would be in the interest of an adequate national defense, and that therefore such an expenditure would be exempt. But the final ruling would have to be made by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. In view of the fact that these steam plants and some of these dams were particularly recommended by the Defense Establishment for the purpose of furnishing electricity to these projects, some of which I have named, which have a direct and very important bearing upon our national-defense effort, does the Senator feel, as a sponsor of the amendment, that the money for such electrical projects should and would be excluded from the reduction which the Senator is seeking?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is my own personal feeling, but of course the determination is placed in the hands of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. The Senator has stated my own feeling.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I wonder if the Senator would consider amending—of course by agreement of the other sponsors of the amendment—the amendment he is offering, so as to cover the point I have raised.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There are about five sponsors of the amendment, and it is somewhat difficult to get agreement on such points on the floor, but it would certainly seem to me that such expenditures as those referred to would be exempt. The difficulty is that when we start making exemptions in terms of specific projects, then a whole series of exemptions will be demanded by differing Senators, and the logic and symmetry of the amendment itself is destroyed.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield for a question.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If I could phrase the question a little differently, can the Senator tell us where he thinks the first five hundred million would be cut or should be cut—where the cut would be made, primarily?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I can give the Senator the totals. The total of construction items for the nonexempt agencies is about $1,040,000,000. The total budgeted amounts for supplies and materials is about $820,000,000. The total amount in the bill for Federal aid postwar highways would be three hundred and eighty-five million, and four hundred and five million, depending on the final figure which is adopted in conference. This makes a total of about two and a quarter billion dollars from which the $500,000,000 reduction provided for in paragraph (a) would be drawn.

In other words, there would be an aggregate average reduction of about 22 percent distributed over the items for construction, materials, and supplies.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield for a question. Pardon me. I do not think the Senator from Arkansas has finished his questioning. After the Senator from Arkansas has finished his questioning I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should like to get further enlightenment. I recall the Senator's views about certain rivers and harbors projects which were particularly the object of his disapproval. I wondered if this particular item primarily would come out of that program.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am not passing judgment as to what should be eliminated from the program. That is up to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. From the whole range of projects, of highways, rivers and harbors, public buildings, materials and supplies, and so forth, he is merely directed to make a reduction of $500,000,000, but not to eliminate anything which in his judgment is necessary for the national defense.

I now yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from New Hampshire wants to know how much the Senator from Illinois is cutting on the highways.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The question is left up to the Bureau of the Budget. What I am saying is that the items from which this $500,000,000 reduction can be drawn will total approximately $2,250,000,000. Approximately one billion and forty million dollars for land and structures, about $820,000,000 for materials and supplies, and somewhere around $400,000,000 for highways, or a total, as I have said, of $2,250,000,000. Then from this, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget would take the $500,000,000 least essential items, the 22 percent which is least essential, leaving in the 75 to 78 percent which is most essential.

Mr. BRIDGES. Would the Senator from Illinois be surprised, after the statement he has made about highways——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me interrupt the Senator. It is not merely highways. It is all public works.

Mr. BRIDGES. Very well. In the second paragraph of the amendment appears the following:

(a) funds appropriated in this act for supplies and materials, for lands and structures, and for Federal-aid postwar highways shall be reduced by $500,000,000.

Now having put that in his amendment and then explained it, would the Senator be surprised if he found that he provides no reduction whatsoever in his amendment?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Unless there is some catch here, I should be greatly surprised, because the funds for these items are specifically reduced to make a total reduction of $500,000,000 for those categories. The Senator from New Hampshire may have some subtle catch in mind, but I am not aware of it. I shall be much interested in having the jack-in-the-box come out.

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not want to say that I think the amendment has not been properly drafted or that the Senator does not realize what is in it. But paragraph (g), on page 4, says:

Amounts provided in this act for payment of obligations incurred under prior appropriations or authorizations, and obligated balances of reappropriations.

I have here, from the Bureau of the Budget, an analysis of what paragraph (g) provides, and included in it is everything for postwar construction, Federal-aid program. In other words, what the Senator has done is to insert in one paragraph and in another paragraph take out.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I urge upon my good friend from New Hampshire, since he is interested in a detailed analysis of the bill, to consult paragraph (k), on page 5 of the amendment. Among the items exempted are grants other than those for Federal postwar highways. So that the Federal-aid postwar highways would be included in the two and a quarter-billion dollars from which the $500,000,000 reduction could be made. But let me emphasize again that there is no direction to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget as to what projects he will eliminate in order to make the $500,000,000 reduction. He is to take the $500,000,000 from what is least essential, but not to interfere with what is necessary for the national defense.

Mr. BRIDGES. But under paragraph (g) the Senator takes it entirely out. He exempts the whole thing.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No. Funds for Federal-aid postwar highways are provided under the appropriation for the Department of Commerce, Bureau of Public Roads, and are in the form of grants to States for highway construction. Therefore, in including highways I have specified that these funds are not exempt.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield for a question.

Mr. HUNT. Is the Senator from Illinois aware of the fact that under expenditures for 1950 and anticipated expenditures in 1951, even the full amount is not maintaining our highways, and repairing damage caused to them, and does the Senator think it is economy further to allow our highways to deteriorate, which would mean in the future a tremendous additional outlay in order to bring them back to the condition they are in at the present time?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say to my good and esteemed friend from Wyoming that I am not the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. The final decision is not to be made either by an individual Senator or by the Senate as a whole. It is to be made by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. Now in practice this is about what will happen anyway. The amendment gives the President power to suspend construction of that which in his opinion is not in the national interest. But the present situation is that we take credit amongst our constituents for making the appropriations, and then we throw upon the President the onus of canceling the contracts and the work. Under my proposal the Senate and the Congress would help to assume the responsibility with the President for an act of national economy, the necessity for which I think we all admit, namely, that it is better to put our resources into tanks, guns, and ammunition than into some of the public works for which we have made appropriations.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an additional question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. HUNT. Does the Senator feel that in the amendment he has suggested he is placing tremendous authority in the Executive?

Mr. DOUGLAS. As a matter of fact, so far as the suspension of public works is concerned, that is already given to the Executive. He does have the power to suspend construction of public works if in his judgment such construction contributes to inflation, and so forth. The President exercised that power in the summer of 1946 when, with the sharp rise of prices, he shut off the construction of some public works. He is doing that now. But the point is that by this appropriation bill we join him in that effort, and we give him a mandate that at least $500,000,000 is to be cut, instead of leaving him all alone to hold the fort against the demands not only of bureaus but of localities. We would say: "Good work. Cut $500,000,000. And you can do it by legislative authority, and not mere Executive discretion, and we will take the 'rap' along with you." If there is popular indignation, we will take the "rap" too, instead of claiming for ourselves all the benefits for appropriations and throwing upon the President all the opprobrium for cuts.

Mr. HUNT. May I say to the distinguished Senator from Illinois that that does not maintain American highways, which we need in our war effort.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If it is necessary to spend $500,000,000 for American highways, the money will be spent. The amendment does not say that there must be proportionate cuts for each of these purposes. It merely says that there shall be a total cut of $500,000,000 among the items which aggregate $2,250,000,000.

Mr. President, I do not wish to take too much time, but I should like to point out also that another $500,000,000 is to be drawn from reductions in personnel, equipment, transportation of persons and transportation of things, printing, and communications. The total items in this connection amount to about $4,600,000,000 in the nonexempt agencies. The average cut on these items would be around 11 percent.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Illinois proposes to reduce the appropriations by $1,000,000,000.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In total; yes.

Mr. BYRD. Total. How is he to accomplish that reduction?

Mr. DOUGLAS. For the $500,000,000 of construction, the Bureau of the Budget will make the reduction. For the $500,000,000 of other items, those amounts are to be prorated amongst departments and independent agencies in the same ratio as their total sums for these purposes, as the Bureau of the Budget has already indicated in an analysis.

Mr. BYRD. But the amendment does not say that. Let me ask the Senator this question. The amendment says:

That the Director of the Bureau of the Budget is empowered to make such reductions among the departments and agencies in the executive branch of the Government in such a manner as to provide for the most efficient use of the Nation's manpower and resources consistent with prevailing needs for an adequate national defense and a sound national economy.

Yet the amendment does not direct the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to do that; the amendment would simply empower him to do it.

The amendment covers a much broader field than the question of making a reduction in the amount of $500,000,000, for the amendment goes into the question of the Nation's manpower and resources, the language being—

in such a manner as to provide for the most efficient use of the Nation's manpower and resources consistent with prevailing needs for an adequate national defense and a sound national economy.

That includes the entire field.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Virginia will consult the first sentence of section 1001 (a), he will see that the reduction to be made by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget is to apply to "supplies and materials, for land and structures, and for Federal-aid postwar highways,". On the other hand the executive departments and agencies will make the reductions in the case of funds for "personal services, travel, transportation of things, communications services, rents and utilities, printing and reproduction, other contractual services, and equipment"—according to subsection (b). In other words, this latter reduction is to be prorated among the various departments and agencies.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Illinois is not reading from the amendment now, for the amendment simply says that the Director of the Bureau of the Budget is empowered to do it. He is not directed to do it; and in that connection, under the provisions of the amend-

ment, he can proceed on whatever basis he regards as best or most suitable in connection with the purpose of the amendment—

To provide for the most efficient use of the Nation's manpower and resources consistent with prevailing needs for an adequate national defense and a sound national economy.

The amendment does not direct the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to proceed in any particular way; but it gives the Director the power to make reductions of the appropriations in the case of any or all of the departments, so long as he proceeds—

In such a manner as to provide for the most efficient use—

I do not know just what that means—

of the Nation's manpower and resources—

And so forth. So in this amendment the Senator from Illinois is not directing the Bureau of the Budget to do anything specifically, but the amendment would simply give him a power which has never been given to any official of the Government, so far as I have ever heard.

I should like the Senator from Illinois to explain these things. For instance, just what is "the most efficient use of the Nation's manpower and resources"?

I may say that this amendment proposed by the Senator from Virginia does not direct any cuts—it authorizes the cuts.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I would also say that the most efficient use of the Nation's manpower and resources consistent with needs for national defense is to have men work at those public works which, in comparison with defense needs and civilian needs, will have the greatest beneficial effect on our defense effort. In other words, only nonessential projects would be eliminated.

Mr. BYRD. That is the Senator's interpretation and definition, but it is not written in the amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not know how it could be made plainer.

Mr. BYRD. As I read the language of the amendment, it is so broad that the Director of the Bureau of the Budget could do anything he wished to do or anything he might decide to do.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the amendment reduces construction funds by $500,000,000 and gives the Bureau of the Budget the power to allocate this reduction among the projects which are regarded as least necessary, and the amendment would permit them to be eliminated. The amendment gives that power; and in that connection the national defense and the total productivity of the Nation are to be considered.

Mr. BYRD. But I submit to the Senator from Illinois that the amendment does not say that. The Senator may have that in his mind, but there is nothing in the amendment to indicate that in any way whatever.

Mr. DOUGLAS. When the amendment says that—

Funds appropriated in this act for supplies and materials, for lands and structures, and for Federal-aid postwar highways shall be reduced by $500,000,000——

Mr. BYRD. Very well; let the Senator from Illinois read the rest of the amendment, rather than to draw upon his own thoughts or imagination in this connection. I ask the Senator to read the entire sentence.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It has been read many times. I am perfectly willing to strike out the word "empowered," and substitute for it the word "directed", although the Senator's own amendment merely uses the word "authorized."

Then the amendment would read as follows, at that point:

Provided, That the Director of the Bureau of the Budget is directed to make such reductions among the departments and agencies in the executive branch of the Government in such a manner as to provide for the most efficient use of the Nation's manpower and resources consistent with prevailing needs for an adequate national defense and a sound national economy.

The Director of the Bureau of the Budget would be directed to proceed in that way to the extent of making reductions of appropriations in a total amount of $500,000,000 although, since the reduction is already made by the amendment, it seems obvious to me that the word "empower" merely provides a vehicle for the allocation of the reduction.

Mr. BYRD. However, the amendment says nothing about the 22 percent the Senator from Illinois has been discussing. Under the amendment, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget could cut out all of the funds for roads; he could cut out the entire $380,000,000 for roads, for the amendment would not limit him to making a 22 percent reduction in any particular item.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; but the figures which I gave were based on an analysis of the budget made by the Bureau of the Budget and with particular respect to the expenditures proposed to be made on the basis of the available materials. I should like to have parts of this memorandum inserted at the end of my remarks.

Mr. BYRD. However, all that is not set forth in the amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; but from this it will be seen that a reduction of $500,000,000 will mean that the average reduction will be approximately 22 percent. That does not mean that the appropriations for each project will be reduced by 22 percent, but it does mean that there will be a reduction in the aggregate of 22 percent in the appropriations we have made thus far for these purposes for the non-exempt agencies and those which are regarded as the least necessary and the least efficient would be eliminated.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Illinois contends, does he not, that the amendment does apply to the road fund?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes, certainly.

Mr. BYRD. The bill appropriated $380,000,000 for the road fund for the coming year. Is it not true that under the amendment the Director of the Bureau of the Budget could cancel the entire appropriation for the road fund, if he chose to do so?

Mr. DOUGLAS. However, he certainly would not do so.

Mr. BYRD. But could not he do so?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Of course he could make a reduction of $500,000,000 in total amount from a variety of projects.

Mr. BYRD. And could not he take $380,000,000 from the road fund, as a part of the total reduction of appropriations? Nevertheless, the road fund is a contractual obligation, because the States are authorized by law to contract for that purpose and to issue obligations in that connection.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator suggest that the entire cut would be directed at the highway funds?

Mr. BYRD. I do not think it would be done, but I say that under the amendment it could be done.

Mr. DOUGLAS. However, I am sure the Senator from Virginia knows perfectly well that it would not be done.

Mr. BYRD. I do not know what would be done. I have seen many things done in the Government which I thought never would be done.

Mr. DOUGLAS. As a matter of fact, what is proposed by the amendment is really the situation today, for under acts passed by the Congress prior to 1946, the President has the power to suspend those public works which he thinks would contribute to inflation and are not in the national interest.

I remember that in the summer of 1946 the President called off the commencement of all new projects. I also know that in the last few days the President has sent to the Government departments a letter asking them to list the projects the construction of which in their opinion is not essential; and that list, when prepared, will go to the President, and he will strike out those projects. Furthermore, the Army engineers have called a conference to eliminate some of their items.

So this amendment will not give to the President any more power, insofar as eliminating construction is concerned, than he already possesses.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, if the Senator will further yield, let me ask him another question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. All these amendments—whether they call for percentage reductions or any other kind of reductions, other than specific ones—are very technical. Has the Senator from Illinois submitted his amendment to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget or the Legislative Drafting Service or to the General Accounting Office, to have the amendment approved by them?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Legislative counsel helped to draw up the amendment and members of the staff of the Bureau of the Budget have been contacted, and they say that technically the amendment can be administered although it probably would not be easy. I may say that a meat-ax cut of 10 percent would probably be easier to administer. However, I have always thought that the Congress, not the Bureau of the Budget, is the legislative body, and that Congress should at least specify the areas where the cuts are to be made.

Mr. BYRD. Of course, Congress is the legislative body. However, I am sure the Senator is well aware of the fact that the Congress has learned the wisdom of submitting technical matters for expert advice.

Does the Senator from Illinois have a written statement to the effect that the amendment is workable? Let me ask also who in the Office of the Bureau of the Budget says the amendment is workable?

Mr. DOUGLAS. A man by the name of Donald MacPhail; but the statement is not in writing. I should make it clear that I do not claim the support of the Budget Bureau and that Mr. MacPhail only indicated that the amendment was technically workable. I may say that the Budget Bureau has not endorsed the amendment proposed by the Senator from Virginia, either.

Mr. BYRD. Then let me ask another question, if the Senator will yield further.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Illinois proposes a general reduction of appropriations, and by his amendment the Director of the Bureau of the Budget would be directed to accomplish a reduction of $500,000,000. However, the Senator's amendment states, in the first few lines, that a total reduction of $1,000,000,000 is to be made. Who is to make the other reduction?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The other reduction is to be made in the funds appropriated "for personal services, travel, transportation of things, communications services, rents and utilities, printing and reproduction, other contractual services, and equipment."

Mr. BYRD. However, the details in regard to those items are not set forth in the amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Bureau of the Budget has made a classification of those items, based on the appropriations bill; and I hold that classification in my hand at this time. It is a classification on a functional basis for these items, and it is classified by departments, as well, showing the amounts spent for these purposes by the various departments. In that way we can determine the proportionate reduction to be made in the case of each and every department and independent agency. Then the head of each department or agency is to determine that matter for his particular department or agency; and the Bureau of the Budget is to make the determination for the combined independent agencies. I ask unanimous consent to insert this study at the close of my remarks.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be inserted as requested.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In other words, this cut, which averages around 11 percent, can be applied within each department according to the judgment of the head of that department, picking out those items he regards as least necessary. It is the most scientific across-the-board cut that we could have.

Mr. BYRD. Let me ask the Senator this question: He says the Director of the Budget only has to do with the $500,000,000. As to the other $500,000,000, who is to see that each department makes a proportionate cut? There must be someone who has that authority, otherwise it will not be made. They are not going to make a cut unless we make it. There must be an apportionment. Someone must apportion the reduction among the various departments.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If they do not have the funds, they will have to make the cut.

Mr. BYRD. No, but who is going to cut the funds?

Mr. DOUGLAS. This makes an automatic reduction in the appropriations in these amounts, to each department.

Mr. BYRD. What reductions? Who is to say what is to come out of the Department of State and all the other departments?

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the Senator will be kind enough to look at lines 9 and 10 on page 2, he will find:

shall be reduced by $500,000,000, which reduction shall be made among the departments and agencies in the executive branch of the Government on a pro rata basis.

Mr. BYRD. What is a pro rata basis?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Each department would be reduced in an amount which bears the same ratio to $500,000,000 as the amount appropriated to such department for such purposes bears to the total amount appropriated for such purposes in this act which are not exempt.

Mr. BYRD. Where in the amendment does that definition appear?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it necessary to define everything in the amendment? I do not see how any other interpretation could be applied.

Mr. BYRD. Yes; but we are not going on the opinion of the Senator from Illinois. His opinion might be incorrect.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The legislative history can furnish a basis for this, as the Senator from Virginia well knows.

Mr. BYRD. What pro rata basis? I never heard of it before.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think that is a perfectly good term.

Mr. BYRD. It would be necessary to define it, in order to make it workable under this amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have defined it although its meaning seems clear. It is workable. I think if we used the Anglo-Saxon word "proportionate" instead of the Latin term, it would be just as good as "pro rata."

I am sorry if there has been any heat in this interchange between the Senator from Virginia and myself.

Mr. BYRD. There is no heat.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is a worthy laborer in the vineyard of economy, and I should like to think of myself as laboring alongside of him and trying to get the same end, even if by different means.

Mr. BYRD. Let me say I have enjoyed greatly my associations with the Senator from Illinois in our joint efforts for economy. I admire the efforts he has made. But even regardless of how anxious I am for economy, I want to vote for a law which will be workable. I want to vote for something which, if enacted, is going to work efficiently as between the departments. I respectfully submit to the Senator that in this case he is doing what the House did in adopting the Taber amendment and the Jensen amendment. Both of those amendments were declared to be impractical from an administrative standpoint. When the Senator tells me that it will be necessary to make an estimate, to find out what a pro rata basis is, when we are asked to write into the law a provision involving a $1,000,000,000 reduction, I simply cannot follow him on it. I think it ought to be made clear, if the amendment should become law. I am not a lawyer, but it seems to me that what is meant should be written in the law.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think it is in the bill. Were it not for the fact that so able a gentleman as the Senator from Virginia finds difficulty in determining where it is, I should be certain it is in the law. But, since the Senator from Virginia finds some doubt about it, it is possible we shall have to fall back on legislative history, which I hope I have made clear.

Mr. BYRD. One of my colleagues has suggested it is not heat, but probably a lack of light that is bothering the Senator. [Laughter.]

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator knows there is a wise-crack to the effect that when people ask for light rather than heat, they sometimes forget that they themselves are the soot upon the lamp chimney which prevents the diffusion of light. It is very likely that it is my fault, and that I have obscured the real light that is within this amendment.

Now, Mr. President, I do not want to take up too much time, but I do want to say that this is really a very simple proposal, and, on the whole, one which would cut about 11 percent from these items. That can be done by reducing vacation leave, now 26 working days or 5⅕ weeks, and by reducing sick leave from 15 working days, or 3 weeks, to 20 days and 12 days, respectively.

We would still be providing for governmental employees better conditions than 99$^{11}/_{100}$ percent of private employers provide, and we would also squeeze out the 2 percent, let us say, of the least efficient governmental employees. We would then merely fill one-half of the vacancies which occur. This is much, much milder than the Thomas-Taber and the Jensen amendments. The Thomas-Taber amendment provided for a 10-percent cut, and then the Jensen amendment, on top of that, provided for filling only one-tenth of the vacancies. Nine-tenths of the vacated jobs would be allowed to fall vacant. This amendment allows the filling of one-half of vacancies, and diminishes the force by one-half. That is, by one-half the vacancies, during the course of the year. The average Government turn-over is about 26 percent, so that at the end of the year the working force would have shrunk by 13 percent, plus the 2 percent for vacations, or an average for the year of around 7 percent. When this is combined with the 5 percent reduction effected by reducing leave and eliminating the most inefficient personnel we get a total personal reduction of about 12 per-

cent. It is the most painless way of taking the fat out of the Government service, and yet, if in a given department the head of the department wants to make his economies from equipment, materials and supplies rather than from personnel, he can make all the economies in that way. He is given freedom, but he does have to make reductions from specific areas.

I commend the Senator from Virginia, the Senator from New Hampshire and their gallant cohorts for their desire to save money. They have made estimates that their amendments will save about $800,000,000, and I am ready to accept that estimate. This amendment will save $1,000,000,000. In other words, if they have $800,000,000 worth of virtue, this amendment has $1,000,000,000 worth of virtue. It saves $200,000,000 more than the eminent gentlemen propose to save. It is done in a more painless fashion, and in a more discriminating fashion. We both use the meat-ax, but whereas they bring it down indiscriminately and order a 10 percent cut across the board, this cut is employed with discrimination and with care. So I hope that my amendment will be adopted. If it should fail, then I shall vote for the Bridges-Byrd amendment as a last resort—as the worst possible way to cut the budget. [Laughter.] But before we turn to the worst way, let us do it in a better way.

SUMMARY OF OBLIGATIONS, BY OBJECTS, FISCAL YEARS 1949, 1950, AND 1951

(Includes those items exempt by Douglas amendment)

The attached tables, summarizing obligations by objects, show the nature and scope of the services, articles, or other items for which obligations have been or will be incurred for the fiscal years 1949, 1950, and 1951.

The classification consists of the categories shown in the numbered stubs of table 1. These categories are defined in part V of the Budget-Treasury Regulation No. 1, dated June 1, 1942, as modified by section 45 of Budget Bureau "Instructions for the preparation and submission of the annual budget estimate," dated August 1, 1949. (See appendix 1 attached.) Unumbered categories: "Unvouchered obligations" includes only those obligations which may lawfully be incurred for confidential purposes, without being subject to vouchering; "Obligations not distributed by object class" is used when the agencies have not classified all of their obligations by objects; "Reserve for future allocation" represents mutual defense assistance funds undistributed to other agencies for obligation.

The dollar amounts of obligations entered in these tables consist of "orders placed, contracts awarded, services received, and all other transactions during a given period which legally reserve an appropriation for expenditure." (See sec. 2 of the Budget-Treasury Regulation No. 1.) These amounts include all obligations from general, special, and postal accounts, but not from trust accounts or corporation checking accounts. The obligations included for the Post Office Department consist of those transactions financed by postal revenues plus the appropriation from the Treasury to cover the postal deficiency. In the case of wholly-owned Government corporations, data are included only for those obligations which are incurred from appropriated funds, and hence exclude all obligations paid by checking, special deposit, or trust accounts. Federal contributions to retirement and disability funds and the District of Columbia are included in the obligations listed under object "11 Grants, subsidies and contributions." Object "13 Refunds, awards and indemnities" excludes the amounts of obligations representing refunds of excess deposits in the Treasury receipt accounts.

When one agency of the Government requests a service from another agency on a reimbursable basis, the agency originating the request obligates its appropriated funds for "07 Other contractual services" or some other appropriate object at the time it makes advances to working funds prior to the work being done, or makes reimbursements after it is performed. The agency receiving the advance payment or reimbursement uses the same amounts to incur obligations for the various objects required to provide the service involved. This causes a duplication, which, under the present accounting system, would be difficult to eliminate.

The tables were prepared from obligation schedules printed in the 1951 budget. They include obligations based on (a) actual or recommended appropriations for 1949, 1950, and 1951, and (b) the anticipated supplemental appropriations for 1950. They do not include obligations for 1950 or 1951 based on (a) appropriations required by proposed legislation, and (b) the few anticipated supplemental appropriations which are not included in the obligation schedules.

Obligations against "Funds appropriated to the President" (pp. 51 to 68) are shown either under the respective agencies to which allocations were made, or in consolidated schedules under the respective funds. Unallocated balances are shown as reserve for future allocation.

TABLE I.—*Summary of obligations by objects, general and special accounts, for the fiscal years 1949, 1950, and 1951*

Description	1949, actual	1950, estimated	1951, estimated
01 Personal services:			
Permanent positions	$5,818,471,829	$5,793,430,629	$5,795,072,078
Part-time and temporary positions	499,948,433	461,783,395	462,013,465
Military	3,651,041,098	4,008,750,453	3,917,683,308
Other	[1]—41,343,915	187,124,183	181,244,507
Net total, 01	[2] 9,954,466,833	[2] 10,479,761,775	[2] 10,385,869,330
02 Travel	335,787,043	360,678,180	355,583,413
03 Transportation of things	994,066,487	899,780,287	784,154,014
04 Communication services	64,112,490	65,292,729	64,041,788
05 Rents and utility services	203,764,462	213,668,350	217,107,045
06 Printing and reproduction	51,987,726	55,879,854	58,073,105
07 Other contractual services	2,109,385,237	1,955,744,377	1,367,141,315
Services performed by other agencies	185,517,098	129,894,208	126,908,783
08 Supplies and materials	5,692,568,658	4,941,324,999	3,973,724,605
09 Equipment	2,917,404,287	3,803,873,007	3,610,081,894
10 Lands and structures	1,343,603,233	2,008,126,752	1,359,260,954
11 Grants, subsidies and contributions	5,601,993,717	7,451,399,318	3,474,547,221
12 Pensions, annuities and insurance losses	5,764,709,619	5,508,337,560	5,310,067,407
13 Refunds, awards and indemnities	3,188,030,678	2,489,626,707	2,330,551,457
14 Interest	5,447,283,936	5,825,573,768	5,732,221,204
16 Investments and loans	2,111,340,475	1,359,953,073	1,190,513,963
Obligations not distributed by object class	9,936,682	19,290,387	13,090,500
Unvouchered	24,677	592,245	160,000
Reserved for future allocation		1,314,010,000	
Total obligations	45,886,483,388	48,882,807,876	40,353,097,998

[1] Due to deduct charges for quarters and subsistence.
[2] Detail does not add to this total because of the inclusion of 1949, $10,105,655; 1950, $9,988,680; 1951, $10,428,407 for Senate; and 1949, $16,015,540; 1950, $18,448,215; 1951, $19,178,710 for House; and 1949, $228,193; 1950, $236,220; 1951, $248,855 for miscellaneous not shown under the separate catagories above.

Source: Obligation schedules in pt. II of the 1951 budget document.

TABLE II.—*Obligations by organization unit, general and special accounts, fiscal years 1949, 1950, and 1951*

Organization unit	1949 actual	1950 estimated	1951 estimated
Legislative branch	$102,572,180	$113,419,804	$117,981,372
The judiciary	21,361,635	24,146,016	26,033,100
Executive Office of the President	8,198,338	8,976,468	9,735,802
Funds appropriated to the President	(5,250,045,303)	(5,286,190,300)	
Economic Cooperation Administration	5,246,034,042	3,912,180,300	
All other	4,011,261	1,374,010,000	
Independent offices	(8,820,244,157)	(9,599,373,141)	(8,100,856,878)
Atomic Energy Commission	630,567,997	895,210,229	610,809,100
Civil Service Commission	244,202,972	324,837,105	353,289,254
General Accounting Office	35,565,732	35,726,212	36,946,800
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	50,432,223	63,820,621	63,487,000
Railroad Retirement Board	589,112,451	612,334,146	603,433,136
U. S. Maritime Commission	257,439,898	157,002,222	159,719,235
Veterans' Administration	6,508,575,441	6,702,232,763	5,958,797,205
Other	504,347,443	808,209,843	314,375,148
Federal Security Agency	456,419,065	1,664,858,910	1,670,841,907
General Services Administration	735,559,921	1,037,781,855	816,536,535
Housing and Home Finance Agency	20,255,731	21,687,015	30,569,875
Department of Agriculture	1,345,105,314	1,501,445,686	1,534,627,116
Department of Commerce	720,631,376	861,758,550	834,960,126
Department of the Interior	565,497,701	727,589,568	739,734,499
Department of Justice	129,753,104	137,515,783	149,590,818
Department of Labor	200,241,899	181,452,814	220,173,871
Department of Defense	(16,108,332,893)	(16,576,140,123)	(15,088,372,517)
Office of the Secretary of Defense	279,815,173	340,146,000	373,300,000
Department of the Army:			
Military	4,795,414,861	4,792,866,614	4,482,385,676
Civil	2,122,700,013	1,425,634,476	911,511,501
Department of the Navy	5,429,296,924	5,112,584,847	4,790,355,541
Department of the Air Force	3,481,105,922	4,904,908,186	4,530,819,799
Department of State	302,472,640	386,256,425	282,567,812
Treasury Department	8,948,283,402	8,544,205,216	8,468,008,770
Post Office Department	2,139,508,729	2,198,010,202	2,250,497,000
District of Columbia	12,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000
Total obligations	45,886,483,388	48,882,807,876	40,353,097,998

TABLE III.—*Obligations for 01 Personal services by organization unit—General and special accounts for the fiscal years 1949, 1950, and 1951*

[In millions]

Organization unit	1949 actual	1950 estimated	1951 estimated
Legislative branch	$61	$67	$69
The judiciary	18	19	21
Executive Office of the President	7	7	8
Funds appropriated to the President	10	13	
Independent offices	(863)	(867)	(865)
Atomic Energy Commission	21	23	24
Civil Service Commission	15	15	15
General Accounting Office	34	34	35
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	25	28	31
Railroad Retirement Board	4	4	4
U. S. Maritime Commission	25	23	20
Veterans' Administration	613	618	623
Other	126	122	113
Federal Security Agency	84	92	98
General Services Administration	112	80	77
Housing and Home Finance Agency	13	17	24
Department of Agriculture	209	222	234
Department of Commerce	161	219	200
Department of the Interior	162	195	215
Department of Justice	104	109	115
Department of Labor	19	23	27
Department of Defense	(6,155)	(6,453)	(6,260)
Office of the Secretary of Defense	5	8	9
Department of the Army:			
Military	2,281	2,417	2,382
Civil	237	206	186
Department of the Navy	2,175	2,221	2,090
Department of the Air Force	1,457	1,601	1,593
Department of State	72	94	92
Treasury Department	366	399	425
Post Office Department	1,538	1,603	1,656
Total obligations for personal services	9,954	10,480	10,386

OBLIGATIONS FOR 02 TRAVEL BY ORGANIZATION UNIT

Legislative branch	$1	$1	$1
The judiciary	1	1	1
Executive Office of the President	(1)	(1)	(1)
Funds appropriated to the President	1	1	
Independent offices	(19)	(19)	(19)
Atomic Energy Commission	1	2	2
Civil Service Commission	(1)	(1)	(1)
General Accounting Office	(1)	(1)	(1)
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	(1)	(1)	(1)
Railroad Retirement Board	(1)	(1)	(1)
U. S. Maritime Commission	(1)	(1)	(1)
Veterans' Administration	11	10	11
Other	6	6	5
Federal Security Agency	3	3	4
General Services Administration	1	1	2
Housing and Home Finance Agency	1	1	1
Department of Agriculture	11	14	15
Department of Commerce	7	10	9
Department of the Interior	7	10	11
Department of Justice	5	6	7
Department of Labor	1	2	3
Department of Defense	(217)	(226)	(212)
Office of the Secretary of Defense	(1)	1	1
Department of the Army:			
Military	96	94	91
Civil	14	11	10
Department of the Navy	51	59	52
Department of the Air Force	56	61	58
Department of State	9	10	12
Treasury Department	7	11	13
Post Office Department	43	45	45
Total obligations for travel	336	361	356

Footnote at end of tables.

TABLE III.—*Obligations for 01 Personal services by organization unit—General and special accounts for the fiscal years 1949, 1950, and 1951*—Continued

OBLIGATIONS FOR 03 TRANSPORTATION OF THINGS BY ORGANIZATION UNIT

[In millions]

Organization unit	1949 actual	1950 estimated	1951 estimated
Legislative branch	$1	$1	$1
The judiciary	(1)	(1)	(1)
Executive Office of the President	(1)	(1)	(1)
Funds appropriated to the President	29	13	
Independent offices	(15)	(14)	(15)
Atomic Energy Commission	4	3	4
Civil Service Commission	(1)	(1)	(1)
General Accounting Office	(1)	(1)	(1)
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	(1)	(1)	(1)
Railroad Retirement Board	(1)	(1)	(1)
U. S. Maritime Commission	(1)	(1)	(1)
Veterans' Administration	5	6	5
Other	5	4	5
Federal Security Agency	(1)	(1)	(1)
General Services Administration	1	1	(1)
Housing and Home Finance Agency	(1)	(1)	(1)
Department of Agriculture	2	2	2
Department of Commerce	2	3	3
Department of the Interior	9	10	10
Department of Justice	1	1	1
Department of Labor	(1)	(1)	(1)
Department of Defense	(484)	(405)	(302)
Office of the Secretary of Defense	(1)	(1)	(1)
Department of the Army:			
Military	161	170	159
Civil	163	79	14
Department of the Navy	86	77	57
Department of the Air Force	74	78	72
Department of State	4	4	5
Treasury Department	3	3	3
Post Office Department	442	443	442
Total obligations for transportation of things	994	900	784

OBLIGATIONS FOR 04 COMMUNICATION SERVICES BY ORGANIZATION UNIT

Legislative branch	$1	$1	$1
The judiciary	(1)	(1)	(1)
Executive Office of the President	(1)	(1)	(1)
Funds appropriated to the President	(1)	(1)	
Independent offices	(9)	(8)	(8)
Atomic Energy Commission	2	2	2
Civil Service Commission	(1)	(1)	(1)
General Accounting Office	(1)	(1)	(1)
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	(1)	(1)	(1)
Railroad Retirement Board	(1)	(1)	(1)
U. S Maritime Commission	(1)	(1)	(1)
Veterans' Administration	5	4	4
Other	1	1	1
Federal Security Agency	1	1	1
General Services Administration	5	5	4
Housing and Home Finance Agency	(1)	(1)	(1)
Department of Agriculture	2	2	2
Department of Commerce	8	9	10
Department of the Interior	1	1	1
Department of Justice	2	2	2
Department of Labor	(1)	(1)	(1)
Department of Defense	(25)	(24)	(22)
Office of the Secretary of Defense	(1)	(1)	(1)
Department of the Army:			
Military	8	8	8
Civil	5	3	2
Department of the Navy	4	3	4
Department of the Air Force	7	9	8
Department of State	4	6	6
Treasury Department	3	3	3

Footnote at end of tables.

TABLE III.—*Obligations for 01 Personal services by organization unit—General and special accounts for the fiscal years 1949, 1950, and 1951*—Continued

OBLIGATIONS FOR 04 COMMUNICATIONS SERVICES BY ORGANIZATION UNIT—continued

[In millions]

Organization unit	1949 actual	1950 estimated	1951 estimated
Post Office Department	$2	$2	$3
Total obligations for communication services	64	65	64

OBLIGATIONS FOR 05 RENTS AND UTILITY SERVICES BY ORGANIZATION UNIT

Legislative branch	$1	(1)	(1)
The judiciary	(1)	(1)	(1)
Executive Office of the President	(1)	(1)	(1)
Funds appropriated to the President	(1)	(1)	
Independent offices	(31)	($35)	($37)
Atomic Energy Commission	8	11	14
Civil Service Commission	(1)	(1)	(1)
General Accounting Office	(1)	(1)	(1)
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	2	3	3
Railroad Retirement Board	(1)	(1)	(1)
U. S. Maritime Commission	(1)	(1)	(1)
Veterans' Administration	16	16	16
Other	4	4	3
Federal Security Agency	1	2	2
General Services Administration	24	23	22
Housing and Home Finance Agency	1	1	2
Department of Agriculture	4	5	5
Department of Commerce	5	6	7
Department of the Interior	3	4	5
Department of Justice	2	2	2
Department of Labor	(1)	(1)	(1)
Department of Defense	(92)	(91)	(89)
Office of the Secretary of Defense	(1)	(1)	(1)
Department of the Army:			
Military	35	35	33
Civil	11	10	8
Department of the Navy	28	26	29
Department of the Air Force	18	20	19
Department of State	3	3	3
Treasury Department	10	11	10
Post Office Department	26	29	32
Total obligations for rents and utility services	204	214	217

OBLIGATIONS FOR 06 PRINTING AND REPRODUCTION BY ORGANIZATION UNIT

Legislative branch	$1	$2	$2
The judiciary	(1)	(1)	(1)
Executive Office of the President	(1)	(1)	(1)
Funds appropriated to the President	(1)	(1)	
Independent offices	(6)	(5)	(5)
Atomic Energy Commission	(1)	(1)	(1)
Civil Service Commission	(1)	(1)	(1)
General Accounting Office	(1)	(1)	(1)
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	(1)	(1)	(1)
Railroad Retirement Board	(1)	(1)	(1)
U. S. Maritime Commission	(1)	(1)	(1)
Veterans' Administration	3	2	3
Other	1	1	(1)
Federal Security Agency	1	1	1
General Services Administration	1	1	1
Housing and Home Finance Agency	(1)	(1)	(1)
Department of Agriculture	3	3	3
Department of Commerce	4	6	6
Department of the Interior	1	1	1

Footnote at end of tables.

TABLE III.—*Obligations for 01 Personal services by organization unit—General and special accounts for the fiscal years 1949, 1950, and 1951*—Continued

OBLIGATIONS FOR 06 PRINTING AND REPRODUCTION BY ORGANIZATION UNIT—continued

[In millions]

Organization unit	1949 actual	1950 estimated	1951 estimated
Department of Justice	$1	$1	$1
Department of Labor	(1)	1	1
Department of Defense	(24)	(22)	(23)
Office of the Secretary of Defense	(1)	1	1
Department of the Army:			
Military	9	8	10
Civil	(1)	1	1
Department of the Navy	9	8	7
Department of the Air Force	5	4	4
Department of State	2	2	3
Treasury Department	6	7	7
Post Office Department	2	4	4
Total obligations for printing and reproduction	52	56	58

OBLIGATIONS FOR 07 OTHER CONTRACTUAL SERVICES BY ORGANIZATION UNIT

Legislative branch	$6	$9	$11
The judiciary	2	3	3
Executive Office of the President	(1)	(1)	(1)
Funds appropriated to the President	710	563	
Independent offices	(352)	(421)	(420)
Atomic Energy Commission	181	262	272
Civil Service Commission	(1)	(1)	(1)
General Accounting Office	(1)	(1)	(1)
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	2	3	3
Railroad Retirement Board	1	1	1
U. S. Maritime Commission	22	6	2
Veterans' Administration	137	132	124
Other	9	17	18
Federal Security Agency	4	5	5
General Services Administration	44	36	37
Housing and Home Finance Agency	(1)	2	2
Department of Agriculture	26	15	16
Department of Commerce	11	10	9
Department of the Interior	53	55	63
Department of Justice	6	6	6
Department of Labor	(1)	(1)	1
Department of Defense	(776)	(795)	(762)
Office of the Secretary of Defense	(1)	1	1
Department of the Army:			
Military	229	267	240
Civil	66	66	47
Department of the Navy	292	248	252
Department of the Air Force	188	213	222
Department of State	11	14	12
Treasury Department	14	16	14
Post Office Department	5	5	5
Total obligations for other contractual services	2,020	1,956	1,367

OBLIGATIONS FOR 07 SERVICES PERFORMED BY OTHER AGENCIES BY ORGANIZATION UNIT

Legislative branch	(1)	(1)	(1)
The judiciary	(1)	(1)	(1)
Executive Office of the President	$1	$1	$1
Funds appropriated to the President			
Independent offices	(41)	(40)	(38)
Atomic Energy Commission	40	37	36
Civil Service Commission	(1)	(1)	
General Accounting Office	(1)	(1)	(1)
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	(1)	(1)	(1)
Railroad Retirement Board	(1)	(1)	(1)
United States Maritime Commission	(1)	(1)	(1)
Veterans Administration			
Other	(1)	2	1

Footnote at end of tables.

TABLE III.—*Obligations for 01 Personal services by organization unit—General and special accounts for the fiscal years 1949, 1950, and 1951*—Continued

OBLIGATION FOR 07 SERVICES PERFORMED BY OTHER AGENCIES BY ORGANIZATION UNIT—continued

[In millions]

Organization unit	1949 actual	1950 estimated	1951 estimated
Federal Security Agency	$1	$1	$1
General Services Administration	2	6	13
Housing and Home Finance Agency	(1)	(1)	(1)
Department of Agriculture	57	4	5
Department of Commerce	2	9	12
Department of the Interior	15	4	4
Department of Justice	(1)	(1)	(1)
Department of Labor	(1)	(1)	1
Department of Defense	32	33	(19)
Office of the Secretary of Defense	(1)	(1)	(1)
Department of the Army:			
Military	17	7	5
Civil	3	2	2
Department of the Navy	6	6	6
Department of the Air Force	6	18	6
Department of State	1	1	3
Treasury Department	30	26	26
Post Office Department	4	4	4
Total obligations for services performed by other agencies	186	130	127

OBLIGATIONS FOR 08 SUPPLIES AND MATERIALS BY ORGANIZATION UNIT

Legislative branch	$27	$29	$29
The judiciary	(1)	(1)	(1)
Executive Office of the President	(1)	(1)	(1)
Funds appropriated to the President	111	62	
Independent offices	(199)	(184)	(221)
Atomic Energy Commission	71	55	77
Civil Service Commission	(1)	(1)	(1)
General Accounting Office	(1)	(1)	(1)
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	5	5	5
Railroad Retirement Board	(1)	(1)	(1)
U. S. Maritime Commission	3	2	4
Veterans' Administration	95	92	97
Other	24	29	37
Federal Security Agency	15	14	13
General Services Administration	474	778	505
Housing and Home Finance Agency	(1)	(1)	(1)
Department of Agriculture	20	18	19
Department of Commerce	17	16	15
Department of the Interior	45	58	67
Department of Justice	7	7	7
Department of Labor	(1)	(1)	(1)
Department of Defense	(4,687)	(3,688)	(3,014)
Office of the Secretary of Defense	(1)	(1)	(1)
Department of the Army:			
Military	1,371	1,207	978
Civil	1,140	439	
Department of the Navy	1,496	1,300	1,209
Department of the Air Force	680	742	773
Department of State	4	7	10
Treasury Department	37	41	45
Post Office Department	49	37	28
Total obligations for supplies and materials	5,693	4,941	3,974

OBLIGATIONS FOR 09 EQUIPMENT BY ORGANIZATION UNIT

Legislative Branch	$2	$2	$3
The judiciary	(1)	(1)	(1)
Executive Office of the President	(1)	(1)	(1)
Funds appropriated to the President	1	4	
Independent offices	(243)	(160)	(186)
Atomic Energy Commission	24	21	21
Civil Service Commission	(1)	(1)	(1)
General Accounting Office	(1)	(1)	(1)
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	3	4	

Footnote at end of tables.

TABLE III.—*Obligations for 01 Personal services by organization unit—General and special accounts for the fiscal years 1949, 1950, and 1951*—Continued

OBLIGATIONS FOR 09 EQUIPMENT BY ORGANIZATION UNIT—continued

[In millions]

Organization unit	1949 actual	1950 estimated	1951 estimated
Independent offices—Con.			
Railroad Retirement Board	(1)	(1)	(1)
U. S. Maritime Commission	$181	$82	$75
Veterans' Administration	16	20	28
Other	19	33	58
Federal Security Agency	5	4	6
General Services Administration	1	2	7
Housing and Home Finance Agency	(1)	(1)	(1)
Department of Agriculture	13	9	9
Department of Commerce	18	36	31
Department of the Interior	24	29	34
Department of Justice	2	2	3
Department of Labor	(1)	(1)	(1)
Department of Defense	(2,578)	(3,522)	(3,276)
Office of the Secretary of Defense	(1)	(1)	(1)
Department of the Army:			
Military	503	480	528
Civil	26	28	
Department of the Navy	1,102	968	975
Department of the Air Force	946	2,046	1,755
Department of State	6	5	5
Treasury Department	11	14	30
Post Office Department	13	14	19
Total obligations for equipment	2,917	3,803	3,610

OBLIGATIONS FOR 10 LANDS AND STRUCTURES BY ORGANIZATION UNIT

Legislative branch	$1	(1)	(1)
Executive Office of the President			(1)
Funds appropriated to the President	3		
Independent offices	(328)	($638)	($253)
Atomic Energy Commission	278	478	157
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	12	21	17
Veterans' Administration	36	136	75
Other	2	3	4
Federal Security Agency	(1)	(1)	(1)
General Services Administration	59	67	76
Department of Agriculture	3	3	3
Department of Commerce	54	41	43
Department of the Interior	205	323	292
Department of Justice	1	1	1
Department of Defense	(658)	(894)	(664)
Department of the Army:			
Military	66	99	36
Civil	456	574	577
Department of the Navy	92	108	31
Department of the Air Force	44	113	20
Department of State	28	35	22
Treasury Department	3	6	5
Total obligations for lands and structures	1,344	2,008	1,359

OBLIGATIONS FOR 11 GRANTS, SUBSIDIES, AND CONTRIBUTIONS BY ORGANIZATION UNIT

Legislative branch	(1)		
Executive Office of the President	(1)	(1)	
Funds appropriated to the President	$3,047	$3,163	
Independent offices	(509)	(1,287)	($452)
Atomic Energy Commission	2	1	2
Civil Service Commission	227	308	336
Railroad Retirement Board	9	4	3
U. S. Maritime Commission	26	45	58
Veterans' Administration	118	517	47
Other	127	412	6
Federal Security Agency	326	1,507	1,507
General Services Administration	8	32	60
Housing and Home Finance Agency	4		
Department of Agriculture	438	627	651
Department of Commerce	428	492	490

Footnote at end of tables.

TABLE III.—*Obligations for 01 Personal services by organization unit—General and special accounts for the fiscal years 1949, 1950, and 1951*—Continued

OBLIGATIONS FOR 11 GRANTS, SUBSIDIES, AND CONTRIBUTIONS BY ORGANIZATION UNIT—con.

[In millions]

Organization unit	1949 actual	1950 estimated	1951 estimated
Department of the Interior	$28	$32	$30
Department of Justice	(1)	(1)	(1)
Department of Labor	178	154	187
Department of Defense	(1)	(1)	(1)
Department of the Army:			
Military	(1)	1	1
Civil	(1)	(1)	(1)
Department of the Navy	(1)	(1)	(1)
Department of the Air Force	(1)	(1)	(1)
Department of State	139	144	85
Treasury Department	125	(1)	(1)
District of Columbia	12	12	12
Total obligations for grants, subsidies, and contributions	5,602	7,451	3,475

OBLIGATIONS FOR 12 PENSIONS, ANNUITIES, AND INSURANCE LOSSES BY ORGANIZATION UNIT

Independent offices	($5,453)	($5,150)	($4,925)
U. S. Maritime Commission	(1)	(1)	
Veterans' Administration	5,453	5,150	4,925
Federal Security Agency	1	1	1
Department of Commerce	(1)	(1)	(1)
Department of the Interior	(1)	(1)	(1)
Department of Defense	(298)	(342)	(368)
Office of the Secretary	266	322	356
Department of the Army:			
Military	8	(1)	1
Civil	(1)	(1)	(1)
Department of the Navy	24	19	11
Department of the Air Force	(1)	(1)	(1)
Treasury Department	13	15	16
Total obligations for pensions, annuities and insurance losses	5,765	5,508	5,310

OBLIGATIONS FOR 13 REFUNDS, AWARDS, AND INDEMNITIES BY ORGANIZATION UNIT

Legislative branch	(1)	(1)	(1)
Funds appropriated to the President	$4		
Independent offices	(178)	($167)	($62)
Atomic Energy Commission	(1)	(1)	(1)
General Accounting Office	(1)	(1)	(1)
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	(1)	(1)	(1)
U. S. Maritime Commission	(1)		
Veterans' Administration	(1)	(1)	(1)
Other	176	165	60
Federal Security Agency	14	33	32
General Services Administration	2	7	8
Housing and Home Finance Agency	(1)	(1)	(1)
Department of Agriculture	12	2	2
Department of Commerce	3	3	(1)
Department of Interior	8	1	(1)
Department of Justice	(1)	1	5
Department of Labor	(1)		
Department of Defense	(80)	(77)	(72)
Office of the Secretary	6	7	6
Department of the Army:			
Military	10	(1)	(1)
Civil	(1)	2	(1)
Department of the Navy	64	68	66
Department of the Air Force	(1)	(1)	(1)
Department of State	(1)	20	(1)
Treasury Department	2,878	2,172	2,143
Post Office Department	7	6	6
Total obligations for refunds, awards, and indemnities	3,188	2,490	2,331

OBLIGATIONS FOR 14 INTEREST BY ORGANIZATION UNIT

Independent offices: Other	$1	$1	$1
Federal Security Agency	(1)	(1)	(1)
General Services Administration	(1)	(1)	(1)

Footnote at end of tables.

TABLE III.—*Obligations for 01 Personal services by organization unit—General and special accounts for the fiscal years 1949, 1950, and 1951*—Continued

OBLIGATIONS FOR 14 INTEREST BY ORGANIZATION UNIT—continued

[In millions]

Organization unit	1949 actual	1950 estimated	1951 estimated
Department of Agriculture	(1)		
Department of the Interior	$1	$1	$1
Department of Defense	(3)	(3)	(3)
Department of the Army:			
Military	1	1	1
Civil	1	1	2
Department of the Navy	(1)	(1)	(1)
Department of the Air Force	1	(1)	(1)
Treasury Department	5,442	5,821	5,727
Total obligations for interest	5,447	5,826	5,732

OBLIGATIONS FOR 16 INVESTMENTS AND LOANS BY ORGANIZATION UNIT

Executive Office of the President	(1)	(1)	(1)
Funds appropriated to the President	$973	$150	
Independent offices: Railroad Retirement Board	575	602	$594
General Services Administration	1	(1)	4
Department of Agriculture	544	568	570
Department of the Interior	1	4	3
Department of State	11	30	14
Treasury Department		(1)	
Post Office Department	6	5	5
Total obligations for investments and loans	2,111	1,360	1,190

UNVOUCHERED OBLIGATIONS BY ORGANIZATION UNIT

Funds appropriated to the President	(1)	(1)	
Independent offices: Atomic Energy Commission		(1)	(1)
Federal Security Agency		(1)	(1)
Department of Defense	(1)	(1)	(1)
Department of the Army:			
Military	(1)	(1)	(1)
Treasury Department	(1)	(1)	(1)
Total unvouchered obligations	(1)	$1	(1)

OBLIGATIONS NOT DISTRIBUTED BY OBJECT CLASS

Legislative branch	$1	$1	$1
Department of Agriculture		6	1
Department of the Interior	(1)	(1)	(1)
Department of Justice		(1)	(1)
Department of State	8	11	11
Post Office Department	(1)		
Total obligations not distributed by object class	10	19	13

RESERVE FOR FUTURE ALLOCATION

Mutual defense assistance		$1,314	

NOTE.—Due to rounding the detail in table III may not add to totals.

[1] Less than $500,000.

APPENDIX 1

DEFINITIONS OF OBJECT CLASSES

01. Personal services: Includes all salaries and wages for labor or other services of officers or employees, either civil or military, of the Government. This classification also includes compensation for special services rendered by consultants or others employed on a per diem or fee basis, and cash allowances for quarters, heat, light, and other cash emoluments incident to personal services.

Examples:

Civil-service employees: Salaries and wages and other compensation of all civil-service officers and employees, including that portion which represents employees' retirement contributions, and other deductions creditable to other appropriations and funds.

Non-civil-service employees: Salaries and wages and other compensation of all non-civil-service officers and employees.

Military and naval personnel: Pay and cash allowances for quarters or subsistence of all military, naval, and quasi-military personnel.

Relief employees: Wages to persons who have been certified as needing relief and who are employed on work projects operated by a Federal agency.

Special and miscellaneous payments for personal services: Commissions, fees, etc., for special and miscellaneous services rendered by consultants or others.

02. Travel: Includes transportation of persons, their subsistence while in an authorized travel status, and other expenses incident to travel which are to be paid by the Government either directly or by reimbursing the traveler.

Examples:

Transportation of persons: Contractual services rendered in connection with carrying persons from place to place, whether by land, air, or water, and the furnishing of accommodations incident to actual travel. This includes commercial transportation charges, charter of passenger cars, trains, vessels, or airplanes, and expenses incident to the operation of the chartered conveyances. It also includes mileage allowances and reimbursement for gasoline and oil used in privately owned vehicles, storage and care of vehicles, and streetcar and taxi fares.

Subsistence: Food and lodging, whether on the basis of a reimbursement for actual expenses or a per diem allowance in lieu of subsistence.

Incidental travel expenses: Other expenses necessitated by travel, such as baggage transfer, steamer chairs, and telephone and telegraph expenses, as authorized by travel regulations.

03. Transportation of things: Includes those charges for the transportation of things (including animals) which are paid or to be paid directly by the Government and not by the vendor, whether such transportation be by land, air, or water. It also includes charges for the care of such things while in process of being transported.

Examples:

Freight and express: Charges by common carrier, including freight and express, demurrage, switching, recrating, refrigerating, and other incidental expenses.

Drayage and other local transportation: Cartage, handling, and other charges incident to local transportation.

Mail transportation: Contractual services for the transportation of mail by water, rail, air, motor vehicles, etc.

04. Communication service: Includes the transmission of messages from place to place, such as tolls for land telegraph service, marine cable service, radio and wireless telegraph service, telephone service, postage, and messenger service. It also includes switchboard and service charges and telephone installation costs.

05. Rents and utility services: Includes charges for rents as well as for heat, light, power, water, gas, electricity, and other utility services exclusive of transportation and communication services.

Examples:

Rents: The right of possession and use of land, structures, or equipment owned by another, the possession of which is to be relinquished at a future time. This also includes charges under purchase rental agreements. Under such agreements, until the title to the equipment is acquired, payments should be classified as rentals. Payments subsequent to the acquisition of title should be classified as equipment.

Heat, light, power, water, gas, and electricity: The services indicated when billed separately from "rent."

06. Printing and reproduction: Includes all contractual services for the printing and binding of books, pamphlets, documents, and other publications. Printed forms and letterheads are also included under this group.

07. Other contractual services: Includes all contractual services not otherwise classified.

Examples:

Repairs and alternations: Repairs and alterations to buildings, bridges, viaducts, vessels, equipment, and like items, when done by contract, except those which add materially to the value of such property and therefore may be properly considered as capital improvements.

Storage and maintenance of vehicles: Storage and care of vehicles, except items of this nature incurred in connection with travel and which are, therefore, classified under "02 Travel."

Subsistence and support of persons: Services for providing board, lodging, and care of persons, except travel items, which are included under "02 Travel."

Photographing, typewriting, and stenographic services: Includes contractual stenographic work, typewriting, and duplicating work, such as multigraphing and mimeographing, as well as photographing, developing, and blueprinting.

Advertising and publication of notices.

Fees and other charges: Includes fees and expenses of witnesses and jurors, and fees of abstracting land titles.

08. Supplies and materials: Includes all commodities which are ordinarily consumed or expended within a comparatively short period of time, converted in the process of construction or manufacture, or from a minor part of equipment or fixed property. Also includes commodities purchased for resale.

Examples:

Office supplies (other than printed forms and letterheads).

Chemicals, surgical and medical supplies.

Fuels: All substances, such as coal, wood, petroleum, and oils used in cooking, heating, and generating power, or in making artificial gas.

Clothing and clothing supplies: Articles of clothing, together with materials and sewing supplies used in the manufacture of wearing apparel.

Provisions: Food and beverages for human consumption.

Forage and stable supplies: Food used for livestock and other animals, and stable supplies such as bedding, horseshoes, collar pads, etc.

Cleaning and toilet supplies.

Ammunition and explosives: Bombs, shells, propellent powders, mines, torpedoes, chemical and chemical gases used for combat, powder, fuses, detonators, primers, pyrotechnic supplies, and components thereof.

Materials and parts: Commodities, including building material, entering into the construction, repair, or production of supplies, equipment, machinery, buildings, and other structures.

09. Equipment: Includes machinery, implements, tools, furniture and fixtures, livestock (other than that purchased for slaughter), armaments, vehicles, and other apparatus, which are adapted to continuing use without material impairment of their physical condition, and which it may be expected will have an extended period of service.

Examples: Transportation equipment: Vehicles including passenger-carrying automobiles, motor trucks, motorcycles, tractors, aircraft of any character, wagons, carts, vessels, steamships, barges, lighters, and power launches.

Furniture, furnishings, and fixtures: Movable furniture, fittings, and fixtures, such as desks, tables, chairs, typewriters, adding and bookkeeping machines, and household equipment.

Machinery and apparatus: Engines, generators, manufacturing machinery, transformers, shop equipment, stationary pumps, and other production and construction machinery. Instruments and apparatus, such as surgical instruments, X-ray apparatus, signaling and telephone and telegraph equipment, scientific instruments and appliances, measuring and weighing instruments and accessories, photographic equipment, picture-projection equipment, and accessories, and mechanical drafting devices.

Armaments: Tanks, armored cars, tractors, machine guns, rifles, bayonets, antiaircraft guns, cannons, lights, detectors, fixed and mobile mounts or carriages for cannon, including limbers, caissons, battery and store wagons, reels and carts, fire-control apparatus, submarine mine equipment, ammunition hoists, torpedo tubes, and other special and miscellaneous military equipment.

10. Lands and structures: Includes land and interest in land, buildings, and other structures and permanent improvements and additions when acquired under contracts.

Examples:

Lands and interest in lands.

Buildings and other structures: The acquisition or construction of buildings and structures, and additions and alterations materially adding to the original value when secured under contract.

Nonstructural improvements: Improvements of land, such as landscaping, fences, sewers, wells, reservoirs, when secured under contract.

Fixed equipment: Fixtures and equipment which become permanently attached to or form a part of buildings or structures, such as elevators, plumbing, power-plant boilers, fire-alarm systems, lighting or heating systems, generators, and air-conditioning and refrigerating systems.

11. Grants, subsidies, and contributions: Includes educational and public-welfare grants, Federal contributions to the retirement and disability funds, public-assistance grants, and aid to States, Territories, political subdivisions, corporations, associations, and individuals. Gratuities, contributions to international societies, or payments of quotas of expenses of international societies and proceedings or projects; and contributions of the Government fixed by treaty.

12. Pensions, annuities, and insurance losses: Includes retirement pay on the basis of civil or military service to the Government, pensions on account of service, annuities paid from trust funds to civil service employees and others, monetary allowances on account of military and naval services, losses on life- and marine-insurance policies, and payments made on account of accidents to civil employees of the Government while in the discharge of their official duties.

Examples:

Pensions: Army, Navy, and Marine Corps pensions, civil pensions on account of disability or death due to service.

Retirement salaries: Accruals and compensation for past civil or military services of the Government.

Annuities: Accruals and compensation from retirement and disability funds and from the old age and survivors' insurance trust fund.

Allowances: Allowances to families of deceased soldiers and sailors, vocational rehabilitation allowances for disabled persons discharged from military and naval forces, medical attendance and hospital allowances, other allowances, United States employees' compensation fund payments.

Insurance losses: Losses from the United States life-insurance fund, and on military and naval insurance, etc. Does not include charges under the Government Losses in Shipment Act.

13. Refunds, awards, and indemnities: Includes refunds of the whole or part of amounts previously received by the United States; items for or included in awards by courts of law, boards, or commissions; indemnities made on recommendation of officers of the Government; or indemnities for destruction or injury of persons or property.

Examples:

Refunds: Refunds of fines, penalties, forfeitures, taxes, duties, refunds from retirement and disability funds, and other refunds on account of adjustments, errors in computation, etc.

Awards: Awards arising from abrogation of contracts, awards for the destruction of livestock, crops, etc.; awards to persons for losses incurred in the courses of duty; and other awards such as amounts paid to informers and awards paid to foreign nations not covered by treaty.

Indemnities, losses, and contingencies: Remuneration for loss or injury, such as damage to property, personal injuries, etc. This also includes losses made good on Government shipments, and the difference between the face value of uncurrent coins and the value of coins resulting from their recoinage.

Repayments of deposits: Repayments of amounts not subject to demand or claim by the United States for which it has assumed custody. Such items represent the repayment of those moneys received in trust for private purposes and over which the Government exercises the responsibility of custodian rather than owner.

14. Interest: Includes compensation to creditors of the United States for the use of funds loaned, deposited, overpaid, or otherwise made available to the United States.

16. Investments and loans: Includes the purchase of stocks, bonds, notes, and other choses in action; the original advances for revolving funds—that is, nonstock enterprises, and any increase of the original advances; and loans to foreign governments, States, Territories, and other political subdivisions, or loans to corporations, associations, and individuals.

Examples:

Investments in securities: The purchase of stocks, bonds, debentures, and other securities in which money is invested either temporarily or permanently, including the amounts paid for interest accrued on such investments at the time of purchase, as well as any premium paid on such investments. This classification also includes subscriptions to paid-in surplus of Government-owned corporations.

Advances to revolving funds: The establishment of revolving and other funds, and increase thereof, where such funds are to remain intact, either in the form of cash, receivables, inventory, or other assets, the investment in which is to be returned when the enterprise is liquidated, transferred, or sold.

Loans: Advances to foreign governments, States, Territories, and other political subdivisions, as well as loans to corporations, associations, and individuals.

ANALYSIS OF OBLIGATIONS BY OBJECTS

In order to provide a uniform basis for consideration of the estimates and for consolidation of certain information on a Government-wide basis, the following information will be supplied in the schedule of "Obligations by objects":

Total number of permanent positions.

Average number of all employees.

01. Personal services: Permanent positions, part-time and temporary positions, regular pay in excess of 52-week base, payment above basic rates, total personal services, deduct charges for quarters and subsistence, net personal services.

02. Travel.

03. Transportation of things.

04. Communication services.
05. Rents and utility services.
06. Printing and reproduction.
07. Other contractual services. Services performed by other agencies.
08. Supplies and materials.
09. Equipment.
10. Lands and structures.
11. Grants, subsidies, and contributions.
12. Pensions, annuities, and insurance losses.
13. Refunds, awards, and indemnities.
14. Interest.
16. Investment and loans (net).
Unvouchered.

The first two lines will contain information as follows: "Total number of permanent positions—All full-time permanent positions, regardless of the status of the employees (permanent, temporary, etc.), which are occupieid or to be occupied at any time during the fiscal year.

"Average number of all employees"—Average paid employment on a full-year basis, stated to the nearest whole number, including the full-time equivalent of terminal leave and of temporary and part-time employment.

The amounts under object class 01 will be broken down as follows:

"Permanent positions"—Net obligations for regular pay for full-time, permanent positions, after deducting savings due to delays in filling vacancies, absences without pay, etc. offset to whatever extent may be necessary by terminal leave payments. Where such positions are paid from more than one appropriation, the applicable portion will be included under each appropriation. Only the actual reimbursement made (if any) for military personnel on detail to civilian agencies will be included. New positions for the budget year are to be estimated at the minimum of the grade.

"Temporary and part-time positions"—Net obligations for regular pay for all positions not included in "permanent positions" above.

"Regular pay in excess of 52-week base"—Compensation at regular rates for the extra day or two, if any, in excess of 52 weeks in the fiscal year.

"Payment above basic rates"—Net obligations for all other types of compensation, including overtime and holiday pay, nightwork differential, living and quarters allowance, and additional pay for service abroad.

Where employees are charged for quarters or subsistence, provided in kind, an additional entry "Deduct charges for quarters and subsistence" will be used, followed by an entry called "Net personal services."

Each other object class will be set forth on a single line, except that (a) within class 07, reimbursements and advances to other agencies (for items ordinarily classed as 07) will be set forth separately as an unnumbered item, immediately following the usual entry for the remainder of 07, and (b) a more detailed subclassification may be used optionally to show the distribution of large or unusual obligations under any class.

The distribution of obligations by object class will follow the definitions in the latest Budget-Treasury Regulation No. 1, as revised and amended, issued under Executive Order 8512.

The uniform wording of the object classes will be used exactly as set forth, although an explanatory phrase may be added in parentheses where the whole of the obligations in some class are for a particular or special object. The unnumbered entry "unvouchered" will be used only where obligations may be incurred lawfully for confidential purposes, not subject to detailed vouchering or reporting.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I shall speak but a word or two in regard to this very simple amendment. I recently said I did not believe in legislating on the floor of the Senate. I referred to the preparation of bills. Here is a committee which, since the 26th day of last January, has worked on this bill faithfully and well, to my knowledge, as faithfully as any committee ever worked. And here is a Senator who says, "We will turn down all this; I have a plan here which provides that almost anyone can make reductions." He first proposes that the Bureau of the Budget make the reductions. He then provides that the heads of the departments shall make the reductions. What would happen, I may ask, if we suppose that neither of them made reductions? I wonder whether the Senator expects that they will turn it over to him to make the reductions.

The Senator from Illinois must not have exerted himself very much in getting information about this bill. The Senator from Virginia has exposed the utter ineptness of this amendment, the utter unfitness of it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the able Senator from Tennessee will yield, I ask, in what way?

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator will have to excuse me. I did not interrupt him.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. McKELLAR. I accept the apology. I think the Senator should have apologized, after proposing this remarkable amendment. I want to read it to the Senate. It will take me only a minute. I ask Senators to listen carefully to it:

SECTION 1001. Reductions in appropriations contained in this act are hereby made in the sum of $1,000,000,000. Such reductions shall be made in the following manner:

(a) Funds appropriated in this act for supplies and materials, for lands and structures, and for Federal-aid postwar highways shall be reduced.

"Postwar highways"? We have had quite a number of wars, and I suppose we can be said to be "postwar" as to all of them. We had the Revolutionary War. The Senator's amendment would not specify whether he meant after the Revolutionary War, or whether he meant after World War II. Perhaps he means after the Civil War. On the other hand, possibly the expression is used with reference to the Mexican War. Also, it may have been used, having in mind a half-dozen Indian wars. The Senator does not specify. He merely says "postwar highways."

The Senator calls it fat.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall not yield at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall yield a little later, but not at this time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I could clear things up for the Senator by saying that the term "postwar highways" is used in the appropriations bill reported by the Senator from Tennessee. That is why I used it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator has shown that if this is a product of his mind, he has one of the most unclear minds in the world. I do not see how he could attempt to explain anything to anyone. I have heard him attempt to explain many things, but this is an amendment which I am sure he cannot explain. It is inexplicable. Listen to this:

Provided, That the Director of the Bureau of the Budget is empowered to make such reductions among the departments and agencies in the executive branch of the Government in such a manner as to provide for the most efficient use of the Nation's manpower—

The Nation's manpower? I wonder what the Senator means.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I wonder if he means the mail carrier on a post road.

Mr. McKELLAR. He may. I do not know whether he means a mailcarrier or not. He may mean a stenographer in the office. I do not know what he has in his mind. Yet he wants to clarify something which no one can clarify. I think the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], in the questions which he asked the distinguished Senator from Illinois a while ago, brought out a very clear exposition of the matter. I suggest that the Senator from Illinois get the Senator from Virginia to explain what is in this amendment other than a lot of contradictions.

I have just read that the Bureau of the Budget is to make reductions. I wonder what part of the Bureau of the Budget—a clerk? An office boy? A stenographer? The amendment does not say, as was pointed out by the Senator from Virginia.

After giving the Director of the Budget such power, what happens? Listen to this:

That the reductions provided for in this subsection among the departments shall be made on a department-wide basis—

I wonder what that means. I wish the Senator from Illinois would find out from the Senator from Virginia what that means, when he has time to do so—

and the secretaries of the departments are empowered—

The Senator is now turning over the power, already vested in the Bureau of the Budget, to the secretaries of the various departments on a department-wide basis. Suppose a department head cut out a billion and a half dollars and the Bureau of the Budget did not cut out more than half a billion or three-fourths of a billion dollars: Who would decide the matter? One would cut out the fat and the other would cut out the lean, as the Senator from Illinois has said. I do not know what those things mean in that connection. I know when a man is fat or when he is lean, of course, but I do not understand the use of the words "fat" and "lean" in this manner.

Let me go on, Mr. President:

the secretaries of the departments are empowered—

They are not authorized or told to do it; they are not directed to do it, as the Senator from Virginia so well explained a while ago. Is there a Senator

present who is so dumb as to believe that simply granting such power would cause a single officeholder, whether he be in the Bureau of the Budget or in the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, to reduce expenses by a billion dollars because he is empowered to do it? If so, let him hold up his hand.

I see no hands go up. I congratulate the Senate that no hands went up.

I can see a good deal of advertising by the Senator from Illinois in this amendment. Many persons think that if a man says he is for economy he can show it by offering an amendment of this kind. My heavens. What an effect it would have on the country. The Senator could probably be elected Vice President next time on a platform of that kind. He could say, "Fellow citizens, I did not attempt to cut out only a half-billion dollars; I cut it all out. That shows how economical I am. I just cut it all out."

I read further:

The secretaries of the departments are empowered, by means of transfers and adjustments—

See how easy it is—

by means of transfers and adjustments—

My heavens. Can we make money by transfers and adjustments? I wonder what that means. I yield to the Senator from Illinois to tell me what "adjustments" means.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I take it that this very interesting outpouring of ridicule and satire is not really intended to be taken seriously by the Senator from Illinois. I am very glad indeed if the exercise of this ridicule and satire by the Senator from Tennessee has served to make him happier, and I may say that if I have contributed to giving him more of the joy of life, even though he has exposed me to satire and ridicule, I feel that perhaps that may be one of my unwitting contributions to the Senator, for which I shall be grateful. He has indulged in a fit of temper, and I hope he feels better for it. But since the Senator has yielded to me——

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no; I did not yield to the Senator from Illinois to make a foolish speech. I am not at all surprised. What the Senator is now saying is in full accord with the remarkable production which after-ages will heed and because of which they will rejoice. I am very much obliged for his kind feeling toward me because of my recent Charley-horse affliction. I appreciate it very much. Without pursuing the matter much further, I should like to challenge any Senator, with the exception of the Senator from Illinois, who feels there is anything justifiable in the Senator's amendment to say what it is. Certainly it would be a blow at the system used by the Senate if we were to adopt the Senator's amendment.

Mr. President, here we have a committee working day and night on the appropriations bill. My friend from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], my friend from Nebraska, the minority leader [Mr. WHERRY], who is one of the finest of men, as is the Senator from Arizona, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and all the other members of the committee, have been working almost like slaves on this bill since the 26th day of January, sometimes at night, although mostly in the daytime. Most of them have spent from 8 to 10 hours a day on the committee's work. They prepared a wonderful bill. I think when it is finally enacted into law it will be pleasing not only to the Senate, the House, and the President, but to the country at large, because it is a well prepared bill which fits in with governmental policies and governmental practices. It does not cut one thing off here, another thing there, and it does not destroy. Here at the last moment, Mr. President, comes an amendment offered by a Senator who has not taken part in any hearings, who has not given us any evidence on this bill or on any other bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question at that point?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Listening in the best of faith to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] in his laudable attempt at economy——

Mr. McKELLAR. I am sure it is laudable.

Mr. CHAVEZ. With particular reference to highways and roads, is it not a fact that the committee recommended to the Senate appropriations for roads only to the limited amount that would be in keeping with our present-day finances?

Mr. McKELLAR. Exactly. We had the proof. Road officials from the various States appeared before our committee. We had all kinds of expert evidence given to us on the question of roads. We made reductions. How did we do it? By resort to imagination? Not at all. We made reductions based on evidence. We based our decisions on evidence which was given before us and very carefully considered. Here at the last minute we have the whole thing being upset.

Mr. CHAVEZ. On the road provisions of the bill we had evidence from the Commissioner of Public Roads and the American Association of State Highway Officials, who are the ones back home who do the actual construction. Does the Senator from Tennessee know of any Senator, aside from the Senator from Illinois, who would like to take one dollar out of the money for the construction of roads in any State?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not know of a single one.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. McKELLAR. There may be some Senators, but I do not know of any. I think I have heard several Senators ask that we vote. I want to vote. I hope we can vote on this amendment. I ask for a vote on the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the substitute amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I thought it best to wait to say what I had to say until the Senator from Tennessee had finished so that he would have a chance to resume his seat and rest. I thought it would be better to not interrupt him frequently while he was in the process of speaking.

Mr. President, essentially what the Senator from Tennessee is saying is that once a committee has made a report it is an act of impudence for any other Member of the Senate to question the recommendation made by the committee. I should like to point out that excellent as the work of this committee was—and I want to say that I know that a lot of work was done and I want to pay tribute to the Senator from Tennessee, who in many ways is a very gallant gentleman—that despite its virtues the committee did bring in an appropriation bill which even prior to the Korean war would have put us approximately $4,000,000,000 in the red. I submit that it is perfectly proper for any Senator, after such an appropriation bill has been brought in, to try to save money for the taxpayers and the country, and that it is not helpful for one Senator to try to hold up to ridicule a Senator who seeks such economies.

Mr. President, the need of our country for economy is certainly greater in view of the Korean situation, which is going to cost us $10,000,000,000 and possibly $15,000,000,000 more, and needs for which were not before the Committee on Appropriations when it held its hearings and made its report.

The other day on the floor of the Senate I produced a copy of the hearings which were held by the Committee on Appropriations which showed that the regular hearings were closed on March 6, I believe, or more than 3 months before the Korean war broke out, that the supplementary hearings were closed in May, or 6 weeks before the Korean war broke out, and that the report and recommendations were made before the Korean war broke out. In the light of changed conditions, in the light of the need for munitions and matériel, I submit that we should economize, and I submit it is not improper—if Senators will bear with me I shall conclude in a moment and we can vote on the amendment—for a Senator to move for economy in general items after all specific efforts at economy have failed.

Mr. President, I have only one specific reply to make to what the Senator from Tennessee has said and what the Senator from Virginia has alluded to. The Senator from Tennessee has poked fun at my use of the term "empowered," when I suggested that the Director of the Budget be empowered to make reductions of construction amounting to $500,000,000, and that the secretaries of the various departments also be "empowered" to do so. The Senator from Virginia did not make fun of my use of the term, but he did imply that it was not sufficiently strong. In helping to draft the amendment I consulted the amendment introduced by the Senator from Virginia, the Senator from New Hampshire, and other eminent Senators. They used the words, "the head of each

department and agency of the executive branch of the Government is hereby authorized to make adjustments and transfers." In view of the fact that they used the weaker term "authorized" I thought it would be permissible for me to use the term "empowered." If "authorized" is correct for the Senator from Virginia, I do not quite see why he cavils at the use of "empowered." What is proper for the gander should not be improper for the goose.

I may say for the benefit of the Senator from Virginia, who has just returned to the Chamber, that I was saying that my use of the term "empowered" was based on the precedent which the Senator from Virginia had set when he used the term "authorized." So I feel I am in goodly company with the Senator from Virginia and the Senator from New Hampshire, except that I am trying to effect a bigger cut.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point an analysis of the so-called Douglas amendment which I have had prepared by the staff.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEC. 1001. This paragraph purports to reduce appropriations in the amount of $1,000,000,000. But just as in the case of the original Taber-Thomas amendment adopted by the House, there are serious questions not answered by the remainder of the amendment as to how this reduction is to be accomplished and how the total reduction is to be achieved.

Paragraph (a). This paragraph provides for a $500,000,000 reduction in funds appropriated in this act for supplies and materials, lands and structures, and Federal aid to postwar highways, and empowers the Director of the Budget to make such reductions among the executive departments and agencies. This paragraph is subject to the same objection as the original Taber-Thomas amendment, chapter 10–A, for the reason that the Director of the Budget, an official of the executive branch, is empowered—not required—to allocate the reductions. In other words, the appropriation act in itself does not make the appropriations but some further action must be taken in the executive branch before it can be determined how much money is actually appropriated under the headings affected.

This Executive action is not merely ministerial, but discretionary, and, under the authority granted, the Director of the Budget could completely wipe out all appropriations for any given agency under these headings if he could determine what such appropriations are, as made in other parts of the act.

However, it must be remembered that budget estimates are not binding in any way unless the Congress specifically states so when an appropriation is actually made. They are merely used for the purpose of justification as to how the agency or department expects to spend the money involved. Therefore, unless some formula is given as to how to determine what is meant in (a), the Bureau of the Budget or anyone else would have to guess. In other words, appropriations in the act are frequently made, not for "supplies and materials" or "lands and structures" but for "salaries and expenses" or for carrying out certain programs. There is no break-down in the bill between the different objects of expenditure, and frequently the amounts carried in the budget estimates in the aggregate of objects of expenditure have been varied so that no one can tell how much is finally carried in the bill under a given heading of appropriations applicable to a given object of expenditure.

Furthermore, the $385,000,000 provided for the Federal-aid postwar highway-construction program and a major part of funds indicated in this paragraph are exempted under section 1002 (g) of the Douglas amendment.

1001 (b). This paragraph is subject to the same type of objection as paragraph (a), since it attempts to operate on objects of expenditure rather than on appropriations. Furthermore, the paragraph specifies no one to allocate the reduction between the departments and agencies, merely providing for a "pro rata basis" of allocation. There is no definition as to what, in this connection, the words "pro rata" mean. Obviously, someone has got to make this interpretation. Does it mean prorated between departments on the basis of the total amount appropriated to each department for all purposes elsewhere in the bill? Does it mean prorated in relation to the total amount appropriated for each object or for all objects specified in (b) or theoretically appropriated for, again, no one can possibly tell the amount appropriated for a given object? Incidentally, if this is going to be done on a pro rata basis, it would be a very nice financial proposition to make it come out exactly $500,000,000.

The second and third provisos would authorize department heads within their departments and the Budget Director in nondepartmental agencies to make unlimited transfers and adjustments. It may be significant that the department heads, while making reductions, are required to keep the agencies within their respective departments at their "maximum of efficiency," whereas the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, in making the reductions in the nondepartmental and independent agencies, is only required "to provide for maximum of efficiency." In any event, the standard of a maximum of efficiency would be difficult to attain under the reductions provided in the amendment.

The first proviso seems to require reductions in personnel where practicable to be made by eliminating 5 percent of the personnel—not 5 percent of the amount of money estimated for personnel—in the President's budget, and by filling in more than one-half of vacancies. This requirement, while it would be difficult to meet as a firm one, is actually meaningless because of the leeway granted.

The final proviso relates to the annual and sick leave for Government employees. If this subject is to be attached to the bill at all, it should be in the way of a separate amendment since it is a separate legislative problem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the substitute amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I have an amendment to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska, the Senator from Virginia, and other Senators, which I send to the desk. I am heartily in favor of the amendment offered by these Senators, but I stated at the time it was offered that I would offer an amendment which would exclude the Economic Cooperation Administration from the effects of the amendment. I will send the amendment forward, and have it lie on the table, and bring it up tomorrow for discussion, if the plan is to take a recess now. I should like to have the amendment stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, lines 24 and 25, it is proposed to strike out the words "paragraph headed 'Mutual Defense Assistance'" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "paragraphs headed 'Economic Cooperation', 'International Children's Welfare Work', 'International Development', and 'Mutual Defense Assistance'; so much of title III of chapter X–B as is contained in the paragraph headed 'Aid to Palestine Refugees'."

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Are we to continue in session tonight, or take a recess at this time?

Mr. LUCAS. I may say, in reply to the Senator, that we will recess in a very few minutes.

Mr. President, I hope that we can finish the bill tomorrow, and I am sure the Senator from Tennessee would like to have that done.

Mr. McKELLAR. I certainly would.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Tennessee has been very constant in his attendance on the floor of the Senate for a long time, and he is not in the best of health, so I hope we can get through with the bill tomorrow. We have spent weeks on it, and I should indeed like to accommodate the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator with all my heart, and I hope the minority leader and the other Senators on the other side feel as does the majority leader.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I see no reason why the bill should not be concluded tomorrow, unless some unforeseen amendment comes up about which we do not know at the present time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk. It is a very minor amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois offers an amendment, which will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an amendment which I intend to offer to the appropriation bill, on page 366, together with a statement which I have prepared in support of the amendment.

There being no objection the amendment intended to be proposed by Senator DOUGLAS and the statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 366, before the period in line 16, insert a colon and the following: *"Provided further,* That none of the funds appropriated herein shall be used for construction of the Pine Flat Reservoir or the Isabella Reservoir, California, unless (1) within 6 months following the date of enactment of this act, the Secretary of the Army shall have received reports with respect to the division of costs of such projects among flood control, irrigation, and other water uses from the Bureau of Reclamation and local organizations

I announce further that if present and voting the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] would each vote "nay."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], who is absent by leave of the Senate, is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay" and the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 40, as follows:

YEAS—45

Aiken	Hoey	Morse
Anderson	Humphrey	Murray
Chapman	Ives	Myers
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Neely
Connally	Kerr	O'Conor
Douglas	Kilgore	O'Mahoney
Ellender	Leahy	Pepper
Flanders	Lehman	Robertson
Fulbright	Lodge	Smith, Maine
George	Lucas	Smith, N. J.
Graham	McCarran	Sparkman
Green	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Gurney	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Hayden	McMahon	Thye
Hill	Magnuson	Tydings

NAYS—40

Brewster	Hendrickson	Millikin
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bridges	Holland	Russell
Butler	Hunt	Saltonstall
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Schoeppel
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Stennis
Cordon	Kem	Taft
Darby	Knowland	Watkins
Donnell	Langer	Wherry
Dworshak	McCarthy	Wiley
Eastland	McClellan	Williams
Ecton	Malone	Young
Ferguson	Martin	
Gillette	Maybank	

NOT VOTING—11

Benton	Jenner	Tobey
Cain	Kefauver	Vandenberg
Downey	Long	Withers
Frear	Taylor	

So the first branch of Mr. SMITH's amendment to the Byrd-Bridges amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the second branch of the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey, which exempts the International Children's Welfare Work from the provisions of the Byrd-Bridges amendment. [Putting the question.] The "ayes" appear to have it.

Several Senators requested a division.

On a division, the second branch of the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). The question now is on the third branch of the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] exempting the international development from the provisions of the Byrd-Bridges amendment.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Chair announce the result again?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair announced that the second branch of the amendment was rejected on the division vote.

Mr. LUCAS. That it was not agreed to?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request for the yeas and nays comes too late, now that the result has been announced.

Mr. NEELY. I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia moves to reconsider the vote by which the second branch of the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] was rejected.

Mr. WHERRY. I move that the motion be laid on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Nebraska to lay the motion to reconsider on the table.

Mr. HUMPHREY and other Senators demanded the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] to reconsider the vote by which the second branch of the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] was rejected. Senators favoring the motion to lay on the table will vote "yea" when their names are called; those opposed will vote "nay." The yeas and nays having been ordered, the Clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is detained on official committee business.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] would each vote "yea."

The result of the vote was—yeas 42, nays 42.

YEAS—42

Brewster	Ferguson	Malone
Bricker	George	Martin
Bridges	Gillette	Millikin
Butler	Hendrickson	Mundt
Byrd	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Capehart	Hoey	Russell
Chapman	Holland	Saltonstall
Cordon	Johnson, Colo.	Schoeppel
Darby	Kem	Smith, Maine
Donnell	Knowland	Stennis
Dworshak	Langer	Watkins
Eastland	Lodge	Wherry
Ecton	McCarthy	Williams
Ellender	McClellan	Young

NAYS—42

Aiken	Johnson, Tex.	Murray
Anderson	Johnston, S. C.	Myers
Chavez	Kerr	Neely
Connally	Kilgore	O'Conor
Douglas	Leahy	O'Mahoney
Flanders	Lehman	Pepper
Graham	Lucas	Smith, N. J.
Green	McCarran	Sparkman
Gurney	McFarland	Taft
Hayden	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Hill	McMahon	Thomas, Utah
Humphrey	Magnuson	Thye
Hunt	Maybank	Tydings
Ives	Morse	Wiley

NOT VOTING—12

Benton	Fulbright	Taylor
Cain	Jenner	Tobey
Downey	Kefauver	Vandenberg
Frear	Long	Withers

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 42, the nays 42; so the motion to lay on the table fails.

The question now recurs on the motion of the Senator from West Virginia to reconsider the vote by which the second branch of the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] was rejected.

Mr. HOLLAND and other Senators requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] would each vote "nay".

The result was announced—yeas 43, nays 42, as follows:

YEAS—43

Aiken	Douglas	Green
Anderson	Flanders	Gurney
Chavez	Fulbright	Hayden
Connally	Graham	Hill

Humphrey	McFarland	Pepper
Hunt	McKellar	Smith, N. J.
Ives	McMahon	Sparkman
Johnson, Tex.	Magnuson	Taft
Johnston, S. C.	Maybank	Thomas, Okla.
Kerr	Morse	Thomas, Utah
Kilgore	Murray	Thye
Leahy	Myers	Tydings
Lehman	Neely	Wiley
Lucas	O'Conor	
McCarran	O'Mahoney	

NAYS—42

Brewster	Ferguson	Malone
Bricker	George	Martin
Bridges	Gillette	Millikin
Butler	Hendrickson	Mundt
Byrd	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Capehart	Hoey	Russell
Chapman	Holland	Saltonstall
Cordon	Johnson, Colo.	Schoeppel
Darby	Kem	Smith, Maine
Donnell	Knowland	Stennis
Dworshak	Langer	Watkins
Eastland	Lodge	Wherry
Ecton	McCarthy	Williams
Ellender	McClellan	Young

NOT VOTING—11

Benton	Jenner	Tobey
Cain	Kefauver	Vandenberg
Downey	Long	Withers
Frear	Taylor	

So the motion to reconsider the vote by which the second branch of the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] was rejected, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCFARLAND in the chair). The question is on the second branch of the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. WHERRY and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

I announce further that if present and voting the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 44, nays 41, as follows:

YEAS—44

Aiken	Hill	McCarran
Anderson	Humphrey	McFarland
Chavez	Hunt	McKellar
Connally	Ives	McMahon
Douglas	Johnson, Tex.	Magnuson
Flanders	Johnston, S. C.	Maybank
Fulbright	Kerr	Morse
Graham	Kilgore	Murray
Green	Leahy	Myers
Gurney	Lehman	Neely
Hayden	Lucas	O'Conor
O'Mahoney	Sparkman	Thye
Pepper	Taft	Tydings
Smith, Maine	Thomas, Okla.	Wiley
Smith, N. J.	Thomas, Utah	

NAYS—41

Brewster	Ferguson	Malone
Bricker	George	Martin
Bridges	Gillette	Millikin
Butler	Hendrickson	Mundt
Byrd	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Capehart	Hoey	Russell
Chapman	Holland	Saltonstall
Cordon	Johnson, Colo.	Schoeppel
Darby	Kem	Stennis
Donnell	Knowland	Watkins
Dworshak	Langer	Wherry
Eastland	Lodge	Williams
Ecton	McCarthy	Young
Ellender	McClellan	

NOT VOTING—11

Benton	Jenner	Tobey
Cain	Kefauver	Vandenberg
Downey	Long	Withers
Frear	Taylor	

So the second branch of the amendment of Mr. SMITH of New Jersey was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next question is on agreeing to the branch of the amendment exempting international development. [Putting the question.] The "noes" seem to have it.

Mr. MORSE. I ask for a division.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Those who favor the amendment will rise and stand until counted.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, let us have the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Those in favor of the amendment will be seated, and those opposed to the amendment will rise and stand until counted.

Mr. KERR. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

I announce further that if present and voting the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 39, nays 46, as follows:

YEAS—39

Anderson	Gillette	Humphrey
Chavez	Graham	Ives
Connally	Green	Johnson, Tex.
Ellender	Hayden	Johnston, S. C.
Fulbright	Hill	Kerr
Kilgore	Magnuson	Pepper
Leahy	Maybank	Smith, Maine
Lehman	Morse	Smith, N. J.
Lodge	Murray	Sparkman
Lucas	Myers	Thomas, Okla.
McFarland	Neely	Thomas, Utah
McKellar	O'Conor	Thye
McMahon	O'Mahoney	Tydings

NAYS—46

Aiken	Flanders	Martin
Brewster	George	Millikin
Bricker	Gurney	Mundt
Bridges	Hendrickson	Robertson
Butler	Hickenlooper	Russell
Byrd	Hoey	Saltonstall
Capehart	Holland	Schoeppel
Chapman	Hunt	Stennis
Cordon	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Darby	Kem	Watkins
Donnell	Knowland	Wherry
Douglas	Langer	Wiley
Dworshak	McCarran	Williams
Eastland	McCarthy	Young
Ecton	McClellan	
Ferguson	Malone	

NOT VOTING—11

Benton	Jenner	Tobey
Cain	Kefauver	Vandenberg
Downey	Long	Withers
Frear	Taylor	

So the third branch of the amendment of Mr. SMITH of New Jersey was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now recurs on the fourth branch of the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey exempting aid to Palestine refugees.

The fourth branch of the amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is on the amendment, as amended, offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] on behalf of himself and other Senators, the so-called Byrd-Bridges amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to that amendment which I ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, in line 10, it is proposed to strike out "10 percent" and insert in lieu thereof "15 percent."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I rise to register my firm opposition and deep regret over the action which has just been taken on the subject of international development. At a stage in world history when we are in desperate need of the point 4 program for economic development of the underdeveloped and underprivileged areas, it seems to me that the action of the Senate in rejecting the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey was a most unfortunate action. I realize there is little or nothing we can do about it at this stage, except to let it be known that there is at least a sizable number in the United States Senate who feel that the war against communism is not merely a war of tanks and guns; that the war against communism is also a relentless war against poverty, misery, and disease. To think that the Senate of the United States would slice off $2,600,000 from a $26,000,000 appropriation in the name of economy when the peoples of the world that are going into the Communist camp are the underprivileged people of the underdeveloped areas.

If ever there was a weapon that could be used on the side of freedom and democracy it is the weapon of technological assistance and scientific advance, of which this country has an abundance. Here we are about to appropriate vast sums, billions of dollars, for armament which we desperately need for fighting against the Communist aggressor on the battlefield, and yet we do not seem to possess the good judgment to appropriate a few million dollars to fight against the very forces that take people into the arms and into the camp of the Communist menace. I think that is a tragic mistake, and I think this country will rue the day that the Congress of the United States did not have the foresight to strike a blow in behalf of humanity through striking against disease and disaster by giving to these people in other parts of the world a chance to help themselves.

We just sustained the vote on ECA, and there were projects in ECA which could be questioned. But I say there is not one single proposal in the point-4 program that can be questioned. One cannot question the fight against malaria, one cannot question the need for land reclamation, for irrigation, for electric power, the fight to rid these underprivileged areas of disease. We are proposing to pass millions and millions of dollars of appropriations, but when it comes to a matter of equipping the United States of America and the United Nations with a little money to employ teachers, educators, scientists, technicians, those who can help other people help themselves, what do we do? We say no.

Mr. President, I say now that our action will ring over the Moscow radio into Indochina, and it may not be long before we will have to send troops to Indochina, and when we send those troops the Moscow radio will say, "Yes, they will send their soldiers to kill the Indochinese but they will not send you a public health doctor to help you rid your swamps of disease."

Mr. President, what we have done is a shame and a tragedy. I hope that in conference the conferees will reconsider the action of the Senate and in the name of all that is decent and good, in the name of humanity and progress, will report to the Senate an appropriation for the point 4 program which is worthy of the United States of America. In view of the billions we are spending elsewhere, our action today is not worthy of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] to the Byrd-Bridges amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I should like to address myself for five minutes to the effect of the Wherry amendment upon the various departments of the Government.

As Senators know, the appropriation for the State, Justice, and Commerce Departments and the Judiciary are combined under one head, in one chapter of the bill. The appropriation for that chapter as reported by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] was $119,516,000 or 10 percent under the budget estimate. The proposal we now have before us is to cut 15 percent more from the appropriation for those several departments. The result will be that the appropriation for the Department of State will be reduced by $28,863,000. The appropriation for the Department of Justice will be reduced $2,248,000. The Judiciary itself is exempt. The appropriation for the Department of Commerce will be reduced by $37,200,000.

The total reduction, under the budget, by the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska, instead of the $119,000,000 reduction, as our committee has reported, will be increased to $183,050,000.

It seems to me the Senate ought to realize what a drastic cut is now proposed to be made by imposing a 15 percent reduction on the 10 percent reduction which the committee, after careful study, has already provided.

Let us now look at the Department of Agriculture. Let us see what would be done there. The chapter of the bill dealing with the Department of Agriculture, as reported by the committee, carries a reduction of $30,000,000 under the budget estimate. The 15-percent cut would add $96,000,000 more to that. So the total reduction under the budget would be $127,000,000 for the Department of Agriculture. But, more than that, it would also cut $105,000,000 from the ability of the Department of Agriculture to make loans. The 15 percent cut in the money provided for rural electrification and for the farm loan program throughout the United States, would affect those programs to the extent of $105,000,000.

Mr. BYRD. Is the Senator speaking of a 15 percent reduction or a 10 percent reduction?

Mr. HAYDEN. A 15 percent reduction, which is the proposal made by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] as an amendment to the Byrd-Bridges amendment.

Mr. BYRD. Bridges-Byrd amendment calls for a 10 percent reduction.

Mr. HAYDEN. The pending amendment, offered by the Senator from Nebraska to the Byrd-Bridges amendment, calls for a 15-percent reduction.

I simply wished to give these illustrations of the effect of agreeing to such a proposal; I did so in order that Senators might know what they were voting for.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, I shall not support the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska to the Byrd-Bridges amendment.

I believe it is imperative that we economize. For that reason, I voted against the amendment to exclude the ECA from the provisions of the Bridges-Byrd amendment. I have felt, and I still believe, that it is just as necessary for us to economize in peacetime spending abroad as it is for us to economize in our peacetime domestic spending at home.

I think the action taken by the Senate this afternoon in excluding ECA from any cut, is extremely unfortunate. It indicates that we have adopted two standards in regard to spending by the United States in time of an emergency. One is that we shall place the yoke upon our own people and make their burden heavier in order to make certain that we do not withhold anything from those abroad.

Let me remind the Senate that every dollar that is spent abroad under the ECA program, however much it may be justified, makes more compelling and necessary retrenchment and curtailment in our expenditures at home for the development of programs in our own interest and welfare. Our action in voting a few minutes ago the extra $200,000,000-odd for the ECA program, for the building of roads and the carrying on soil-conservation projects, and so forth in Africa and elsewhere, means that every dollar that is spent in such places will have to be taken out of the corresponding programs here in the United States.

Therefore, I shall support, as I originally planned, the Byrd-Bridges amendment calling for a 10-percent reduction; but I shall not support any further reduction.

I regret exceedingly that we are not willing to apply a 10-percent reduction straight across the board, all around the world, in the case of all programs of the same character. There is an inclination on the part of some—and I personally feel the same way, but I will not follow my personal feelings and preference at the moment—that if we are going to spend money abroad for such purposes, then we should not vote to reduce the appropriations for such programs here at home. If reductions are not to be made in the appropriations for foreign assistance, then we should not vote to reduce the appropriations for similar purposes and programs here in the United States.

Mr. President, that is the way I, too, feel about the matter. However, I shall not vote my personal feelings and preference in these trying times. I should like to act that way, but I believe there is a call of duty which is higher than my personal feelings at this moment. Unless we are willing to accomplish, and unless by our actions we actually accomplish, rigid economy in all our programs here in the United States, then, in view of the obligations and burdens we are assuming abroad, we are headed for a national catastrophe.

Yes, Mr. President, every dollar we spend on the ECA, and particularly for certain projects that have been submitted and programed in this appropriation, makes more necessary and more compelling retrenchment and rigid economy in our programs here at home. Unless we are ready and willing to throw all restraint to the winds and spend and spend for everything we want, we must practice rigid economy all the way across the board, Mr. President. If we do not pursue that course, but instead continue as we have proceeded this afternoon, in my judgment we shall soon arrive at a destination of national economic chaos.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Arkansas has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] on page 2, in line 10, of the Byrd-Bridges amendment, to strike out "10 percent" and insert "15 percent."

The amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question recurs on agreeing to the so-called Bridges-Byrd amendment, offered by the Senator from Virginia, the Senator from New Hampshire, and a number of other Senators.

To that amendment the Senator from Nevada has offered an amendment, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, in line 10 of the Bridges-Byrd amendment, after the parenthesis, it is proposed to insert "or the preservation of law and order."

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I had understood that the authors of the Byrd-Bridges amendment would accept this amendment to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nevada to the so-called Byrd-Bridges amendment.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Nevada that the law-enforcement agencies are exempted. I am not certain of the purposes of the amendment he has offered. I do not have the amendment before me.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment again.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, in line 10, of the Byrd-Bridges amendment, after the parenthesis, it is proposed to insert "or the preservation of law and order."

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, in answer to the question of the Senator from Virginia, let me say that a quick examination of the amendment now pending would indicate that practically the entire Department of Justice would be exempted. However, under a stricter interpretation other vital functions and operations of the Department of Justice closely tied into those exempted would suffer a 10-percent reduction in appropriations, thereby directly affecting the activities which would be exempted.

For example, the offices under the appropriation "General administration," such as the Attorney General's Office and other offices which direct and supervise the activities of such exempted groups, would have their appropriations cut, and that would bring about an impossible situation of the tail wagging the dog.

Furthermore, the appropriation for "General legal activities" would be cut 10 percent; and under that heading comes the Criminal Division, whose duties are primarily in connection with the prosecution and investigation of persons suspected or convicted of offenses against the criminal laws of the United States, and it falls clearly within the exemption. Therefore, if the 10-percent cut is apportioned to the other divisions but if the Criminal Division is exempted, that division will suffer a comparatively greater reduction. That would mean that the Antitrust Division, the Claims Division, the Tax Division, the Lands Division, and the Customs Division would be very seriously curtailed and obstructed in their law-enforcement activities.

So, Mr. President, I hope my amendment to the Byrd-Bridges amendment will be accepted.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I do not follow the explanation by the Senator from Nevada. For example, the Customs Division is exempted. In response to a request a very careful analysis of the amendment has been made in writing by the Bureau of the Budget. The FBI is exempted under section 1003 subsection (i), the Immigration and Naturalization Service is exempted, the district attorneys are exempted, the Bureau of Customs is exempted, the Secret Service is exempted, the Bureau of Internal Revenue is exempted; those who audit the accounts and do police work in connection with the collection of taxes are exempted; the Bureau of Narcotics is exempted; and section (a) of the act——

Mr. McCARRAN. I may say to the Senator from Virginia that I have been reading from an opinion by the Department of Justice on the pending Bridges-Byrd amendment. It is from the Department itself.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not have the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thought the Senator from Nevada had yielded to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. All I can say is we have an interpretation from the Bureau of the Budget, in writing, after a very careful examination of the proposed amendment, and the language itself I think is clear:

> The amounts appropriated by this act for the operation of law-enforcement agencies, including the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Bureau of Customs, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and the Secret Service are exempt, and so are the funds for the payment of compensation and expenses of agents and auditors of the Bureau of Internal Revenue and other officers and agents, whose duties pertain to intelligence operations, including funds transferred pursuant to section 6 (a) of the act of June 20, 1949, or the investigation, apprehension, prosecution, or detention of persons suspected or convicted of offenses against the criminal laws of the United States. The exact language may be seen on page 4, subsection (1).

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the Senator yield that I may ask the Senator from Nevada a question?

Mr. BYRD. I yield, provided I do not lose the floor.

Mr. FERGUSON. I desire to ask the Senator from Nevada whether it is the intention to limit this to the Department of Justice.

Mr. McCARRAN. The amendment I have offered to the Bridges-Byrd amendment addresses itself entirely to the Department of Justice.

Mr. FERGUSON. So there cannot be any question about that.

Mr. McCARRAN. It is a clarifying amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. BYRD. I have 5 minutes only, but I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. I merely want to say that the information I have from the Bureau of the Budget is that this 10 percent reduction would affect the Department of Justice to the extent of $1,632,500. So evidently there are some parts of the Department of Justice that are not covered by the language which the Senator has quoted from the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. BYRD. I think that is correct. There are some expenses of the general administration that are not covered by the exemption. But in the main, it was intended that all the law-enforcement agencies would be exempt.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, have I any time remaining?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator can speak again only by unanimous consent, under the agreement entered into.

Mr. McCARRAN. I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to speak for 1 minute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. McCARRAN. This matter was worked out after many weeks of careful study, investigation and hearings, and the committee cut the appropriation $7,050,000 under the Budget estimate. The way the Byrd-Bridges amendment is worded, it would affect seriously certain divisions of the Department of Justice wherein both law and order are involved. The amendment that I have offered would exempt them.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada to the so-called Byrd-Bridges amendment.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I should like the attention of the Senator from Virginia, because he read a rather lengthy list of divisions within the Department of Justice which would be excluded from the amendment which he is sponsoring. I wish the Senator from Virginia would read to the Senate those divisions within the Department of Justice that are embraced in his amendment and that will receive a 10-percent cut if his amendment should prevail.

Mr. BYRD. In answer to the Senator from Pennsylvania, I may say that the fees and expenses of witnesses, $1,250,000, are exempt.

Mr. MYERS. I was asking for those that are not exempt. Will the Senator read those that are not exempt?

Mr. BYRD. Those that are not exempt include the general administrative expenses, the salaries and expenses of the general administration, the salaries and expenses of the general legal activities, and salaries and expenses of the Antitrust Division. The salaries and expenses of the marshals are exempted.

In most of these departments, as the Senator well knows, there is opportunity for great economy in administrative expenses.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is the Tax Court of the United States exempt?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. BYRD. All of the judiciary is exempted, but the Tax Court is not included in the judiciary appropriations in this bill. It is not exempt.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is not my question.

Mr. BYRD. The Tax Court is not exempt.

Mr. MYERS. According to the response of the Senator from Virginia to my question, it seems that the attorneys who are in charge of the administration of justice are the ones who will suffer as a result of this amendment. I particularly note that the Antitrust Division is a part of the Department of Justice. Its work will be curtailed if this amendment should prevail. Therefore, although the FBI and a number of the agencies are exempt, it seems to me that all the other divisions indeed will be hindered in their work, and, at such a critical time in the history of our country we certainly should not curtail the work and activities of the Department of Justice. I hope——

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. MYERS. I have but 5 minutes. However, I will yield as soon as I finish this sentence. I hope, at such a critical time as this, that we will not in the case of one of the most important agencies of the Government undertake to practice a false economy. I now yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to ask the Senator from Pennsylvania whether he thinks it is more appropriate for the Antitrust Division and its personnel to be exempted from this cut than for similar personnel of the Federal Trade Commission, which is enforcing exactly the same laws and performing exactly the same duties, to be exempted.

Mr. MYERS. Perhaps the Senator does not believe in the Federal Trade Commission. Let the Senator offer such an amendment. I am simply saying that the Department of Justice is one of the most important agencies of the Government. It is, in fact, a more important agency than the Federal Trade Commission. I certainly believe it would not be in the best interest of our country or in the best interest of the efficient and proper administration of justice to practice economy on this agency.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada to the so-called Byrd-Bridges amendment. [Putting the question.] The amendment to the amendment is rejected.

Mr. McCARRAN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. The Chair has ruled.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nevada was on his feet. But the demand for the yeas and nays is not sufficiently seconded. The question now is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to speak very briefly upon this amendment. The question before the Senate this afternoon is simply whether it is going to vote according to a symbol or according to reality. I have every sympathy with the purpose of those who have sponsored this amendment to make a substantial cut in the nondefense, nonessential expenditures of the Federal Government. As a member of one of the subcommittees which handled one of the largest chapters in this bill, I want the Senate to know that the committee in charge of that bill diligently sought to reduce expenditures to a minimum. I know that the same thing was done by other subcommittees. Substantial reductions were made. But it seems to be difficult for Senators to make up their minds that it is impossible to legislate upon the floor of the Senate upon a matter of such great complexity as appropriations. When the predecessor of this amendment was presented in the Appropriations Committee, on the very first day of its consideration, when I first read it, I saw gaping holes in the amendment, through which, in the term so familiar to us all, it would be possible to drive a coach and four. I pointed out that there was no exemption for the Post Office Department, and that it contained a provision for a 10-percent decrease of the amount of money to be expended for the transportation of things. That necessarily meant the portation of mail. The sponsors of the amendment say that it was a valid criticism. It does not appear——

Mr. BYRD. It does not appear in this amendment?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It does not appear in this amendment. I raised the question about the application of this cut to strategic and critical materials. It was not in the old amendment. There is an exemption in this amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have but 5 minutes. Let me proceed.

So it went, Mr. President. Every criticism which I made very briefly, within scarcely 5 minutes of the meeting of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, was met, but I had not begun to point out the loopholes in the amendment. This amendment, although it has been labored over, still contains loopholes which will injure the defense program if the Senate agrees to it. For example, on page 3, it undertakes to exempt trust funds. It should read "appropriations for trust funds."

In the next paragraph it deals with funds for Government corporations, excluding those made available in the act for administrative expenses. It should say "appropriations for funds."

Then there is an exemption which does not exempt administrative expenses. It deals with the Farm Credit Administration, for example, which receives an appropriation for its administrative proceedings, and which does not operate on a single dollar of public funds, because every penny is repaid. The Farm Credit Administration contributes three or four million dollars annually to the Treasury of the United States. It will be vitally necessary, in case of a great war, to maintain our livestock.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] was concerned about the failure to exempt meat inspection. How can we handle our meat program?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am still concerned.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course the Senator is concerned.

Mr. WHERRY. The way I want to handle it is to offer an amendment to the agriculture chapter.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator will pardon me, but I cannot yield.

These illustrations are indicative of the loopholes in this amendment, Mr. President.

I want to invite attention to the fact that the General Services Administration——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. DOUGLAS and Mr. HUNT addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I believe I have made it clear that I do not like the meat-ax approach to reducing expenditures. That is why I have been trying to cut appropriations item by item so that cuts would be made by Congress itself on those items which should be reduced. After making little headway on 68 individual proposals for reductions, I resorted to a general amendment which although it did not hit individual items, did specify the areas where the cuts were to be made so that Congress would not be completely abdicating its power of appropriating. I did not assert that the amendment was perfect. Any proposal for a general cut has flaws. But the reductions would have been made. However, I could not get the necessary support, even to get a roll call.

It may have appeared that there was competition between my general amendment calling for a reduction of $1,000,000,000 from selected areas and the Byrd-Bridges amendment calling for a 10-percent cut amounting to an estimated $525,000,000. It is true that I wanted to vote on my amendment first because I thought it was a better method but, in the final analysis, the important thing is to make the reductions so that we can keep down inflation and release manpower and resources for the defense effort. Therefore, I want to give my wholehearted support to the Byrd-Bridges amendment. While I shall not offer other amendments, this is our last opportunity to make a major reduction and we must not let it pass us by.

The Byrd-Bridges amendment may be a meat ax, but it will make reductions

and since my previous efforts have not been successful, I hope we can pass it. It has an excellent chance. It has a great deal of support whereas my efforts apparently had little. Therefore, I ask those senators who have so graciously supported me to support the Byrd-Bridges amendment as well. If we pool our strength we can get these reductions, and I certainly hope that partisanship will not enter into the drum on this issue.

We all know of the great need for economy in nonessential expenditures. Let us follow this up and show the country that we are aware of this need by passing this amendment reducing these funds by $525,000,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, it had been my purpose to support this amendment, but since the Senate has seen fit to make fish of one appropriation and fowl of another, I shall vote against it. Having some responsibility as the chairman of the subcommittee which handles the agricultural appropriations, I wish to refer briefly to the effect of this amendment upon agricultural appropriations.

The subcommittee and the full committee reduced the appropriations for the Department of Agriculture approximately $30,000,000. This amendment would reduce them $65,000,000.

I have a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, in which he points out that if this 10 percent cut is applied across the board it will mean a reduction of 346 meat inspectors and will seriously curtail the program of meat inspection. He further says that it would ruin the Rural Electrification Administration; that it would restrict the rural telephone program and would make it impossible to give the minimum attention required to safeguard the Government's interest in $2,200,000,000 worth of loans. It would level a great blow at the operations of the Soil Conservation Service and would deny technical assistance to from 150 to 180 soil conservation districts, as well as reducing technical assistance in 250 other districts.

If the amendment were applied across the board it would reduce the appropriation for the National Forest Service by approximately $3,000,000. According to the Department of Agriculture, there have been more fires this season than ever before. We all know there is a great need for protection of our forest resources because of the fact that they are shrinking, due to the unparalleled and unprecedented demand made upon them during the past 10 years.

Those are only a few of the items, Mr. President, in the agricultural appropriation bill, which are pointed out by the Secretary, in connection with which very dire consequences would be visited upon our domestic economy.

I am not any expert on the Scriptures, Mr. President, but I remember something is said in the Bible to the effect that he who does not look after his own household is worse than an infidel.

We have now seen fit to eliminate the ECA from any reduction whatever. I cannot go along with the proposition of drastically reducing appropriations which are so important to the national welfare as are those which I have mentioned, and I could point out others in the bill.

I assert without any fear of successful contradiction that $1 spent on the national forests of the United States means more to the free peoples of this earth than would $7 spent for the ECA.

I believe, Mr. President, that the health of the American people, protected through a meat-inspection program, is as important as is the health program in other lands so eloquently outlined by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. We are preserving and protecting our natural resources and carrying on a research program which will be crippled if this 10-percent reduction is agreed to. That program is infinitely important not only to the American people, but to freemen everywhere.

Mr. President, we always help the other nations of the earth, but in the last analysis here in America is the last citadel of freedom. These appropriations deal with the resources of America and our ability to protect and defend ourselves from the forces of aggression which threaten us at this very hour.

Mr. President, for the reason that this so-called economy drive has at least half collapsed, I shall not cast a discriminatory vote to reduce appropriations within the United States when no reduction whatever is being made in the appropriations for the foreign economic administration.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the subcommittee headed by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] has done a wonderful work on this sector or chapter of the bill. I hardly know whether to call it a sector or a chapter under the new method of dividing up appropriations, but whatever it may be called, the committee has done a splendid work. I endorse everything the Senator has said, and I hope the Senate of the United States will not agree to this amendment.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. May I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute and speak on it for 5 minutes?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator may offer an amendment to the Byrd-Bridges amendment either as an amendment or by way of a substitute for it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I desire to do that at the appropriate time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. When the Senator gets the floor is the appropriate time to do it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. May I be recognized now for that purpose?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair recognized the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] before he asked the Senator to state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment and desire to make what I believe to be some pertinent observations which have not been brought out in any of the debates I have listened to since the pending measure has been before the Senate.

I do not know why it is necessary to go into the Department of Justice, Department of Agriculture, and Department of Commerce and trim down their personnel. If it is fair to do it in the executive branch of the Government, why is it not fair to do it in the legislative branch? Why do we in the Senate, instead of decreasing our personnel 10 percent, increase the appropriation? Last year the appropriation for the Senate alone was $12,013,000. This year the figure is $12,422,000, or an increase of approximately $410,000 for personnel in the Senate and for things that have to be done in the way of paying for telegrams, telephone calls, and so forth. Yet no one in this economy group, who are so strong for cutting everything in the executive branch of the Government has done a single thing to see to at that something along the same line is done in our own house.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield for a question.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator is making rather an extensive statement when he says not a single thing has been done.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I shall not yield for a speech. The record speaks for itself.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Last year we appropriated $12,013,000. This year we intend to appropriate $12,422,000. For the contingent fund of the Senate we appropriated for the fiscal year 1949 $2,626,118. For the fiscal year 1950 we appropriated $2,755,000.04, or an increase of approximately $125,000. Mr. President, so far this year we have resolutions for investigations alone calling for $1,200,000. Yet only $832,000 has been appropriated in the appropriation bill for that kind of work. We shall be forced to have another deficiency bill. The disbursing officer tells me that this year the contingent fund of the Senate alone will require at least $3,000,000. That is an increase over last year of approximately $400,000. Apparently we in the Senate are not willing to apply the meat ax on our own people in order to decrease the personnel of the United States Senate, but we are willing to apply it to the executive branch. Of course not very much is involved, but the principle is exactly the same. We ought to do it in the judiciary and the legislative branches if we are to do it in the executive branch. If we are to reduce appropriations in one, we should do it in all. That is the point I am making.

Those who are so strong for economy did not examine the Senate cut and offer to economize. If 10 percent is good for the executive, it should be good for the legislative and judiciary. That is something that someone will have to answer for. Somebody ought to talk about it. I am certain the country would be interested in knowing why the legislative branch was excluded.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I send forward an amendment in the na-

ture of a substitute and ask that the clerk read it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment, it is proposed to insert the following:

CHAPTER X–A—AUTHORIZATION TO STUDY AND REPORT ON RESCISSIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS AND CONTRACT AUTHORIZATIONS

SEC. 1001. The Senate Committee on Appropriations and the House Committee on Appropriations, acting jointly, or any duly authorized subcommittee of said committees, are authorized and directed to make a full and complete study of each appropriation, reappropriation, and contract authorization or reauthorization, made by this act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, or made by any other act and available for expenditure or obligation during such fiscal year, to any department or agency in the executive branch of the Government (including funds of Government corporations authorized by this or any other act for administrative expenses), with a view to making such rescissions in nondefense spending as may be possible without impairing effective and efficient operation of the Government.

SEC. 1002. The said committees shall report to the Senate and to the House the results of its study, together with such recommendations as they may deem desirable, not later than August 31, 1951.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would suggest to the Senator that the amendment is not in order to X–A. It would be in order to section 1114.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The amendment is offered to chapter XI.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is the Senator offering the amendment at the same place as the pending amendment?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. To take the place of the language of the Byrd-Bridges amendment?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Then it is in order. The Senator is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, this amendment is very plain in its terms. It is a direction to the Committee on Appropriations, which has the responsibility of examining the evidence and the facts, to go over all these appropriations and to report back to the Senate and House by the end of the month recommendations for the rescission of nondefense expenditures. Mr. President, I say that is essential, because by the other amendment, for which this is a substitute, we would seriously injure the defense of the United States.

One of the agencies for which appropriation is made in the bill is the General Services Administration. The agency was established by act of Congress in 1949 for the express purpose of providing the Federal Government with economical, efficient, and effective management of the Government's personal property, real property, and records. The General Services Administration was recommended by the Hoover Commission. I want to call to the attention of Members of the Senate that it has the custody of the 66 reserve plants of the Nation. I have in my hand the list showing the location of these 66 plants, which would be needed in our national defense. The so-called Byrd-Bridges amendment would impair the ability of the General Services Administratoin to handle those defense plants. It would cut millions of dollars and hundreds of persons from the necessary operation of providing for this national industrial reserve. This list contains not only 66 industrial plants. It contains 14,000 tons of machine tools.

Then, Mr. President, there is the wartime Civilian Disaster Relief Planning, under which the General Services Administration works with the National Security Resources Board. With the broad-ax method of a flat 10 percent cut we would impair the essential activities of the National Security Resources Board at a time when in a day or two we shall turn around to provide additional appropriations.

Mr. President, are we to march up the hill and then march right down the hill? Let us cut the nonessential, nondefense appropriation, but let us not take the risk of cutting defense appropriations, as it is clear we would be doing. Let us consider the problem of the strategic relocation activity of the Federal Government which is carried on by the National Security Resources Board and the General Services Administration.

Mr. President, as was pointed out in my statement a moment ago, when the Byrd-Bridges proposal was considered in the Senate committee, we pointed out the loopholes and the errors that were being made. The few I mentioned there were corrected. Here I mention others. If there were not a limitation of time, I could go through this amendment line by line and show that the result of the adoption of the amendment would be seriously to impair the capacity of the Government to function at a time when we need its most efficient operation.

Mr. President, I trust that the substitute which I have offered may be accepted by the Senate. Again I say, I have here in my hand the list of the 66 industrial plants which are in the custody of the General Services Administration, the care of which will be seriously impaired unless the substitute is agreed to.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I do not know where the Senator from Wyoming got his figures. As a matter of fact, General Services Administration appropriations totaling $782,000,000 are exempted in this cut.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I referred to the appropriation for carrying on the Strategic Materials Stockpiling Act.

Mr. BYRD. Six hundred and five million dollars for the strategic materials, and $175,000,000 in addition to that, are exempted in the particular agency referred to.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not also true that the buildings to which the Senator from Wyoming referred would be exempted because they come under the $10,500,000,000 to finance the war effort, and the Administration would have absolute power under that to take over the buildings for the necessary manufacturing of war materials?

Mr. BYRD. Any building to the extent that prior obligations are made, is exempted. There is a number of buildings. There is the office building in Nashville, Tenn. Some of the funds for that are exempted. There is a partial exemption for the Alaska public works item. There is exemptions for the defense planning for Federal public works, to the extent of $14,000,000. There are partial exemptions for water-pollution plants, and so forth. When the Senator talks about millions and hundreds of millions, he has overlooked the fact that $782,000,000 in this particular agency is exempt.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I strongly hope that the Senate will vote down the substitute amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming, and will then adopt the so-called Byrd-Bridges amendment.

First answering the point made by the Senator from Illinois, I call his attention to the fact that the Senate is in excellent position to require that these civilian agencies shall make a reduction of their expenses. The only substantial cut in the appropriation bill which has been made in the weeks of debate on the bill has been the cutting off of the $10,000,000 appropriation which was designed to start a new Senate office building, very badly needed by Senators and their staffs and the Senate committees.

In the next place, I remind the Senator from Illinois that just as the President's salary and the salaries of his staff and assistants are exempted from the cut because they are a war agency, as well as a peace agency, and their efforts are largely increased in time of war, so in the case of the legislative staffs and the legislative expenses. I do not have to tell every Senator here, because he knows already, that his mail has been greatly increased, that his efforts are greatly spread out, and that war has brought upon him added duties, instead of lessened duties, whereas in the case of the civilian agencies, the opposite is the case.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I can not yield just now, to my regret. I have only five minutes.

Mr. President, this is the acid test. We have not made any real reductions. The House voted over a billion-dollar reduction in time of peace. Shall we, the Senate, be blind to the fact that war has come, that these civilian agencies should make some contribution by way of greater economy, as we face the difficult test, the supreme test, which lies ahead of our Nation?

Mr. President, it seems to me that this is the last chance we are going to have to indicate to the public whether we recognize the fact that this Nation is at war, and that the same philosophy and logic and reasoning which very properly were applied by our able committee, our devoted committee, in drafting the pending bill, shoul' not be applied now. They drew the bill in time of peace. We are passing the bill in time of war.

Mr. President, I think we would make a tragic mistake if we gave rise to a feeling on the part of the people of the country that we think no real effort toward economy should be made. It is not a big effort, cutting out $525,000,000, but it will show that we do recognize that there is a changed situation which requires a changed approach, and that we propose to attempt to economize as we tighten our belts and face the difficult days ahead.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I have a statement with regard to the pending amendment which I should like to have inserted in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, Mr. BUTLER'S statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, I believe it should be made crystal clear that there is nothing in the language of the so-called Bridges-Byrd amendment, which I have joined in sponsoring, that requires a reduction in personnel in any specific office, division, or bureau within any one of the departments.

I am particularly concerned about the lay-off notices which have been given to several hundred meat inspectors, apparently in anticipation of a possible reduction in the general appropriations covering the whole Government. There was absolutely no necessity for such a reduction, and, in my judgment, it was ridiculous to single out this small, highly essential service to bear the brunt of the reductions in the Department of Agriculture. I refuse to believe, Mr. President, that there is no other place within the Department of Agriculture where an equivalent saving could be made without hampering any vital service.

The meat-inspection service is essential if packing plants are to continue to process livestock under present law. If the inspector is not there, then the packing plant must close down. I believe it should be fully understood that Congress intended the Secretary of Agriculture to use his discretion, to make adjustments and transfers between such appropriations, so as to protect the really essential functions of the Department.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to take about 5 minutes. I have not used any time on the bill so far.

I intend to vote for an amendment which does not have my unqualified approval. I think this means of forcing economy in the executive branch of the Government is an outright evasion of responsibility on the part of the Congress. I believe that in delegating certain appropriating powers, or the power to vary appropriations to the executive branch, entails a good deal of risk, and is something we should be slow to start. Nevertheless, I am unable to see that there is any other way of forcing the executive branch of the Government to cooperate with the legislative branch in an effort to effect some measure of economy in appropriations which we are making.

There are enough unwarranted appropriations in the pending bill which we are considering to amount to more than the 10 percent which it is proposed to cut from certain departments. I believe that if we had done as we should have done, we would have stricken out the appropriations which are completely unwarranted; but we have not done that.

I do not believe that a cut across the board, even though it affects only a few departments, is the right way to handle the situation. Nevertheless, I do not see any other way under the sun by which we can require economy within the executive branch of the Government, or certain agencies in it, at this time unless we take some strict measures, whether we like them or not.

Mr. President, in spite of the fact that the head of at least one agency has indicated that if he is required to cut at all, he is going to cut where it hurts most—and I presume that applies to more than one agency head—I think we should vote for the amendment, and then, if it turns out that the Congress has done an injustice to certain departments, if after doing the best they can, they are still unable to operate in an efficient manner, we will still have a chance to make supplementary appropriations at the beginning of the year.

Mr. President, I shall vote for the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] because I see no other way whereby we can force this matter to a conclusion, and get some showdown on careful spending with the executive branch of the Government.

I was simply amazed when the President, less than 2 weeks ago, sent a special message to the Congress asking for authority to begin several brand new projects, including a dam in Idaho where there had been no dam before, and dams here and there. It looked to me as if it were done for political purposes, and I do not like that at all. I believe some department could well cut out spending for political purposes and propaganda. We cannot expect to spend as much as we would like for peacetime projects while there is a war on. The executive departments should give us full cooperation in reducing appropriations to a feasible minimum. If they are unwilling to do this, we have no other recourse than to force economy in nonessential programs by reducing appropriations.

Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. WHERRY, and Mr. CORDON rose.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, a point of order. I addressed the Chair, and the Senator from Nebraska did not even open his mouth.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would suggest to the Senator from Indiana that he is behind the Senator from Nebraska while the Chair is in front of him. The Chair understood the Senator from Nebraska to address the Chair.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, a point of order. I addressed the Chair, and the Senator from Nebraska did not. I notice too much of that sort of thing going on, so far as I am personally concerned.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska, whom the Chair had recognized, yield temporarily to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. WHERRY. I will be glad to. I did not know that the Senator from Indiana was on his feet, but I will agree with everything he said, except that for the first time in my life I did not speak.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I understand the rule of the Senate to be that the Senator who rises and addresses the Chair first is the one who should be recognized. I may be wrong in that, but that is my understanding of the rule. My observation here during the past several months or a couple of years has been that that rule has not been observed so far as I am personally concerned.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would like to say to the Senator from Indiana that that statement is not true.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I want to say that I do not yield to the Chair; that I do not yield for an observation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has made it just the same.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Chair has made it, but the Chair has made it out of order so far as I am personally concerned, because it has happened to me on any number of occasions, and I want the Senate to know, and I want the Presiding Officer to know that I do not particularly appreciate it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would like to say to the Senator from Indiana——

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I have not yielded to the Chair to make an observation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will say to the Senator—and he will extend his time long enough to permit the Chair to do so—that he has never knowingly or intentionally ignored the Senator from Indiana or any other Senator. Frequently it transpires here that a number of Senators rise at the same time and address the Chair, and in that case the Chair certainly has discretion in determining which one he will recognize.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I agree with that, but in this particular instance the Senator from Indiana rose and addressed the Chair, and the able Senator from Nebraska did not address the Chair. I shall be very happy to leave that observation up to anyone who was on the floor.

What I rose for was to say that it seems to me the United States Senate today has two standards. It has a standard for appropriating money for foreign nations, and another standard for appropriating money for its own people. I have observed on the floor of the United States Senate this afternoon that we are against cutting any of the appropriations for foreign nations. I do not know how others feels about it, but I do not think the people of the United States particularly appreciate it.

When we need to reduce expenses in this country, when we need to save money because we are at war, when we are asked to cut all appropriations straight across the board, I can see absolutely no fairness in cutting the appropriations for our own people and increasing the appropriations we make for peoples in other countries. I say that it is a dual standard in the Senate. We

have one standard for foreigners and another standard for Americans.

It is perfectly all right, according to Senators, as shown by their votes, to reduce the expenditures for our own domestic concerns, and yet it is absolutely wrong to do the same thing when it comes to appropriations for foreign nations. That does not make sense to me. We either should economize, or we should not. We either should balance the budget and raise taxes to finance this war, or we should not. By such actions it seems to me we make ourselves look silly not only to our own people, but silly to the peoples in other parts of the world.

Here we are prosecuting a war. We are prosecuting a war. We are getting ready to raise taxes by from $5,000,000,000 to $10,000,000,000, which we should do. Yet we set up two standards in the United States Congress. We are told, "You dare not touch an appropriation the money from which is to be used by some other nation," and at the same time we are told that we should cut the appropriations for our own people.

Mr. President, I do not like to cut appropriations for our own people. My inclination is exactly the same as that of the able junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. I do not like such action. My personal inclination is to say that I shall vote against the pending amendment, but I am not going to do so. I am not going to vote against it. But that is what I should do. I repeat, that is what I should do. I should at least treat every American as well as we are treating every foreign nation. I shall vote for the amendment, but I certainly want the Senate to know that I do not like it, and I am certain the people in the State of Indiana do not like two standards. I am certain they do not, and I am not so sure that that is not true in all the other 47 States.

We have a war on our hands. It is not a police action. We have a war. We have not yet seen published the casualties, the names of the boys who have been lost in battle, the boys who have been wounded, the boys who have been killed. We have a war on our hands, and it is going to take several months even to win this Korean war. We are going to need a great deal of money. We are going to have to tighten our belts. But the United States Congress says to the American people, "We will furnish all the materials, all the money, all the men to fight this war," and then we say to the American people, "Tighten up your belts now. We are going to reduce the amounts for your highways and roads and everything else, but at the same time we are going to increase the appropriations for the peoples in every other country in the world."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator——

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not true that the Senator's last statement——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Indiana has expired.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I certainly want to apologize to the Senator from Indiana if he feels that I saw him on the floor and wanted to gain recognition first.

I did not have an opportunity to speak on the 15-percent-cut amendment, and I feel that the facts have been pretty well presented to the Senate. Of course, now that the foreign-aid part of the bill is not touchable, it makes necessary more of a cut in our own domestic economy. Those who are interested in our own construction projects and in our civil function, which have been reduced 8.6 percent, and the Interior Department appropriation which has been reduced almost a like amount, and in other branches of the Government the appropriations for which have been reduced considerably below the estimates, will find that the cut heretofore made will be increased by 10 percent. I think the Members of the Senate ought to know that.

I agree with the remarks made by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. I have already expressed myself. The question has been very well presented by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN].

Mr. President, it seems to me we take an untenable position when we say, as I outlined yesterday on the Senate floor, that we will build projects everywhere around the globe, and yet not do the same thing here at home. The Senate, however, has acted on that proposition. The Senate has made its decision. Now what can we do with what is left?

I should like to say briefly that the amount of the appropriation carried in the bill is $32,504,972,672. Add to that the increase we have made for foreign aid of $65,000,000, and it makes the figure $32,569,972,672. If we add to that the Spanish loan of $100,000,000, if we add to that the contract authority carried in the bill—and to me contract authority is just the same as cash on the barrel head—if we add to that $2,183,336,000, and then if we add to that the $10,500,000,000 the military is asking for—and I sat in the Appropriations Committee and know that every Senator wants to back up the military—and if we add to that the $1,200,000,000 that has already been given to MAP, and then if we add to that the $4,000,000,000 more which is being asked, we will have a figure of $50,553,308,000. That does not take into consideration the supplemental appropriation bills and the deficiency bills which will still come before the Senate of the United States.

Think of it, Mr. President—$50,553,308,000! Yet when there comes before us a proposal to adopt a little bit of an amendment which would now reduce these appropriations, as I figure the proposal, by only $552,000,000—just think of it; that is the result of the economy drive which was started way back last January to balance the budget—Senators oppose making such a small reduction.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. If I have time to do so.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator said that additions of $10,500,000,000 and $4,000,000,000 have been made, making $14,500,000,000 of additional requests for appropriations. However, there are additional costs in all of $16,649,000,000.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts. I totaled the figures rather hurriedly.

So, Mr. President, what the Senator from Massachusetts has just said means we must add practically another billion dollars to the total amount about to which I have referred.

Senators can talk all night about these matters, if they will; and of course, every Senator has a good reason to urge opposition to making a reduction in one item or another. However, the committee worked hours and hours to get a formula by which appropriations could be cut straight across the board, and by which that cut could be made with the least detrimental impact.

To Senators who wish to vote for economy in the right way, I say here is the formula, although all it will save, out of $51,000,000,000 of appropriations, is the paltry sum of $552,000,000.

Mr. President, I am going to support that amendment. I shall continue to support a proposal for a 10-percent reduction of appropriations; and if that amendment is not carried, I shall vote for any other amendment providing for reductions in appropriations, as I have done in the past. I certainly think that in the last move we make on this subject, we should deduct at least $552,000,000 from a grand total of nearly $51,000,000,000 of appropriations which now confront the people of the United States.

It is said that we are now engaged in only a police action. If that is so, Mr. President, what will our situation be when we have a real four-alarm war? Certainly we must tighten our belts. Much as I respect the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] I hope his substitute amendment will not prevail, and that at least the 10-percent reduction will be made.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] to the so-called Byrd-Bridges amendment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I think the Appropriations Committee did a very good piece of work. Although we might like to make further reductions in the appropriations, I, for one, say to the Senator from Nebraska that I am not willing to agree to make reductions in the appropriations for a single American—not a penny's worth of reduction—so long as we do not make reductions in the appropriations for the foreign programs. I did not want to make any reductions in the appropriations for the programs abroad; but neither do I wish to agree to make reductions in the appropriations for a single American at this time. That may be considered treason, but I am still for the Stars and Stripes, rather than the UN.

We might as well face the stern realities, Mr. President. In other words, why should we give money to Europe and to Asia, and then say that the people of the United States, who are paying the bill, must be penalized and must have cuts made in the appropriations for the programs in the United States of America itself, programs which our people need?

So, Mr. President, I hope the substitute amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming will be rejected at this particular time.

Senators who take a different view may think they are correct; Senators may be convinced by reports in the newspapers and on the radio to the effect that it is better to do something for the foreign programs. However, Mr. President, such a view is a mistaken one, for in the final analysis the burden must be borne by the people of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the substitute amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming to the so-called Byrd-Bridges amendment.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I have addressed the Chair perhaps 12 times, but I seem to have difficulty in obtaining recognition even when no other Senator is addressing the Chair.

Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Wyoming as a so-called substitute for the Byrd-Bridges amendment. I may later discuss the Byrd-Bridges amendment itself, for which the O'Mahoney amendment is offered as a substitute, and thereby takes 10 minutes in presenting my views. However, I hope I can state my views in 5 minutes.

The amendment which has been submitted by the Senator from Wyoming as a substitute for the Byrd-Bridges amendment will confer on the Appropriations Committee no authority which that committee does not now possess. The substitute would be utterly idle and futile, were it not for the fact that it directs a reexamination; to that extent, there may be something to be said for the so-called O'Mahoney substitute.

However, Mr. President, what the Appropriations Committee now would be directed to do by the substitute amendment, the committee has just finished doing. There are no changes in the situation so far as the items in this bill are concerned.

Senators say a war has intervened and that we should reexamine, to see whether these items or all of them or the whole of each of them are essential to the war. Mr. President, if there is in this bill a provision for a dollar that is essential to the economy of the United States, to that extent it can be said to be essential to the war effort, to the national security. So, in that respect, we are simply playing with words.

Ninety-five percent of the items in this bill, other than those in the chapter devoted to the national defense, are items which have been recurring over and over and over again, through all the years; and there is not a member of the Appropriations Committee who is not entirely familiar with all of them.

The committee did the best it could. I have previously stated on this floor that I think this is the best bill which has ever come from the Appropriations Committee since I have known it. I repeat that statement.

However, Mr. President, in the time given to this matter by the Appropriations Committee, and available to the committee for that purpose, and in view of the limited staff which can be made available to the Appropriations Committee, the kind of job the people of the United States have a right to have done on this subject cannot be done, and it will not be done if the substitute amendment is adopted and if the committee is directed to re-do the same thing by the 31st of August. Such a direction would be a direction to do a vain thing, and it would be wasting our time.

Let us go directly to the point, Mr. President. Either we want economy or we do not want it. If we do want economy, here is a method of getting it—namely, the Byrd-Bridges amendment.

I say that in my opinion the mechanics of this bill cannot be improved upon. The mechanics incorporated in this bill represent the best thinking of the Bureau of the Budget and of the General Accounting Office. I do not mean to say that either of those agencies recommends the Byrd-Bridges amendment; of course, I do not know of any executive department or agency which wants any reductions made in its appropriations. But those two agencies did work—and they worked faithfully together, in cooperation with the members of the Appropriations Committee—to evolve a practicable working arrangement.

Of course, we shall hear criticism of the Byrd-Bridges amendment to the effect that if it is adopted discretion must be vested in the President and in the executive agencies to make the necessary transfers, and so forth, and so on. However, the same Senators who will voice that criticism with reference to the Byrd-Bridges amendment will be heard within the next few days on this floor asking the Congress to give to the President unlimited dictatorial authority in every other field under the sun.

Mr. President, let us once in a while try to be logical.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the so-called O'Mahoney substitute to the Byrd-Bridges amendment.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I merely wish to endorse what my distinguished colleague the Senator from Oregon has said. He and I and some of the other members of the Appropriations Committee worked on this bill for months. In the committee we voted for the cuts which have thus far been made by the Senate, and in the committee we also voted for some cuts which the Senate has not seen fit to make. Certainly it would be an absolute futility to send the bill back to the Appropriations Committee. We now have reached the point where the Senate must vote on the question of whether it wishes to impose, according to a formula which we have been assured is workable, an additional 10-percent cut on nondefense items.

Personally, much as I regret to disagree with some of the members of the Appropriations Committee, I hope the substitute will not be approved, and I hope the Byrd-Bridges amendment will be approved.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the so-called O'Mahoney substitute for the Byrd-Bridges amendment. [Putting the question.] The "noes" seem to have it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I request a division.

Mr. WHERRY. If a division is requested, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is unavoidably detained on official business.

I announce further that if present and voting the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 60, as follows:

YEAS—25

Anderson	Kerr	Murray
Fulbright	Kilgore	Myers
Graham	Langer	Neely
Hayden	Lehman	O'Mahoney
Hill	Lucas	Pepper
Humphrey	McCarran	Russell
Hunt	McFarland	Sparkman
Johnson, Tex.	McMahon	
Johnston, S. C.	Maybank	

NAYS—60

Aiken	Frear	Martin
Brewster	George	Millikin
Bricker	Gillette	Morse
Bridges	Green	Mundt
Butler	Gurney	O'Conor
Byrd	Hendrickson	Robertson
Capehart	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Chapman	Hoey	Schoeppel
Chavez	Holland	Smith, Maine
Connally	Ives	Smith, N. J.
Cordon	Johnson, Colo.	Stennis
Darby	Kem	Taft
Donnell	Knowland	Thomas, Utah
Douglas	Leahy	Thye
Dworshak	Lodge	Tydings
Eastland	McCarthy	Watkins
Ecton	McClellan	Wherry
Ellender	McKellar	Wiley
Ferguson	Magnuson	Williams
Flanders	Malone	Young

NOT VOTING—11

Benton	Kefauver	Tobey
Cain	Long	Vandenberg
Downey	Taylor	Withers
Jenner	Thomas, Okla.	

So Mr. O'MAHONEY's amendment to the so-called Byrd-Bridges amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is on agreeing to the Byrd-Bridges amendment, as amended.

Mr. BRIDGES and other Senators requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] is paired on this vote with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay" and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] would each vote "yea."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], who is absent by leave of the Senate, is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea" and the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 55, nays 31, as follows:

YEAS—55

Aiken	George	Martin
Brewster	Gillette	Millikin
Bricker	Gurney	Morse
Bridges	Hendrickson	Mundt
Butler	Hickenlooper	O'Conor
Byrd	Hoey	Robertson
Capehart	Holland	Saltonstall
Chapman	Ives	Schoeppel
Cordon	Johnson, Colo.	Smith, Maine
Darby	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, N. J.
Donnell	Kem	Taft
Douglas	Knowland	Thye
Dworshak	Lodge	Tydings
Eastland	McCarran	Watkins
Ecton	McCarthy	Wherry
Ferguson	McClellan	Wiley
Flanders	McMahon	Williams
Frear	Magnuson	
Fulbright	Malone	

NAYS—31

Anderson	Kerr	Neely
Chavez	Kilgore	O'Mahoney
Connally	Langer	Pepper
Ellender	Leahy	Russell
Graham	Lehman	Sparkman
Green	Lucas	Stennis
Hayden	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Hill	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Humphrey	Maybank	Young
Hunt	Murray	
Johnston, S. C.	Myers	

NOT VOTING—10

Benton	Kefauver	Vandenberg
Cain	Long	Withers
Downey	Taylor	
Jenner	Tobey	

So the so-called Byrd-Bridges amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The amended amendment, as agreed to, is as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken by the committee amendment on pages 476 and 477, beginning in line 21 (sec. 1114), insert the following:

"CHAPTER X-4—GENERAL REDUCTIONS IN APPROPRIATIONS AND CONTRACT AUTHORIZATIONS

"SEC. 1001. Except as hereinafter provided, each appropriation, reappropriation, and contract authorization or reauthorization, made by this act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, to any department or agency in the executive branch of the Government (including funds of Government corporations authorized by this act for administrative expenses), is hereby reduced by 10 percentum.

"SEC. 1002. In order to provide for the most effective use of appropriations and contract authorizations reduced by this chapter, the head of each department and agency in the executive branch of the Government is hereby authorized to make adjustments and transfers between such appropriations, and between such contract authorizations, within his department or agency; but no such appropriation or contract authorization shall be increased under the authority of this section to an amount in excess of that provided in other chapters of this act.

"SEC. 1003. The reductions provided for in this chapter shall not apply to the following:

"(a) Title II of chapter IV; chapter X; so much of title I of chapter X-B as is contained in the paragraphs headed 'Economic Cooperation,' 'International Children's Welfare Work,' and 'Mutual Defense Assistance;' and the amount appropriated to the General Services Administration for carrying out the provisions of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act of July 23, 1946;

"(b) Appropriations in title I of chapter VIII for the Executive Office of the President under the headings 'Compensation of the President,' 'The White House Office,' 'Emergency Fund for the President,' and 'Executive Mansion and Grounds;'

"(c) Appropriations and contract authorizations for the atomic energy program;

"(d) Trust funds;

"(e) Funds of Government corporations excluding those made available in this act (1) for administrative expenses and (2) by appropriation from the general fund of the Treasury;

"(f) Amounts (other than under the Veterans' Administration) for furnishing medical and hospital services and domiciliary care, excluding (1) administrative expenses not directly connected with the operation of a specific hospital, dispensary, or clinic, and (2) expenses for employee health service programs;

"(g) Amounts provided in this act for payment of obligations incurred under prior appropriations or authorizations, and obligated balances of reappropriations;

"(h) Appropriations of, or measured by, receits;

"(i) Amounts appropriated by this act for the operation of law enforcement agencies, including the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Bureau of Customs, Immigration and Naturalization Services, and the Secret Service; or for the payment of compensation and expenses of agents and auditors of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, and such other officers and employees of other agencies whose duties primarily pertain to intelligence operations (including funds transferred pursuant to section 6 (a) of the act of June 20, 1949; 63 Stat. 211) or to the investigation, apprehension, prosecution, or detention of persons suspected or convicted of offenses against the criminal laws of the United States;

"(j) Amounts provided for any program of the Veterans' Administration, excluding (1) administrative expenses not directly connected with the operation of a specific hospital, dispensary, clinic, or facility, and (2) expenses for employee health service programs;

"(k) Amounts provided for payments to States or political subdivisions thereof;

"(l) Amounts provided to make payment of or contributions toward pensions, retirement and disability annuities and benefits, employees' death or injury benefits, or other items of a similar nature; and

"(m) Appropriations for refunds, awards, and indemnities."

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will say to the Senator from Delaware that there is another committee amendment to be acted on first. Then the Senator's amendment will be in order.

The next section of the bill is section 1114. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 477, after line 22, to insert:

SEC. 1114. During the current fiscal year, no part of any money appropriated in this or any other act shall be used during any quarter of such fiscal year to purchase typewriting machines (except bookkeeping and billing machines) at a price which exceeds 90 percent of the lowest net cash price, plus applicable Federal excise taxes, accorded the most-favored customer (other than the Government, the American National Red Cross, and the purchasers of typewriting machines for educational purposes only) of the manufacturer of such machines during the 6-month period immediately preceding such quarter.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 478, after line 7, to insert:

SEC. 1115. No payment shall be made from appropriations in this act to any officer on the retired lists of the Regular Army, Regular Navy, Regular Marine Corps, Regular Air Force, Regular Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service for a period of 2 years after retirement who for himself or for others is engaged in the selling of or contracting for the sale of or negotiating for the sale of to any agency of the Department of Defense, the Coast Guard, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Public Health Service any supplies or war materials.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We now return to chapter X-A, on page 444 of the bill. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 444, to strike out:

CHAPTER X-A—GENERAL REDUCTIONS IN APPROPRIATIONS AND CONTRACT AUTHORIZATIONS

Reductions in appropriations and contract authorizations contained in this act are hereby made in the sum of $600,000,000.

Not more than the following sums may be obligated by any agency or department provided for in this act, viz:

(1) For civilian personnel, not more than an amount 10 percent below the amount proposed in the President's budget estimates for fiscal year 1951, except that in the Department of Defense where no more than the amount of the President's budget estimate minus 2 percent shall be obligated. This paragraph shall not apply to nurses, doctors, or other medical personnel, including orderlies, in the Public Health Service and the Veterans' Administration.

(2) For travel, not more than a total for all departments and agencies of $319,000,000, and not more than 5 percent less than the estimates provided for military personnel travel and not more than 20 percent less than the amount provided for civilian personnel travel, then the estimates therefor contained in the President's budget message for the fiscal year 1951.

(3) For transportation of things, for all departments and agencies, not more than

$720,000,000: *Provided further,* That in no case shall the amount obligated exceed a figure 10 percent below the estimate submitted by the President in his budget message for 1951 for each item for all agencies except the Department of Defense, and for the Department of Defense not more than 5 percent less than the estimates of the President, transmitted in said budget message.

(4) For communications services, not more than $59,000,000, and not more for any department other than the Department of Defense than the amount of the President's budget estimates for 1951 minus 10 percent, and for the Department of Defense not more than a figure 5 percent below the President's budget estimates for 1951.

(5) For rents and utilities, not more than $205,000,000, and for all establishments other than the Department of Defense not more than the President's budget estimates for fiscal year 1951 minus 10 percent.

(6) For printing and reproduction, not more than $52,000,000, and not more in any case than the President's budget estimates for 1951 minus 10 percent.

(7) For other contractal services, not more than $1,301,000,000, and for all departments other than the Department of Defense not more than the President's budget estimates for 1951 minus 10 percent.

(8) For supplies and materials, not more than $3,888,000,000, and for all departments of the Government except the Department of Defense and the Veterans' hospitals not more than the President's budget estimates for 1951 minus 10 percent.

(9) For equipment, not more than $3,577,000,000, and for all departments other than the Department of Defense, not more than the President's budget estimates for 1951 minus 10 percent.

(10) For lands and structures, for all departments of the Government, except the Department of Defense not more than the President's budget estimates for 1951 minus 5 percent.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask that the clerk state the amendment which I sent forward to the desk on behalf of the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 478, between lines 18 and 19, it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. . No funds or contract authorizations made available by this act shall be used for the construction of any structure, work, or other project unless (1) such construction is certified by the Secretary of Defense to be essential to national security, or (2) the construction of such structure work, or other project has been commenced prior to the enactment of this act, and substantial detriment to the interests of the United States will result if the proposed further construction is not carried out.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, this amendment will place into effect the same rule which applied to Government projects during World War II, only that in this instance, as we pass the appropriation bill we in Congress will be assuming our own responsibility. The President of the United States during the past 2 weeks has called for a survey by the different departments of the Government of all projects which, in their opinion, could be suspended.

The President's recommendation can apply only to those projects for which appropriations have been made. This amendment applies to the projects which are referred to in the appropriation bill which is now before us and holds up those projects until such time as they are certified to be essential to our national defense. In cases where a project has been started, and if the suspension of work would result in an unnecessary loss, it is exempt.

I urge that the Senate accept the amendment. I do not know what the amount of savings will be, as I have no way of knowing how many of the projects will be determined to be nonessential, however we do know that it will reduce expenditures by several hundred millions of dollars.

With a critical shortage of many strategic materials developing in this country it is essential that all public works programs be suspended unless their construction is needed as part of our defense program.

A vote on this amendment is the equivalent of a vote on the percentage of tax increase that will be needed later to pay for these programs. I urge that Congress accept its own responsibility and not pass the decision onto the President.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the amendment proposes legislation in an appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I have filed with the clerk a motion to suspend the rule of the Senate, and I ask for a vote on the motion to suspend the rule in order that the Senate may vote on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has filed such a notice. A two-thirds affirmative vote is required to suspend the rule. The question is on the motion to suspend the rule.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is unavoidably detained on official business, and if present would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is detained on official business.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 34, nays 49, as follows:

YEAS—34

Brewster	Hendrickson	Robertson
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Bridges	Ives	Schoeppel
Butler	Kem	Smith, N. J.
Byrd	Knowland	Stennis
Capehart	Langer	Thye
Donnell	Lehman	Tydings
Douglas	Lodge	Wherry
Eastland	McCarthy	Wiley
Ecton	McMahon	Williams
Ferguson	Martin	
Frear	O'Conor	

NAYS—49

Aiken	Hill	Morse
Anderson	Hoey	Mundt
Chapman	Holland	Murray
Chavez	Humphrey	Myers
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Neely
Cordon	Johnson, Tex.	O'Mahoney
Darby	Johnston, S. C.	Pepper
Dworshak	Kerr	Russell
Ellender	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Flanders	Leahy	Sparkman
Fulbright	Lucas	Taft
George	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Gillette	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Graham	McFarland	Watkins
Green	McKellar	Young
Gurney	Magnuson	
Hayden	Millikin	

NOT VOTING—13

Benton	Kefauver	Tobey
Cain	Long	Vandenberg
Downey	Malone	Withers
Hunt	Maybank	
Jenner	Taylor	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fewer than two-thirds of the Members of the Senate having voted in the affirmative, the motion of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] is rejected.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, a clerical error was made in the bill through inadvertence. Two words were left in the agricultural section of the bill which should not have been there, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that on page 171, line 14, the two words "farm structures" be stricken out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Georgia.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I have some amendments to offer which I think will take but a few minutes to consider. The Department of the Army has sent two or three amendments, and I will ask to have them reported. I do not think there will be any opposition to them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendments.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 472, line 16, following the word "involving", it is proposed to insert "the national security"; on page 473, line 13, following the word "operations" and before the word "receipts", to insert "any appropriation as to which the President determines such an exemption to be necessary in emergencies affecting the national security"; on page 473, line 20, following "confidential nature", to insert "or, in an emergency, any item determined by him to be necessary for the national security"; on page 473, line 24, to insert "(6) any item determined by the Presi-

dent, in an emergency, to be necessary for the national security."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to any of these amendments?

Mr. BRIDGES. I certainly do object.

Mr. McKELLAR. I submitted the amendments to the Senator from New Hampshire, and I believe he had a substitute for them.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator is correct.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have been so busy that I have not been able to take the matter up with the Department. I am perfectly willing to accept the substitute the Senator has drawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will send forward the substitute.

Mr. BRIDGES. I send the substitute to the desk.

Mr. McKELLAR. It will give us an opportunity to take the matter up in conference, and we will work it out there.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from New Hampshire.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 443, after line 12, it is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 630. Appropriations and contract authority contained in this chapter shall not be subject to the provisions of subsections (c) to (i) inclusive of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by section 1111 of this act during the existence of an emergency affecting the national security.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, is this the amendment about which the Senator from Massachusetts spoke to me?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 443, between lines 12 and 13, it is proposed to insert:

SEC. 630. No part of the appropriations made in title IV of this chapter shall be available for contracts with any person, firm, or corporation to make or cause to be made with a stop watch or other time-measuring device a time study of any job of any employee within the Navy; nor shall any part of the appropriations made in title IV of this chapter be available to pay any premiums or bonus or cash reward to any employee in addition to his regular wages, except for suggestions resulting in improvements or economy in the operation of any Government plant; and no moneys appropriated in title IV of this chapter for the Naval Establishment or made available therefor shall be used or expended under contracts hereafter made for the repair, purchase, or acquirement, by or from any private contractor, of any naval vessel, machinery, article, or articles that at the time of the proposed repair, purchase, or acquirement can be repaired, manufactured, or produced in each or any of the Government naval shipyards or arsenals of the United States, when time and facilities permit, and when in the judgment of the Secretary of the Navy, such repair, purchase, acquirement, or production would not involve an appreciable increase in cost to the Government, except when the repair, purchase, or acquirement, by or from any private contractor, would, in the opinion of the Secretary of the Navy, be advantageous to the national defense.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I raise a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont withhold his point of order until I can make a brief statement?

Mr. FLANDERS. I withhold it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. This is an amendment which was a part of the law with regard to the Navy Department from 1915 to 2 years ago. It is in two parts. The first part is the so-called stop-watch amendment, which has applied in all navy yards, as I have stated, from 1915 to 2 years ago. The second part of the amendment would require work to be done in a naval establishment except when, in the opinion of the Secretary, it would be advantageous to the national defense to have it done by a private contractor. That has also been in the law of the land, as a part of appropriation acts, for about 25 years, except for the past 2 years.

I have received permission of the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations to offer the amendment, and to ask that the rule be suspended so that it may be agreed to.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I raise the point of order.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the amendment is subject to a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair withheld a ruling until the Senator from Massachusetts could speak on the amendment.

Mr. FLANDERS. I raise the point of order again.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be read and immediately considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 180, before the period in line 9, it is proposed to insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That nothing contained in this act shall be construed to reduce or to authorize any reduction in this appropriation or in the number of meat inspectors authorized to be paid from this appropriation."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the amendment is probably very trivial to be considered along with a $52,000,000,000 appropriation bill. I think it involves 256 meat inspectors and provides that they shall not be laid off, as a measure of protecting the health of the country.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, was it the intention of the Senator to cut the reduction applicable to the Department of Agriculture, or simply provide that this part of the activities of the Department of Agriculture should not be affected in the adjustment of the cut by the Secretary of Agriculture between various divisions, bureaus, and offices in the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. WHERRY. The latter part of the Senator's statement is what I intended. The Bridges amendment permits the Secretary to transfer employees to different departments. My amendment would permit the retention of these inspectors without a cut, notwithstanding the Bridges amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. And it would not reduce the amount of the reduction accomplished under the Bridges amendment?

Mr. WHERRY. Oh, no.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, there is no question about the importance of meat inspection, but there are other items in the agricultural chapter of the appropriation bill which are just as important. Some Senator remarked to me a few minutes ago that no sooner would this amendment be agreed to than Senators would be marching down the hill with amendments on other items.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I think the Forest Service employees are just as important as meat inspectors, and if this amendment shall be agreed to, it is my purpose to suggest an amendment providing that the Forest Service employees be exempted.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I do not think we should approach this matter in this way. We have provided a 10-percent cut in the Department, and left it up to the Secretary of Agriculture to make the cut. The Secretary of Agriculture knows the relative values of the various offices. If he cuts meat inspectors unduly, we can deal with it in the same deficiency bill in which we deal with other items for which it will be necessary for us to make deficiency appropriations.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. I merely wish to say that I voted to reduce appropriations for the Marshall plan. That is now not included in the reduction which has been made. Other departments were cut, including the Department of Agriculture, which will have to take most of the cut. I voted against that cut. I thoroughly agree with the Senator from Georgia that we should not start exempting sections of the Agricultural Department appropriations. I voted against cutting the appropriations for the agencies of the Government, but voted to cut the appropriations for the foreign activities.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, it would be necessary to offer a number of amendments to other items to exempt them, and if we start on such a practice, Senators will have been able to go on record as voting for a 10-percent cut, and then proceed to vote for amendments which will eliminate any possibility of reducing the appropriation one dollar. After we have just voted for a 10-percent cut, we should not start to make exemptions. If that is kept up and similar action is taken on all items all of us would like to exempt, we will have made a great play of publicity in cutting

appropriations, and then forestalling the cuts by amendments.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. Is it not a fact that under the provisions of the amendment just agreed to the authority rests with the head of the department to make any transfers which may be needed, or advisable, or desirable, to increase the efficiency and protect the essential services of his department?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CORDON. And we do not need any such provision as that now proposed, do we?

Mr. RUSSELL. No.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, now that I have that statement from the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and from the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], and before any Senator proposes to modify the amendment or take exception to it, I should like also to ask the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], if he agrees with the statement made by the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Oregon that the Secretary has power to transfer these funds.

Mr BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well, I withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska withdraws his amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, in the section relating to the price-support operations I think there has been an error in the language. The language tries to exempt price-support operations. I call up the amendment which I have sent to the desk, lettered "A" of July 17, 1950.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 472, line 1, it is proposed to strike out all after the word "States", down to and including the word "programs", in line 3, and in lieu thereof insert the following: "No funds (other than funds for administrative expenses) available for price support, surplus removal, and related operations, with respect to agricultural commodities shall be subject to apportionment pursuant to this section."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the committee attempted to exempt price-support operations from apportionment under the provisions of the bill. The Department has other activities than price-support operations. They have certain activities under section 32. My amendment merely makes it possible for the Department to proceed in an orderly fashion without attempting to apportion the operations between any particular months or any 6 months' period. I have discussed the amendment with the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and I am sure he knows that is true.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I can see no possible objection to the amendment, because the section 32 funds cannot be handled on such a basis as has been proposed. Unless the amendment is adopted, the effectiveness of the section 32 program, as well as the price-support program, would be destroyed.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. We have cut the Marshall plan funds, and we have made other cuts. How much of a cut does the Senator's amendment represent. I realize, of course, that the cut will not apply to section 32 funds, but there may be a reduction in employees.

Mr. ANDERSON. No, Mr. President; the amendment has nothing to do with reduction. The amendment simply means that, if a price-support program is begun on cotton, for example, cotton cannot be supported for 6 months, and then an attempt be made to divide the money on a year's basis, and apply half of it to one period and half to the other.

Mr. RUSSELL. The amendment does not provide for any reduction at all?

Mr. ANDERSON. No.

Mr. RUSSELL. It merely deals with antideficiency provisions of the bill. It has nothing to do with reduction or increase in appropriation.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator from Georgia is entirely correct.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, may we have the amendment explained again by the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; I shall be glad to explain it. Under the language adopted by the committee attempt was made to exempt price-support operations from the provisions of the bill. The Department does other things in addition to carrying on price-support operations. It has certain activities under section 32, which is not really a price-support operation. The language I suggest in my amendment merely makes it possible for the Department to proceed in an orderly fashion, without attempting to apportion the operation between any particular months or any 6 months' period. I am sure there is nothing wrong with the amendment.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does it increase the amount of money available?

Mr. ANDERSON. Not in the slightest.

Mr. RUSSELL. No, not in the slightest.

Mr. BRIDGES. What is the advantage of it, if there is not an increase?

Mr. ANDERSON. If the Department of Agriculture had to apportion its section 32 funds, 6 months in one period and 6 months in another period, it might throw the entire program out of balance. Mr. President, has the amendment been agreed to?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, was the amendment read?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, the amendment has been read. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senator from New Mexico to what I think is adequate language on page 472 of the bill which would make his amendment unnecessary.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Oregon that it is because the language on page 472 is not adequate, that the amendment has been offered.

Mr. CORDON. I am not going to object to the amendment, but I should like to read into the RECORD at this time the provision which appears on page 472, paragraph (d) (2):

> Nothing in this subsection shall be so construed as to interfere with the initiation, operation, and administration of agricultural price-support programs.

I have made some little study of this subject over a period of years. I know that it is not contemplated under the language of the bill itself that there be apportionment in connection with funds which are used in seasonal or emergency operations. The amendment in itself, so far as I can see, can do no harm. Perhaps it might satisfy someone who has a doubt as to the effect of the language of the bill without it. I have no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment on behalf of the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and myself, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 124, line 11, it is proposed to strike out "$400,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "$370,000,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay the expenses of moving empty railroad cars, except where consistent with prevailing commercial practices, and no officer or agency of the United States shall have authority to obligate the Post Office Department, or to cause the Post Office Department to become in any way obligated, for the payment of any such expenses."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I make a point of order against the amendment. The amendment is not in order.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection for a moment while I make a brief statement concerning the amendment?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in the 5 minutes that have been allotted to me, I wish to explain the amendment.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have only 5 minutes, and I should like to make my statement, which is very brief.

The purpose of the amendment is to curtail expenditures for transportation of mails from $400,000,000 to $370,000,000, which would amount to a saving of $30,000,000.

I had the privilege to be the chairman of the Subcommittee of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee which held

81ST CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 7786

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

AUGUST 4, 1950

Ordered to be printed with the amendments of the Senate numbered

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the support of the Government, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, namely:

CHAPTER I—DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

For the general fund of the District of Columbia, (1) ~~$9,800,000~~ *$11,000,000*, and for the water fund, established by law (D. C. Code, title 43, ch. 15), $1,000,000, both amounts to be advanced July 1, 1950.

Act, 1947 (29 U. S. C. 176–180, 182), including printing and binding; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); and rent in the District of Columbia, $50,000.

This title may be cited as the "Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service Appropriation Act, 1951".

This chapter may be cited as the "Labor-Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1951".

CHAPTER VI—DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

TITLE I

RESEARCH AND MARKETING ACT OF 1946

(157) To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of section 9 of title I and title II of the Act of August 14, 1946, as amended (7 U. S. C. 427, 427h, 427j, 1621-1629), as follows:

For payments to States, Territories, and Puerto Rico for agricultural experiment stations pursuant to section 9 of the Bankhead-Jones Act approved June 29, 1935, as amended by the Act of August 14, 1946, $5,000,000;

For the improvement and development, independently or through cooperation among Federal and State agencies, and others, of a sound and efficient system for the distribution and marketing of agricultural products pursuant to the "Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946" (title II of the Act of August 14, 1946, as amended), including the objects for which funds are available for titles II and III of such Act of August

~~14, 1946, $6,000,000: *Provided,* That not less than $650,000 of this amount shall be available for contracts in accordance with the provisions of section 205 of said Act: *Provided further,* That the Secretary may make available to any bureau, office, or agency of the Department such amounts from this appropriation as may be necessary to carry out the functions for which it is made (but amounts made available to the Office of the Secretary, Office of the Solicitor, and Office of Information, shall not exceed those which the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives of the Department, shall determine), and any such amounts shall be in addition to amounts transferred or otherwise made available to other appropriation items of the Department: *Provided further,* That no part of this appropriation shall be available for work relating to fish or shellfish or any product thereof, except for the support of equitable transportation rates before Federal agencies concerned with such rates and for development of foreign markets.~~

~~In all, $11,000,000: *Provided,* That no part of this appropriation shall be used for beginning construction of any building costing in excess of $15,000, except that a poultry breeding house may be constructed at Purdue University at a cost to this appropriation of not to exceed $29,000.~~

To enable the Secretary to improve and develop, inde-

pendently or through cooperation among Federal and State agencies, and others, a sound and efficient system for the distribution and marketing of agricultural products under the provisions of title II of the Act of August 14, 1946, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1621–1629), including the objects for which funds are available for titles II and III of such Act of August 14, 1946, $6,000,000: Provided, That not less than $650,000 of this amount shall be available for contracts in accordance with the provisions of section 205 of said Act: Provided further, That the Secretary may make available to any bureau, office, or agency of the Department such amounts from this appropriation as may be necessary to carry out the functions for which it is made (but amounts made available to the Office of the Secretary, Office of the Solicitor, and Office of Information, shall not exceed those which the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives of the Department, shall determine), and any such amounts shall be in addition to amounts transferred or otherwise made available to other appropriation items of the Department: Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for work relating to fish or shellfish or any product thereof, except for the support of equitable transportation rates before Federal agencies concerned with such rates and for development of foreign markets.

BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

For necessary expenses in carrying out the provisions of the Act establishing the Bureau of Agricultural Economics (5 U. S. C. 673) and related Acts, as follows:

Economic investigations: For conducting investigations and for acquiring and diffusing useful information among the people of the United States, relative to agricultural production, distribution, land utilization, and conservation in their broadest aspects, including farm management and practice, utilization of farm and food products, purchasing of farm supplies, farm population and rural life, farm labor, farm finance, insurance and taxation, adjustments in production to probable demand for the different farm and food products; land ownership and values, (158) ~~farm structures,~~ costs, prices and income in their relation to agriculture, including causes for their variations and trends, (159) ~~$2,600,000~~ *$2,720,000*: *Provided*, That no part of the funds herein appropriated or made available to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics under the heading "Economic investigations" shall be used for State and county land-use planning, for conducting cultural surveys, or for the maintenance of regional offices.

Crop and livestock estimates: For collecting, compiling, abstracting, analyzing, summarizing, interpreting, and publishing data relating to agriculture, including crop and livestock estimates, acreage, yield, grades, staples of cotton,

stocks, and value of farm crops and numbers, grades, and value of livestock and livestock products on farms, production, distribution, and consumption of turpentine and rosin pursuant to the Act of August 15, 1935 (5 U. S. C. 556b), and for the collection and publication of statistics of peanuts as provided by the Act approved June 24, 1936, as amended May 12, 1938 (7 U. S. C. 951–957, (160)~~and data on farm construction as provided by title V of the Housing Act of 1949 (Public Law 171),~~ (161)~~$2,725,000~~ *$2,904,000*: *Provided*, That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be available for any expense incident to ascertaining, collating, or publishing a report stating the intention of farmers as to the acreage to be planted in cotton, or for estimates of apple production for other than the commercial crop.

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR

For necessary expenses of the Office of Administrator, including the purchase of one passenger motor vehicle, travel and subsistence expenses of (162)~~Advisory Committee~~ *advisory committees* authorized by title III of the Act of August 14, 1946 (7 U. S. C. 1628–1629), and the maintenance, operation, and furnishing of facilities and services at the Agricultural Research Center, $600,000: *Provided*, That the appropriation current at the time services are rendered may be reimbursed (by advance credits or reimbursements

based on estimated or actual charges) from applicable appropriations, to cover the charges, including handling and other related services, for equipment rentals (including depreciation, maintenance, and repairs); for services, supplies, equipment, and material furnished: *Provided further*, That of the several appropriations of the Agricultural Research Administration, not to exceed $15,000 shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706 (a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as amended by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a): *Provided further*, That the several appropriations of the Agricultural Research Administration shall be available for the construction, alteration, and repair of buildings and improvements: *Provided, however*, That unless otherwise provided, the cost of constructing any one building (excepting headhouses connecting greenhouses) shall not exceed $5,000, the total amount for construction of buildings costing more than $2,500 each shall be within the limits of the estimates submitted and approved therefor, and the cost of altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed $2,500 or 2 per centum of the cost of the building as certified by the Research Administrator, whichever is greater.

~~(163) WORKING CAPITAL FUND, AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH CENTER~~

~~For the establishment of a working capital fund, to be available without fiscal year limitation, for expenses necessary for furnishing facilities and services by the Agricultural Research Center to Government agencies, $300,000. Said fund shall be reimbursed from applicable appropriations or other funds to cover the charges for such facilities and services, including handling and related charges; for equipment rentals (including depreciation, maintenance, and repairs), for supplies, equipment and materials, stores of which may be maintained at the Center, and for building construction, alterations, and repair, and applicable appropriations or other funds may also be charged their proportionate share of the necessary general expenses of the Center not covered by the annual appropriation.~~

RESEARCH ON STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL AGRICULTURAL MATERIALS

For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to carry out his responsibilities under section 7 (b) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act of July 23, 1946 (50 U. S. C. 98f), $399,000, including not to exceed $30,000 for alterations at the Eastern Regional Research

Laboratory, Wyndmoor, Pennsylvania, to provide pilot plant facilities for tannin extraction, and such amount shall be in addition to amounts otherwise available for alterations.

RESEARCH ON AGRICULTURAL PROBLEMS OF ALASKA

For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to conduct research into the basic agricultural needs and problems of the Territory of Alaska, through such agencies of the Department as he may designate, independently or in cooperation with appropriate agencies of the Territory of Alaska, (164)~~$260,000~~ *$280,000*.

OFFICE OF EXPERIMENT STATIONS

Payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico

For payments to the States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico to be paid quarterly in advance (165)*where applicable*, to carry into effect the provisions of the following Acts relating to agricultural experiment stations:

Hatch, Adams, Purnell, Bankhead-Jones, and related Acts: Hatch Act, the Act approved March 2, 1887 (7 U. S. C. 362, 363, 365, 368, 377–379), $720,000; Adams Act, the Act approved March 16, 1906 (7 U. S. C. 369), $720,000; Purnell Act, the Act approved February 24, 1925 (7 U. S. C. 361, 366, 370, 371, 373–376, 380, 382), $2,880,000; Bankhead-Jones Act, title I of the Act approved June 29, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 427–427g), (166)~~$2,863,708~~ *Sections 3 and 5, $2,863,708, and sections 9 and 11*

of said Act as added by the Act of August 14, 1946 (7 U. S. C. 427h, 427j), including administration by the Office of Experiment Stations in the United States Department of Agriculture, $5,000,000, no part of which latter amount shall be used for beginning construction of any building costing in excess of $15,000, except that a poultry breeding house may be constructed at Purdue University at a cost to this appropriation of not to exceed $29,000; Hawaii, the Act approved May 16, 1928 (7 U. S. C. 386–386b), extending the benefits of certain Acts of Congress to the Territory of Hawaii, $90,000; Alaska, the Act approved February 23, 1929 (7 U. S. C. 386c), extending the benefits of the Hatch Act to the Territory of Alaska, $15,000, and the provisions of section 2 of the Act approved June 20, 1936 (7 U. S. C. 369a), extending the benefits of the Adams and Purnell Acts to the Territory of Alaska, (167)~~$27,500~~ *$37,500*; Puerto Rico, the Act approved March 4, 1931, as amended (7 U. S. C. 386d–386f), extending the benefits of certain Acts of Congress to Puerto Rico, $90,000; in all, payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico, (168)~~$7,406,208~~ *$12,416,208*.

Salaries and Expenses

For necessary expenses in connection with administration of grants and coordination of research with States, to carry out the provisions of the Acts approved March 2,

1887, March 16, 1906, February 24, 1925, May 16, 1928, February 23, 1929, March 4, 1931, and June 20, 1936, and Acts amendatory thereto (7 U. S. C. 361–363, 365–383, 386–386f), and title I of the Act approved June 29, 1935, as amended by the Act of (169)~~December~~ *September* 21, 1944 (7 U. S. C. 427–427g), relative to their administration and for the administration of an agricultural experiment station in Puerto Rico, (170)~~$237,500~~ *$252,500*; and the Secretary shall prescribe the form of the annual financial statement required under the above Acts, ascertain whether the expenditures are in accordance with their provisions, coordinate the research work of the State agricultural colleges and experiment stations in the lines authorized in said Acts with research of the Department in similar lines, and make report thereon to Congress.

Federal Experiment Station, Puerto Rico

For expenses necessary to establish and maintain an agricultural experiment station in Puerto Rico, including the preparation, illustration, and distribution of reports and bulletins, and not to exceed $24,950 to replace water supply line and increase capacity of reservoir, $175,000.

BUREAU OF HUMAN NUTRITION AND HOME ECONOMICS

For necessary expenses in connection with conducting investigations of the relative utility and economy of agricul-

tural products for food, clothing, and other uses in the home, with special suggestions of plans and methods for the more effective utilization of such products for these purposes, and such economic investigations, including housing and household buying, as have for their purpose the improvement of the rural home, for coordinating nutrition services made available by Federal, State, and other agencies, and for disseminating useful information on these subjects, (171)~~$1,500,000~~ *$1,763,200.*

BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY

Salaries and Expenses

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Act, as amended, establishing a Bureau of Animal Industry, and related Acts, and for investigations concerned with the livestock and meat industries and the domestic raising of fur-bearing animals, as follows:

Animal husbandry: For investigations and experiments in animal husbandry and animal and poultry feeding and breeding, and for carrying out the purposes of section 101 (b) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U. S. C. 429) authorizing cooperation with State authorities in the administration of regulations for the improvement of poultry, poultry products, and hatcheries, (172)~~$2,250,000~~ *$2,319,000.*

Diseases of animals: For scientific investigations of diseases of animals, and for investigations of tuberculin,

serums, antitoxins, and analogous products, (173)~~$1,300,000~~ *$1,350,000*, including not to exceed $8,000 for the purchase of land and appurtenances near Ames, Iowa, for continuation of a hog cholera experiment station.

Animal disease control and eradication: For the control and eradication, including inspections and quarantines, of tuberculosis and paratuberculosis of animals, avian tuberculosis, Bang's disease of cattle, scabies in sheep and cattle, southern cattle ticks, hog cholera and related swine diseases, and dourine in horses, and inspection and quarantine work; for supervision of the transportation of livestock, including administration of the twenty-eight-hour law; for inspection of vessels; and for carrying out the provisions of the Act of March 4, 1913 (21 U. S. C. 151–158), relating to veterinary biological products, (174)~~$7,950,000~~ *$7,952,500* (175)~~, including not to exceed $30,000 for the acquisition of land and construction of four buildings for inspection of livestock at Canadian border ports of entry~~: *Provided*, That no payment hereunder as compensation for any cattle condemned for slaughter for tuberculosis, paratuberculosis, or Bang's disease shall exceed (1) $25 for any grade animal or $50 for any purebred animal, (2) one-third of the difference between the appraised value and the value of salvage thereof, or (3) the amount paid or to be paid by the State or other cooperating agency, and no payment hereunder shall be made for any animal if

at the time of test or condemnation it shall belong to or be upon the premises of any person, firm, or corporation to which it has been sold, shipped, or delivered for slaughter: *Provided further,* That inspection service shall be maintained at all stockyards having such service during the current fiscal year.

Meat inspection: For carrying out the provisions of laws relating to Federal inspection of meat and meat-food products, $12,800,000.

Marketing Agreements, Hog Cholera Virus and Serum

The sum of $49,300 of the appropriation made by section 12 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, approved May 12, 1933 (7 U. S. C. 612), is hereby made available during the fiscal year for which appropriations are herein made to carry into effect sections 56 to 60, inclusive, of the Act approved August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 851–855).

Eradication of Foot-and-Mouth and Other Contagious Diseases of Animals

For expenses necessary in the arrest and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, rinderpest, contagious pleuropneumonia, or other contagious or infectious diseases of animals, or European fowl pest and similar diseases in poultry, including the payment of claims growing out of past and future purchases and destruction of animals (including poultry) affected by or exposed to, or of materials contami-

nated by or exposed to, any such disease, wherever found and irrespective of ownership, under like or substantially similar circumstances, when such owner has complied with all lawful quarantine regulations; and for foot-and-mouth disease and rinderpest programs undertaken pursuant to the provisions of the Act of February 28, 1947 (21 U. S. C. Supp. II, 114b–114d), and the Act of May 29, 1884, as amended (7 U. S. C., 391; 21 U. S. C., 111–122), including expenses in accordance with section 2 of said Act of February 28, 1947, the Secretary may transfer from other appropriations or funds available to the bureaus, corporations, or agencies of the Department such sums as he may deem necessary, to be available only in an emergency which threatens the livestock or poultry industry of the country, and any unexpended balances of funds transferred under this head in the next preceding fiscal year shall be merged with such transferred amounts: *Provided*, That, except for payments made pursuant to said Act of February 28, 1947, the payment for such animals hereafter purchased may be made on appraisement based on the meat, egg-production, dairy, or breeding value, but in case of appraisement based on breeding value no appraisement of any such animal shall exceed three times its meat, egg-production, or dairy value, and, except in case of an extraordinary emergency, to be determined by the Secretary, the payment by the United

States Government for any such animals shall not exceed one-half of any such appraisements: *Provided further*, That poultry may be appraised in groups when the basis for appraisal is the same for each bird.

BUREAU OF DAIRY INDUSTRY

For necessary expenses in carrying out the provisions of the Act of May 29, 1924 (7 U. S. C. 401–404), including investigations, experiments, and demonstrations in dairy industry, for carrying out the applicable provisions of the Act of May 9, 1902 (26 U. S. C. 2325, 2326 (c)), relating to process or renovated butter, as amended, and the Act of May 23, 1908 (21 U. S. C. 94 (a)), insofar as it relates to the exportation of process or renovated butter, (176) *not to exceed $100,000 for construction of ten or more housing units for employees*, (177) ~~$1,600,000~~ *$1,735,000*.

BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL AND INDUSTRIAL CHEMISTRY

For expenses necessary for investigations, experiments, and demonstrations established under the provisions of section 202 (a) to 202 (e), inclusive, of title II of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U. S. C. 1292); for the development of new and extended food, feed, and industrial uses for agricultural commodities, both plant and animal, and potential replacement crops, and processing, biological, chemical, physical, pharmacological, toxicological, and technological investigation thereof, (178) ~~$7,750,000~~

$8,500,000: *Provided,* That not to exceed $20,000 shall be available for the alteration to buildings of the Naval Stores Station at Olustee, Florida.

BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY, SOILS, AND AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING

For expenses necessary for investigations, experiments, and demonstrations in connection with the production and improvement of farm crops and other plants and plant industries; soils and soil-plant relationships, and the application of engineering principles to agriculture; plant diseases, including nematodes, and methods for their prevention and control; plant and plant-disease collections, and surveys; the distribution of weeds and means for their control; methods of handling, processing, transportation, and storage of agricultural products; and plants in foreign countries and our possessions for introduction into the United States, including explorations and surveys, and propagation and testing in this country; and for the operation and maintenance of airplanes, as follows:

Field crops: For investigations on the production, improvement, and diseases of alfalfa, barley, clover, corn, cotton, flax, grasses, oats, rice, rubber crops, sorghums, soybeans, sugar beets, sugarcane, tobacco, wheat, and other field crops, (179) ~~$3,400,000~~ *$3,475,000.*

Fruit, vegetable, and specialty crops: For investiga-

tions on the production, improvement, and diseases of fruit, vegetable, nut, ornamental, and related crops and plants, (180)~~$2,950,000~~ *$3,075,000*.

Forest diseases: For investigations of diseases of forest and shade trees and forest products, and methods for their control, (181)~~$450,000~~ *$455,000*.

Soils, fertilizers, and irrigation: For investigations of soil management methods to increase and maintain productivity, including fertilization, liming, crop rotations, tillage practices, and other means of improving soils; fertilizers, fertilizer ingredients, and their improvement for agricultural use; soil management and crop production on dry and irrigated lands, and the quality of irrigation water and its use by crops; and for the classification of soils in a national system and indication of their extent and distribution on maps, and determination of their potential productivity under adapted cropping and improved soil management, (182)~~$2,680,000~~ *$2,767,500*, including not to exceed $100,000 for construction or acquisition of buildings, facilities, and equipment for the station at Brawley, California.

Agricultural engineering: For investigations involving the application of engineering principles to agriculture, including farm power and equipment, rural water supply and sanitation, and rural electrification; farm buildings and

their appurtenances and buildings for processing and storing farm products, and the preparation and distribution of building plans and specifications; cotton ginning, and other engineering problems relating to the production, processing, transportation, and storage of agricultural products; (183) ~~$1,120,000~~ *$1,140,000.*

National Arboretum: For the maintenance and development of the National Arboretum established under the provisions of the Act approved March 4, 1927 (20 U. S. C. 191–194), $152,700.

BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY AND PLANT QUARANTINE

Salaries and Expenses

For expenses necessary for investigations, experiments, demonstrations, and surveys for the promotion of economic entomology, for investigating and ascertaining the best means of destroying insects and related pests injurious to agriculture, for importing useful and beneficial insects and bacterial, fungal, and other diseases of insects and related pests, for investigating and ascertaining the best means of destroying insects affecting man and animals, and the best ways of utilizing beneficial insects, for carrying into effect the provisions of the Plant Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912, as amended (7 U. S. C. 151–167), the Honey Bee Act (7 U. S. C. 281–283), the Insect Pest Act (7 U. S. C. 141–144), the Mexican Border Act (7 U. S. C. 149),

and the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U. S. C. 147a), as amended, authorizing the eradication, control, and prevention of spread of injurious insects and plant pests; including the operation and maintenance of airplanes and the purchase of not to exceed two, as follows:

Insect investigations: For the investigation of insects affecting fruits, grapes, nuts, trees, shrubs, forests and forest products, truck and garden crops, cereal, forage and range crops, cotton, tobacco, sugar plants, ornamental and other plants and agricultural products, household possessions, and man and animals; for bee culture and apiary management; for classifying, identifying, and collecting information to determine the distribution and abundance of insects; for investigations in connection with introduction of natural enemies of injurious insects and related pests and for the exchange with other countries of useful and beneficial insects and other arthropods; for developing methods, equipment, and apparatus to aid in enforcing plant quarantines and in the eradication and control of insect pests and plant diseases; and for investigations of insecticides and fungicides, including methods of their manufacture and use and the effects of their application, (184)~~$4,100,000~~ *$4,165,000*: *Provided,* That of the amount allotted for oriental fruitfly, not to exceed $250,000 may be used for contracts with public or private agencies for research without regard to provisions of

existing law, and the amounts obligated for contract research shall remain available until expended (185)~~: *Provided further,* That $50,000 shall be transferred to applicable appropriations of the Public Health Service for investigations and studies of effects of insecticidal and fungicidal residue on human health~~.

Insect and plant-disease control: For carrying out operations or measures to eradicate, suppress, control, or to prevent or retard the spread of Japanese beetle, sweetpotato weevil, Mexican fruitflies, phony peach and peach mosaic, cereal rusts, pink bollworm and Thurberia weevil, golden nematode, citrus blackfly, white-fringed beetle, and the Hall scale, including the enforcement of quarantine regulations and cooperation with States to enforce plant quarantines as authorized by the Plant Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912, as amended (7 U. S. C. 151–167), and including the establishment of such cotton-free areas as may be necessary to stamp out any infestation of the pink bollworm as authorized by the Act of February 8, 1930 (46 Stat. 67), and for cooperation with States in the compensation of growers for losses resulting from the destruction of or for not planting potatoes and tomatoes on lands infested or exposed to infestations of the golden nematode for the purpose authorized by the Golden Nematode Act (Public Law 645, approved June 15, 1948), and for the enforcement

of domestic plant quarantines through inspection in transit, including the interception and disposition of materials found to have been transported interstate in violation of Federal plant quarantine laws or regulations, and operations under the Terminal Inspection Act (7 U. S. C. 166), (186)~~$4,185,900~~ *$4,651,000*: *Provided,* That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay the cost or value of trees, farm animals, farm crops, or other property injured or destroyed, except potatoes and tomatoes as authorized under the Golden Nematode Act: *Provided further,* That, in the discretion of the Secretary, no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the control of sweetpotato weevil in any State until such State has provided cooperation necessary to accomplish this purpose, or for barberry eradication until a sum or sums at least equal to such expenditures shall have been appropriated, subscribed, or contributed by States, counties, or local authorities, or by individuals or organizations for the accomplishment of this purpose, or with respect to the golden nematode except as prescribed in section 4 of the Golden Nematode Act.

Foreign plant quarantines: For operations against the introduction of insect pests or plant diseases into the United States, including the enforcement of foreign-plant quarantines and regulations promulgated under sections 5 and 7 of the Plant Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912, as amended

(7 U. S. C. 151–167), the Insect Pest Act of 1905 (7 U. S. C. 141–144), and the Mexican Border Act of 1942 (7 U. S. C. 149), for enforcement of domestic-plant quarantines as they pertain to Territories of the United States and enforcement of regulations governing the movement of plants into and from the District of Columbia promulgated under section 15 of the Plant Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912, as amended, and for inspection and certification of plants and plant products to meet the sanitary requirements of foreign countries, as authorized in section 102 of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U. S. C. 147a), (187)~~$2,325,000~~ *$2,384,400.*

Control of Emergency Outbreaks of Insects and Plant Diseases

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the joint resolution approved May 9, 1938 (7 U. S. C. 148–148e), including the operation and maintenance of airplanes and the purchase of not to exceed two, and surveys and control operations in Canada in cooperation with the Canadian Government or local Canadian authorities, and the employment of Canadian citizens, (188)~~$850,000~~ *$2,350,000* (189), *of which $1,500,000 shall be apportioned for use pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes for the purposes of said joint resolution only to the extent that the*

Secretary, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, finds necessary to meet emergency conditions.

CONTROL OF FOREST PESTS

For expenses necessary for carrying out operations, measures, or surveys necessary to eradicate, suppress, control, or to prevent or retard the spread of insects or diseases which endanger forest trees on any lands in the United States, and for such quarantine measures relating thereto as may be necessary pursuant to the Plant Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912, as amended (7 U. S. C. 151–167), including the purchase (not to exceed three) and operation and maintenance of airplanes, construction and alteration of necessary buildings, not to exceed $23,500 for the purchase of one building at Greenfield, Massachusetts: *Provided*, That the cost of constructing or altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed $2,500, as follows:

Gypsy and brown-tail moths: Gypsy and brown-tail moths, pursuant to section 102 of the Act of September 21, 1944 (7 U. S. C. 147a), (190) ~~$539,500~~ *$590,000*.

Forest Pest Control Act: For carrying out the provisions of the Act approved June 25, 1947 (16 U. S. C., Supp. I, 594–1—594–5), (191) ~~$900,000~~ *$1,900,000* (192), *of which $1,000,000 shall be apportioned for use pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes for the purposes of said Act*

only to the extent that the Secretary, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, finds necessary to meet emergency conditions.

White pine blister rust: White pine blister rust, pursuant to the Act of April 26, 1940 (16 U. S. C. 594a), (193)~~$3,280,000~~ *$3,700,000*, of which amount (194)~~$508,750~~ *$565,350* shall be available to the Department of the Interior for the control of white pine blister rust on or endangering Federal lands under the jurisdiction of that Department or lands of Indian tribes which are under the jurisdiction of or retained under restrictions of the United States: (195)~~$1,727,800~~ *$1,947,150* of said amount to the Forest Service for the control of white pine blister rust on or endangering lands under its jurisdiction; and (196)~~$1,043,450~~ *$1,187,500* of said amount to the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine for leadership and general coordination of the entire program, method development, and for operations conducted under its direction for such control, including, but not confined to, the control of white pine blister rust on or endangering State and privately owned lands.

FOREST SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary including not to exceed $10,000 for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706 (a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as

amended by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); to experiment and make investigations and report on forestry, national forests, forest fires, and lumbering, but no part of this appropriation shall be used for any experiment or test made outside the jurisdiction of the United States; to advise the owners of woodlands as to the proper care of the same; to investigate and test American timber and timber trees and their uses, and methods for the preservative treatment of timber; to seek, through investigations and the planting of native and foreign species, suitable trees for the treeless regions; to erect necessary buildings: *Provided,* That the cost of any building purchased, erected, or as improved, exclusive of the cost (not to exceed $1,000) of constructing a water-supply shall be placed in reserve pending determination by the Sec- such building, and exclusive of the cost of any tower upon which a lookout house may be erected, shall not exceed $15,000, with the exception that any building erected, purchased, or acquired, the cost of which was $15,000 or more, may be improved out of the appropriations made under this chapter for the Forest Service by an amount not to exceed 2 per centum of the cost of such building as certified by the Chief of the Forest Service, and that not to exceed $8,000 may be expended for the installation of an elevator in the Yeon Avenue warehouse in Port-

land, Oregon; to protect, administer, and improve the national forests, including tree planting and other measures to prevent erosion, drift, surface wash, soil waste, and the formation of floods, and to conserve water; to ascertain the natural conditions upon and utilize the national forests, to transport and care for fish and game supplied to stock the national forests or the waters therein; to collate, digest, report, and illustrate the results of experiments and investigations made by the Forest Service, as follows:

General administrative expenses: For general administration, including expenses of the National Forest Reservation Commission as authorized by section 14 of the Act of March 1, 1911 (16 U. S. C. 514), $665,000.

National forest protection and management: For the administration, protection, use, maintenance, improvement, and development of the national forests, including the establishment and maintenance of forest tree nurseries, including the procurement of tree seed and nursery stock by purchase, production, or otherwise, seeding and tree planting and the care of plantations and young growth; the operation and maintenance of aircraft and the purchase of not to exceed three; the maintenance of roads and trails and the construction and maintenance of all other improvements necessary for the proper and economical administration, pro-

tection, development, and use of the national forests, including experimental areas under Forest Service administration, except that where direct purchases will be more economical than construction, improvements may be purchased; the construction (not to exceed $15,000 for any one structure), equipment, and maintenance of sanitary and recreational facilities; timber cultural operations; development and application of fish and game management plans; propagation and transplanting of plants suitable for planting on semiarid portions of the national forests; estimating and appraising of timber and other resources and development and application of plans for their effective management, sale, and use; examination, classification, surveying, and appraisal of land incident to effecting exchanges authorized by law and of lands within the boundaries of the national forests that may be opened to homestead settlement and entry under the Act of June 11, 1906, and the Act of August 10, 1912 (16 U. S. C. 506–509), as provided by the Act of March 4, 1913 (16 U. S. C. 512); investigation and establishment of water rights, including the purchase thereof or of lands or interests in lands or rights-of-way for use and protection of water rights necessary or beneficial in connection with the administration and public use of the national forests; and all expenses necessary for the use, maintenance, improvement, protection, and general administration of the national

forests, (197)~~$26,890,000~~ *$29,320,500*, of which not to exceed $75,000 shall be available for the purchase of three nursery sites, and not to exceed $5,000 shall be available for the purchase of administrative sites.

(198)*Cooperative range improvements: For artificial revegetation, construction, and maintenance of range improvements, control of rodents, and eradication of poisonous and noxious plants on national forest lands, pursuant to section 12 of the Act of April 24, 1950 (Public Law Numbered 478), $750,000, to remain available until expended.*

Fighting forest fires: For fighting and preventing forest fires on or threatening lands under Forest Service administration, including lands under contract for purchase or in process of condemnation for Forest Service purposes, and for liquidation of obligations incurred in the preceding fiscal year for such purpose, $6,000,000, of which $2,500,000 shall be apportioned for use, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, only to the extent that the Secretary, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, finds necessary to meet emergency conditions.

Forest research: For forest research in accordance with the provisions of sections 1, 2, 7, 8, 9, and 10 of the Act approved May 22, 1928, as amended (16 U. S. C. 581, 581a, 581f–581i), including the construction and maintenance of improvements, as follows:

Forest and range management investigations: Fire, silvi-

cultural, watershed, and other forest investigations and experiments under said section 2, as amended, and investigations and experiments to develop improved methods of management of forest and other ranges under section 7, at forest or range experiment stations or elsewhere, (199)~~$2,995,000~~ *$3,030,000* (200), *of which $55,000 shall be available for such investigations and experiments at Bartlett Experimental Forest only.*

Forest products: Experiments, investigations, and tests of forest products under section 8, at the Forest Products Laboratory, or elsewhere, $1,300,000 (201), *of which $30,000 shall be made available for the establishment of a forest utilization service unit in the Southwest.*

Forest resources investigations: A comprehensive forest survey under section 9, and investigations in forest economics under section 10, (202)~~$880,000~~ *$1,000,000.*

FOREST DEVELOPMENT ROADS AND TRAILS

For expenses necessary for carrying out the provisions of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act approved November 9, 1921, as amended (23 U. S. C. 23, 23a), relating to forest development roads and trails, including the construction, reconstruction, and maintenance of roads and trails on experimental areas under Forest Service Administration, (203)~~$10,348,000~~ *$12,000,000,* which sum is authorized to be appropriated by the Act of June 29, 1948 (Public Law 834), to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That this

appropriation shall be available for the rental, purchase, construction, or alteration of buildings necessary for the storage and repair of equipment and supplies used for road and trail construction and maintenance, but the total cost of any such building purchased, altered, or constructed under this authorization shall not exceed $15,000 with the exception that any building erected, purchased, or acquired, the cost of which was $15,000 or more, may be improved within any fiscal year by an amount not to exceed 2 per centum of the cost of such buildings certified by the Chief of the Forest Service.

ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR NATIONAL FORESTS

Weeks Act: For the acquisition of forest lands under the provisions of the Act approved March 1, 1911, as amended (16 U. S. C. 513–519, 521), (204) ~~$100,000~~ *$401,000*, to be available only for payment toward the purchase price of any lands acquired, including the cost of surveys in connection with such acquisition: *Provided,* That no part of such funds shall be used for the purchase of lands in the counties of Adair, Cherokee, and Sequoyah, in the State of Oklahoma, without the specific approval of the Board of County Commissioners of the county in which such lands are situated.

Superior National Forest: For the acquisition of forest land within the Superior National Forest, Minnesota, under the provisions of the Act approved June 22, 1948 (Public Law 733), $150,000, to remain available until expended.

Special Acts: For the acquisition of land to facilitate the control of soil erosion and flood damage originating within the exterior boundaries of the following national forests, in accordance with the provisions of the following Acts authorizing annual appropriations of forest receipts for such purposes, and in not to exceed the following amounts from such receipts: Uinta and Wasatch National Forests, Utah, Act of August 26, 1935 (Public Law 337), as amended, $40,000; Cache National Forest, Utah, Act of May 11, 1938 (Public Law 505), as amended, $10,000; San Bernardino and Cleveland National Forests, Riverside County, California, Act of June 15, 1938 (Public Law 634), as amended, $22,000; Nevada and Toiyabe National Forests, Nevada, Act of June 25, 1938 (Public Law 748), as amended, $10,000; Angeles National Forest, California, Act of June 11, 1940 (Public Law 591), $20,000; Cleveland National Forest, San Diego County, California, Act of June 11, 1940 (Public Law 589), $5,000; Sequoia National Forest, California, Act of June 17, 1940 (Public Law 637), $35,000; in all $142,000.

FOREST-FIRE COOPERATION

For cooperation with the various States or other appropriate agencies in forest-fire prevention and suppression and the protection of timbered and cut-over lands in accordance with the provisions of sections 1, 2, and 3 of the Act ap-

proved June 7, 1924, as amended (16 U. S. C. 564–566), $9,500,000.

FARM AND OTHER PRIVATE FORESTRY COOPERATION

To enable the Secretary through the Forest Service to advise timberland owners and associations, wood-using industries or other appropriate agencies in the application of forest management principles to federally owned lands leased to States and to private forest lands, so as to attain sustained-yield management, the conservation of the timber resources, the productivity of forest lands, and the stabilization of employment and economic continuance of forest industries, and to carry into effect, through such agencies of the Department as he may designate, the provisions of the Cooperative Farm Forestry Act, approved May 18, 1937 (16 U. S. C. 568b), (not to exceed (205)~~$490,382~~ *$785,034*) and the provisions of sections 4 (not to exceed (206)~~$671,392~~ *$449,200*) and 5 (not to exceed (207)~~$138,226~~ *$65,766*) of the Act approved June 7, 1924 (16 U. S. C. 567–568), and Acts supplementary thereto; $1,300,000.

FLOOD CONTROL

For expenses necessary, in accordance with the Flood Control Act, approved June 22, 1936 (Public Law 738), as amended and supplemented, to make preliminary examinations and surveys, and to perform works of improvement, and to plan the agricultural phases of the development of the Columbia Basin area in accordance with the provisions of

laws relating to the activities of the Department, to remain available until expended, (208)~~$10,750,000~~ *$9,880,000*, with which shall be merged the unexpended balances of funds heretofore appropriated or transferred to the Department for flood-control purposes: *Provided*, That no part of such funds shall be used for the purchase of lands in the Yazoo and Little Tallahatchie watersheds without specific approval of the county board of supervisors of the county in which such lands are situated, nor shall any part of such funds be used for the purchase of lands in the counties of Adair, Cherokee, and Sequoyah, in the State of Oklahoma, without the specific approval of the Board of County Commissioners of the county in which such lands are situated (209)*: Provided further, That of the funds available herein, not in excess of $7,880,000 may be expended in watersheds heretofore authorized by section 13 of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944, for necessary gulley control, floodwater detention, and floodway structures in areas other than those over which the Department of the Army has jurisdiction and responsibility.*

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Act approved April 27, 1935 (16 U. S. C. 590a–590f), which provides for a national program of erosion control and soil and water conservation, furnishing of subsistence to employees, operation and maintenance of aircraft, and the

purchase and erection or alteration of permanent buildings: *Provided*, That the cost of any building purchased, erected, or as improved, exclusive of the cost of constructing a water supply or sanitary system and connecting the same with any such building, shall not exceed $2,500 except where buildings are acquired in conjunction with land being purchased for other purposes and except for eight buildings to be constructed at a cost not to exceed $15,000 per building: *Provided further*, That no money appropriated in this chapter shall be available for the construction of any such building on land not owned by the Government: *Provided further*, That in the State of Missouri where the State has established a central State agency authorized to enter into agreements with the United States or any of its agencies on policies and general programs for the saving of its soil by the extension of Federal aid to any soil conservation district in such State, the agreements made by or on behalf of the United States with any such soil conservation district shall have the prior approval of such central State agency before they shall become effective as to such district, as follows:

(210) ~~SALARIES AND EXPENSES~~

Soil conservation research: For research and investigations into the character, cause, extent, history, and effects of erosion, soil and moisture depletion and methods of soil and water conservation (including the construction and hydro-

logic phases of farm irrigation and land drainage, and water regulation to conserve the soil and reduce fire hazards in the Everglades region of Florida, except that expenditures for all work in the Everglades region shall be limited to a sum not in excess of funds made available for such work by the State of Florida, or political subdivisions thereof); and for construction, operation, and maintenance of experimental watersheds, stations, laboratories, plots, and installations, $1,500,000.

Soil conservation operations: For carrying out preventive measures to conserve soil and water, including such special measures as may be necessary to prevent floods and the siltation of reservoirs, and including the improvement of farm irrigation and land drainage, the establishment and operation of conservation nurseries, the making of conservation plans and surveys, and the dissemination of information, (211) ~~$52,900,000~~ *$52,400,000*: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation may be expended for soil and water conservation operations in demonstration projects: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $5,000 may be used for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706 (a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as amended by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a).

LAND UTILIZATION AND RETIREMENT OF SUBMARGINAL LAND

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved

July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1010-1012), and the provisions of the Act approved August 11, 1945 (7 U. S. C. 1011 note), (212)~~$1,490,000~~ *$1,665,175.*

WATER CONSERVATION AND UTILIZATION PROJECTS

For expenses necessary to carry into effect the functions of the Department under the Acts of May 10, 1939 (53 Stat. 685, 719), October 14, 1940 (16 U. S. C. 590y-z-10), as amended and supplemented, and June 28, 1949 (Public Law 132), relating to the construction, operation, and maintenance of water conservation and utilization projects, to remain available until expended, (213)~~$400,000~~ *$500,000,* which sum shall be merged with the unexpended balances of funds heretofore appropriated or transferred to said Department for the purposes of said Act.

PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION

CONSERVATION AND USE OF AGRICULTURAL LAND RESOURCES

To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, approved February 29, 1936, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590g 590q), including not to exceed $6,000 for the preparation and display of exhibits, including such displays at State, interstate, and international fairs within the United States; (214)~~$282,500,000~~ *$283,000,000,* to remain available until December 31 of the next succeeding fiscal year for compliance with the program of soil-building

practices and soil- and water-conserving practices authorized under this head in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1950, carried out during the period July 1, 1949, to December 31, 1950, inclusive: *Provided,* That not to exceed $25,500,000 of the total sum provided under this head shall be available during the current fiscal year for salaries and other administrative expenses for carrying out such program, the cost of aerial photographs, however, not to be charged to such limitation; but not more than $5,000,000 shall be transferred to the appropriation account, "Administrative expenses, section 392, Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938": *Provided further,* That payments to claimants hereunder may be made upon the certificate of the claimant, which certificate shall be in such form as the Secretary may prescribe, that he has carried out the conservation practice or practices and has complied with all other requirements as conditions for such payments and that the statements and information contained in the application for payment are correct and true, to the best of his knowledge and belief, under the penalties of title 18, United States Code: *Provided further,* That none of the funds herein appropriated or made available for the functions assigned to the Agricultural Adjustment Agency pursuant to the Executive Order Numbered 9069, of February 23, 1942, shall be used to pay the salaries or expenses of any regional

information employees or any State information employees, but this shall not preclude the answering of inquiries or supplying of information at the county level to individual farmers: *Provided further*, That such amount shall be available for salaries and other administrative expenses in connection with the formulation and administration of the 1951 program of soil-building practices and soil- and water-conserving practices, under the Act of February 29, 1936, as amended (amounting to $285,000,000, including administration, and formulated on the basis of a distribution of the funds available for payments and grants among the several States in accordance with their conservation needs as determined by the Secretary, except that the proportion allocated to any State shall not be reduced more than 15 per centum from the distribution for the next preceding program year, and no participant shall receive more than $2,500); but the payments or grants under such programs shall be conditioned upon the utilization of land with respect to which such payments or grants are to be made in conformity with farming practices which will encourage and provide for soil-building and soil- and water-conserving practices in the most practical and effective manner and adapted to conditions in the several States, as determined and approved by the State committees appointed pursuant to section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic

Allotment Act, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590h (b)), for the respective States (215)~~: *Provided further,* That not to exceed 5 per centum of the allocation for the agricultural conservation program for any county may be allotted to the Soil Conservation Service for services of its technicians in formulating and carrying out the agricultural conservation program and the funds so allotted shall not be utilized by the Soil Conservation Service for any purpose other than technical and other assistance in such county~~: *Provided further,* That such amounts shall be available for the purchase of seeds, fertilizers, lime, trees, or any other farming materials, or any soil-terracing services, and making grants thereof to agricultural producers to aid them in carrying out farming practices approved by the Secretary under programs provided for herein: *Provided further,* That no part of any funds available to the Department, or any bureau, office, corporation, or other agency constituting a part of such Department, shall be used in the current fiscal year for the payment of salary or travel expenses of any person who has been convicted of violating the Act entitled "An Act to prevent pernicious political activities", approved August 2, 1939, as amended, or who has been found in accordance with the provisions of title 18, United States Code, section 1913, to have violated or attempted to violate such section which prohibits the use of Federal appropria-

tions for the payment of personal services or other expenses designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress to favor or oppose any legislation or appropriation by Congress except upon request of any Member or through the proper official channels.

ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS AND MARKETING QUOTAS

To enable the Secretary to formulate and carry out acreage allotment and marketing quota programs pursuant to the provisions of title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1301-1393), $32,300,000, of which not more than $5,500,000 shall be transferred to the appropriation account "Administrative expenses, section 392, Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938": *Provided,* That $4,000,000 of this appropriation shall be placed in reserve pending determination by the Secretary as to necessity of marketing quotas on the 1951 crops of wheat, corn, and rice, to be released in such amounts and at such times as determined by the Bureau of the Budget to be necessary in connection with such marketing quotas.

SUGAR ACT

To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948 (7 U. S. C. 1101-1160), (216) ~~$60,000,000~~ *$63,750,000,* to remain available until June 30 of the next succeeding fiscal year: *Provided,* That expenditures (including transfers) from this appropriation

for other than payments to sugar producers shall not exceed $1,500,000.

NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT

To enable the Secretary to carry out the provisions of the National School Lunch Act (42 U. S. C. 1751–1760), $83,500,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for nonfood assistance under section 5 of said Act.

MARKETING SERVICES

For expenses necessary in conducting investigations, experiments, and demonstrations, as follows:

Market news service: For collecting, publishing, and distributing, by telegraph, mail, or otherwise, timely information on the market supply and demand, commercial movement, location, disposition, quality, condition, and market prices of livestock, meats, fish, and animal products, dairy and poultry products (including broilers), fruits and vegetables, peanuts and their products, grain, hay, feeds, cottonseed, and seeds, and other agricultural products, (217) ~~$2,050,000~~ *$2,187,000.*

Market inspection of farm products: For the investigation and certification, in one or more jurisdictions, to shippers and other interested parties of the class, quality, and condition of any agricultural commodity or food product, whether raw, dried, canned, or otherwise processed, and any

product containing an agricultural commodity or derivative thereof when offered for interstate shipment or when received at such important central markets as the Secretary may from time to time designate, or at points which may be conveniently reached therefrom under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, including payment of such fees as will be reasonable and as nearly as may be to cover the cost for the service rendered, $780,000.

Marketing farm products: For acquiring and diffusing among the people of the United States useful information relative to the needed supplies, standardization, classification, grading, preparation for market, handling, transportation, storage, and marketing of farm and food products, including the demonstration and promotion of the use of uniform standards of classification of American farm and food products throughout the world, for making analyses of cotton fiber as provided by the Act of April 7, 1941 (7 U. S. C. 473d), for carrying out the provisions of section 201 (a) to 201 (d), inclusive, of title II of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U. S. C. 1291), including not to exceed $25,000 for employment at rates not to exceed $100 per diem, pursuant to the second sentence of section 706 (a), of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as amended by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), and not to exceed $20,000 for transportation and other

necessary expenses including not to exceed $10 per diem of persons serving without compensation while away from their homes or regular places of business, $1,260,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary may make available to any bureau, office, or agency of the Department such amounts from this appropriation as may be necessary to carry out the functions for which this appropriation is made, and any such amounts shall be in addition to amounts transferred or otherwise made available to appropriation items in this Act.

Tobacco Acts: To carry into effect the provisions of the Act to establish and promote the use of standards of classification for tobacco, to provide and maintain an official tobacco-inspection service, approved August 23, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 511–511q), the Act to provide for the collection and publication of statistics of tobacco by the Department, approved January 14, 1929 (7 U. S. C. 501–508), as amended, and the Act to prohibit the exportation of tobacco seed and plants, approved June 5, 1940 (7 U. S. C. 516), $1,660,500.

Cotton Statistics, Classing, Standards and Futures Acts: To carry into effect the provisions of the Act authorizing the Secretary to collect and publish statistics of the grade and staple length of cotton, approved March 3, 1927, as amended by the Act of April 13, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 471–

476), and to perform the duties imposed upon him by chapter 14 of the Internal Revenue Code relating to cotton futures (26 U. S. C. 1920–1935), and to carry into effect the provisions of the United States Cotton Standards Act, approved March 4, 1923, as amended (7 U. S. C. 51–65), $1,675,000.

Marketing regulatory Acts: For expenses necessary to carry into effect the provisions of the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, as amended (7 U. S. C. 499a–499r), the Act to prevent the destruction or dumping of farm produce (7 U. S. C. 491–497), the Act to provide standards for baskets and containers for fruits and vegetables, as amended (15 U. S. C. 251–256), the Act to fix standards for hampers, round stave baskets, and splint baskets for fruits and vegetables (15 U. S. C. 257–257i), the Act to provide export standards for apples and pears (7 U. S. C. 581–589), the United States Grain Standards Act (7 U. S. C. 71–87), the United States Warehouse Act (7 U. S. C. 241–273), the Federal Seed Act (7 U. S. C. 1551–1610), the Packers and Stockyards Act, as amended (7 U. S. C. 181–229), the Naval Stores Act (7 U. S. C. 91–99), and the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U. S. C. 135–135k), (218) ~~$3,550,000~~ *$3,495,000*.

COMMODITY EXCHANGE AUTHORITY

To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1–17a), $650,000.

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION

For operating and administrative expenses, (219)~~$6,854,000~~ *$7,204,000*.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

To carry into effect the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended (7 U. S. C. 901–915), as follows:

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For administrative expenses, including not to exceed $500 for financial and credit reports, (220)~~$8,150,000,~~ *$8,750,000*.

LOAN AUTHORIZATION

For loans in accordance with said Act, and for carrying out the provisions of section 7 thereof, to be borrowed from the Secretary of the Treasury in accordance with the provisions of section 3 (a) of said Act as follows: Rural electrification program, $350,000,000; and rural telephone program, (221)~~$25,000,000~~ *$40,000,000*; and additional amounts, not to exceed a total of $150,000,000 (including the uncommitted balance available as a carry-over from the fiscal year 1950),

may be borrowed for the rural electrification program under the same terms and conditions if and to the extent that the Secretary of Agriculture shall certify, from time to time, to the Secretary of the Treasury that such additional amounts are required during the fiscal year 1951, under the then existing conditions, for the expeditious and orderly development of the program.

FARMERS' HOME ADMINISTRATION

To carry into effect the provisions of titles I, II, and the related provisions of title IV of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1000–1031), the Farmers' Home Administration Act of 1946 (7 U. S. C. 1001, note; 31 U. S. C. 82h; 12 U. S. C. 371; 35 D. C. Code 535; 60 Stat. 1062–1080); the Act of July 30, 1946 (40 U. S. C. 436–439); the Act of October 19, 1949 (Public Law 361); the Act of August 28, 1937, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590r–590x, 590z–5), for the development of facilities for water storage and utilization in the arid and semiarid areas of the United States; and the provisions of title V of the Housing Act of 1949 relating to financial assistance for farm housing (Public Law 171, approved July 15, 1949), as follows:

LOAN AUTHORIZATION

For loans (including payments in lieu of taxes and taxes under section 50 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant

Act, as amended, and advances incident to the acquisition and preservation of security of obligations under the foregoing several authorities) : Title I and section 43 of title IV of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended and title V of the Housing Act of 1949 (except grants under 504 (a)) (222)~~$56,350,000~~ *$71,350,000* (223), *of which not to exceed $3,500,000 of the amount available for the purposes of title I and section 43 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, may be distributed to States and Territories without regard to farm population and prevalence of tenancy, in addition to the amount otherwise distributed thereto, for loans in reclamation projects and to entrymen on unpatented public land* (sums available for loans under title V of the Housing Act of 1949 to remain available until expended) ; title II of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, $85,000,000; the Act of August 28, 1937, as amended, $4,000,000: *Provided,* That not to exceed the foregoing several amounts shall be borrowed in one account from the Secretary of the Treasury on the request of the Secretary of Agriculture at such rate of interest as may be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, but not in excess of 3 per centum per annum; and the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to lend such sums to the Secretary upon the security of any obligations of borrowers from the Secre-

tary under the provisions of said Acts: *Provided further,* That the Secretary may utilize proceeds from payments of principal and interest under such Acts to repay the Secretary of the Treasury the amounts borrowed therefrom for the purposes of such Acts (224): *Provided further, That for the purpose of making loans pursuant to the foregoing authority, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public-debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under that Act are extended to include such loans to the Secretary: Provided further, That repayments to the Secretary of the Treasury on such loans shall be treated as a public-debt transaction.*

GRANTS

For grants and for the grant portion of combination loans and grants for the purpose of section 504 (a) of the Housing Act of 1949, $650,000, to remain available until expended.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For the making, servicing, and collecting of loans and insured mortgages, the servicing and collecting of loans made under prior authority, the liquidation of assets transferred to Farmers Home Administration pursuant to the Farmers Home Administration Act of 1946, and the extension of

financial assistance under the Housing Act of 1949, (225) ~~$27,700,000~~ *$29,000,000*, together with a transfer to this appropriation item of not to exceed $80,000 of the fees and administrative expense charges made available by subsections (d) and (e) of section 12 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended.

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses, including not to exceed $5,000 for attendance at meetings or conventions of members of organizations at which matters of importance to the work of the Farm Credit Administration are to be discussed or transacted; library membership fees or dues in organizations which issue publications to members only or to members at a lower price than to others, payment for which may be made in advance; not to exceed $20,000 for expenditures authorized by section 602 of the Organic Act of 1944 (12 U. S. C. 833); purchase of one passenger motor vehicle (for replacement only) for use in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; garage rental in the District of Columbia; payment of actual transportation and other necessary expenses and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of subsistence of persons serving, while away from their homes, without other compensation from the United States, in an advisory capacity to the Farm Credit Administration, except that such expenditures shall not exceed $10,000; examination of corporations,

banks, associations, and institutions operated, supervised, or regulated by the Farm Credit Administration $585,000, together with not to exceed $2,325,000 of collections from Federal Farm Credit agencies of assessments and charges, to be advanced by transfer and counter warrant to this appropriation, to cover the cost of Farm Credit Administration facilities, examinations, and other services rendered to such agencies; $2,910,000.

Extension Service

payments to states, hawaii, alaska, and puerto rico

For payments to the States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico, for cooperative agricultural extension work as follows:

Capper-Ketcham, Bankhead-Jones, and related Acts: Capper-Ketcham Act, the Act approved May 22, 1928 (7 U. S. C. 343a, 343b), $1,480,000; Bankhead-Jones Act, section 21, title II, of the Act approved June 29, 1935, (7 U. S. C. 343c), $12,000,000; Bankhead-Jones Act, section 23, title II, of the Act approved June 29, 1935, as amended by the Act of June 6, 1945 (7 U. S. C. 343d–1), $12,500,000; additional extension work, the Act approved April 24, 1939, as amended (7 U. S. C. 343c–1), $555,000; Alaska, the Act approved February 23, 1929 (7 U. S. C. 386c), extending the benefits of the Smith-Lever Act to the Territory of Alaska, $13,950, and (226)~~section~~

~~3 of the Act approved June 20, 1936 (7 U. S. C. 343e),~~ ~~extending the benefits of the Capper-Ketcham Act to the Territory of Alaska, $10,000~~ *the Act approved October 27, 1949 (Public Law 417), extending to the Territory of Alaska the benefits of the Capper-Ketcham Act and sections 21 and 23 of title II of the Bankhead-Jones Act, $42,150; Puerto Rico, section 3 of the Act of March 4, 1931 (7 U. S. C. 386f), authorizing extension of the Capper-Ketcham Act to Puerto Rico, $31,348*; the Act approved August 28, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 343f–343g), extending the benefits of section 21 of the Bankhead-Jones Act to Puerto Rico, ~~$~~408,000 (227), *and the Act approved October 26, 1949 (Public Law 406), extending the benefits of section 23 of title II of the Bankhead-Jones Act to Puerto Rico, $40,000*; and section 506a of title V of the Housing Act of 1949 (Public Law 171), $33,050; in all, payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico, (228)~~$27,000,000~~ *$27,103,498.*

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary to administer the provisions of the Smith-Lever Act, approved May 8, 1914 (7 U. S. C. 341–348), and Acts amendatory or supplementary thereto, and to coordinate the extension work of the Department and the several States, Territories, and insular possessions, (229)~~$900,000~~ *$915,000.*

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

For expenses of the Office of the Secretary of Agriculture, including the purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only; travel expenses, including examination of estimates for appropriations in the field; stationery, supplies, materials, and equipment; freight, express, and drayage charges; advertising, communication service, postage, washing towels, repairs and alterations, and other miscellaneous supplies and expenses not otherwise provided for and necessary for the practical and efficient work of the Department of Agriculture, (230)~~$2,143,300~~ *$2,179,300*, together with such amounts from other appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules in the Budget for the current fiscal year for such services and expenses, which several amounts or portions thereof as may be determined by the Secretary not exceeding a total of $109,280, shall be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation: *Provided, however,* That if the total amounts of such appropriations or authorizations for the current fiscal year shall at any time exceed or fall below the amounts estimated, respectively, therefor in the Budget for such year, the amounts transferred or to be transferred therefrom to this appropriation shall be increased or decreased in such amounts as the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives of the Department, shall determine are

appropriate to the requirements as changed by such reductions or increases in such appropriations or authorizations.

OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

For necessary expenses, including payment of fees or dues for the use of law libraries by attorneys in the field service, (231)~~$2,450,000~~ *$2,675,000* (232), *together with such amounts from other appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules in the budget for the current fiscal year for such expenses which several amounts not exceeding a total of $207,000 shall be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation.*

OFFICE OF FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL RELATIONS

For necessary expenses for the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations and for enabling the Secretary to coordinate and integrate activities of the Department in connection with foreign agricultural work, $600,000.

OFFICE OF INFORMATION

For necessary expenses in connection with the publication, indexing, illustration, and distribution of bulletins, documents, and reports, the preparation, distribution, and display of agricultural motion and sound pictures, and exhibits, and the coordination of informational work (233)*and programs authorized by Congress* in the Department, $1,265,800, together with such amounts from other appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules in the Budget

for the current fiscal year for such expenses, which several amounts or portions thereof, as may be determined by the Secretary, not exceeding a total of $16,200, shall be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation, of which total appropriation amounts not exceeding those specified may be used for the purposes enumerated as follows: For preparation and display of exhibits, $109,959; for preparation, distribution, and display of motion and sound pictures, $58,700; for farmers' bulletins, which shall be adapted to the interests of the people of the different sections of the country, an equal proportion of four-fifths of which shall be delivered to or sent out under the addressed franks furnished by the Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress, as they shall direct (7 U. S. C. 417) and not less than two hundred thirty thousand eight hundred and fifty copies for the use of the Senate and House of Representatives of part 2 of the annual report of the Secretary (known as the Yearbook of Agriculture), as authorized by section 73 of the Act of January 12, 1895 (44 U. S. C. 241), $611,128 **(234)**: *Provided, That when and to the extent that in the judgment of the Secretary agricultural exhibits and motion and sound pictures relating to the programs of the various agencies of the Department authorized by Congress can be more advantageously prepared, displayed, or distributed by the Office of Information, as the central agency of the Department therefor, additional*

funds not exceeding $300,000 for these purposes may be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation, from the funds applicable; and shall be available for the objects specified herein: *Provided further*, That in the preparation of motion pictures or exhibits by the Department, not exceeding a total of $10,000 may be used for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706 (a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as amended by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a): *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the establishment or maintenance of regional or State field offices, or for the compensation of employees in such offices except that not to exceed $10,000 may be used to maintain the San Francisco radio office.

LIBRARY

For necessary expenses, including dues, for library membership in societies or associations which issue publications to members only or at a price to members lower than to subscribers who are not members; $713,293.

(235) ~~Not to exceed $12,000,000 of the funds appropriated in this title shall be available for travel expenses. Amounts available from appropriations contained in this title are hereby reduced by the total sum of $645,496, such amount to be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury immediately upon approval of this chapter.~~

TITLE II—CORPORATIONS

The following corporations and agencies are hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to each such corporation or agency and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the Budget for the fiscal year 1951 for such corporation or agency, except as hereinafter provided:

Federal Crop Insurance Corporation.

Commodity Credit Corporation: Nothing in this chapter shall be so construed as to prevent the Commodity Credit Corporation from carrying out any activity or any program authorized by law: *Provided,* That not to exceed (236) ~~$16,000,000~~ *$16,350,000* shall be available for administrative expenses of the Corporation: *Provided further,* That all necessary expenses (including legal and special services performed on a contract or fee basis, but not including other personal services) in connection with the acquisition, operation, maintenance, improvement, or disposition of any real or personal property belonging to the Corporation or in which it has an interest, including expenses of collections of pledged collateral, shall be considered as nonadministrative

expenses for the purposes hereof: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to discharge (237) ~~$170,515,131~~ *$66,698,457* of the indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation to the Secretary of the Treasury by canceling notes in such amount issued by the Corporation to the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to section 4 of the Act of March 8, 1938, as amended (15 U. S. C. 713a–4).

Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation: Not to exceed $1,280,000 (to be computed on an accrual basis) of the funds of the Corporation shall be available for administrative expenses, including employment on a contract or fee basis of persons, firms, and corporations for the performance of special services, including legal services, and the use of the services and facilities of Federal land banks, national farm loan associations, Federal Reserve banks, and agencies of the Government as authorized by the Act of January 31, 1934 (12 U. S. C. 1020–1020h); and said total sum shall be exclusive of services and facilities furnished and examinations made by the Farm Credit Administration central office, interest expense, and expenses in connection with the acquisition, operation, maintenance, improvement, protection, or disposition of real or personal property belonging to the Corporation or in which it has an interest: *Provided*, That promptly after June 30 of each fiscal year

all cash funds in excess of the estimated operating requirements for the current fiscal year shall be declared as dividends and paid into the general fund of the Treasury: *Provided further*, That the aggregate amount of bonds the Corporation may issue and have outstanding at any one time shall not exceed $500,000,000.

Federal intermediate credit banks: Not to exceed $1,496,000 (to be computed on an accrual basis) of the funds of the banks shall be available for administrative expenses and services performed for the banks by other Government agencies (except services and facilities furnished and examinations made by the Farm Credit Administration central office, and services performed by any Federal Reserve bank and by the United States Treasury in connection with the financial transactions of the banks); and said total sum shall be exclusive of interest expense, legal and special services performed on a contract or fee basis, and expenses in connection with the acquisition, operation, maintenance, improvement, protection, or disposition of real or personal property belonging to the banks or in which they have an interest.

Production credit corporations: Not to exceed $1,358,000 (to be computed on an accrual basis) of the funds of the corporations shall be available for administrative expenses and services performed for the corporations by other Govern-

ment agencies (except services and facilities furnished and examinations made by the Farm Credit Administration central office); and said total sum shall be exclusive of interest expense, legal and special services performed on a contract or fee basis, and expenses in connection with the acquisition, operation, maintenance, improvement, protection, or disposition of real or personal property belonging to the corporations or in which they have an interest.

TITLE III—REDUCTIONS IN APPROPRIATIONS

Amounts available from appropriations are hereby reduced in the sums hereinafter set forth, such sums to be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury immediately upon the approval of this Chapter:

An amount of $199,990,000 in the revolving fund held in the Treasury available to the Governor, Farm Credit Administration, as authorized by the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act, as amended (12 U. S. C. 1020b), for resubscriptions to the capital stock of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation.

The total amount of $125,000,000 in the revolving fund appropriated to the Office of the Secretary, Treasury Department, as authorized by the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended (12 U. S. C. 698), for subscriptions to the capital stock of the Federal land banks.

TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. Within the unit limit of cost fixed by law, the lump-sum appropriations and authorizations made for the Department under this chapter shall be available for the purchase of not to exceed 497 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, and for the hire of such vehicles, necessary in the conduct of the work of the Department outside the District of Columbia.

SEC. 402. Provisions of law prohibiting or restricting the employment of aliens shall not apply to (1) the temporary employment of translators when competent citizen translators are not available; (2) employment in cases of emergency of persons in the field service of the Department for periods of not more than sixty days; and (3) employment under the appropriation for the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations.

SEC. 403. Appropriations and authorizations made in this chapter shall be available for health service programs as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150).

SEC. 404. Funds available to the Department during the current fiscal year shall be available for the payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672).

SEC. 405. Funds available to the Department of Agriculture during the current fiscal year may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

SEC. 406. Funds available to the Department of Agriculture may be used for printing and binding, including the purchase of reprints of scientific and technical articles.

SEC. 407. Of appropriations herein made which are available for the purchase of lands, not to exceed $1 may be expended for each option to purchase any particular tract or tracts of land.

SEC. 408. No part of the funds appropriated by this chapter shall be used for the payment of any officer or employee of the Department who, as such officer or employee, or on behalf of the Department or any division, commission, or bureau thereof, issues, or causes to be issued, any prediction, oral or written, or forecast, except as to damage threatened or caused by insects and pests, with respect to future prices of cotton or the trend of same.

SEC. 409. Except to provide materials required in or incident to research or experimental work where no suitable domestic product is available, no part of the funds appropriated by this chapter shall be expended in the purchase of twine manufactured from commodities or materials produced outside of the United States.

SEC. 410. Not less than $575,000 shall be available for contracts in accordance with section 10 (a) of the Act of August 14, 1946 (7 U. S. C. 427i) from appropriations herein made for the Bureau of Agricultural Economics;

Bureau of Animal Industry; Bureau of Dairy Industry; Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering; Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine; Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry; Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics; and the Forest Service.

(238) *SEC. 411. Of the funds appropriated in this chapter for travel expenses, $791,888 shall be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury on or before August 1, 1950; but such amount shall be credited toward any other reduction in amounts available for such travel expenses resulting from decreases in appropriations made by this Act below the budget estimates.*

This chapter may be cited as the "Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1951".

CHAPTER VII—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

TITLE I

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary of the Interior (hereafter in this chapter referred to as the Secretary), including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; for purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only at not to exceed $4,500; printing and binding; employment of a Director of the Oil and Gas Division without regard to the civil service laws; and teletype rentals and service; (239) ~~$2,315,000~~ *$2,100,000.*

(240) *STANDARDIZATION OF GEOGRAPHIC NAMES*

For expenses necessary for carrying out the provisions of the Act of July 25, 1947 (43 U. S. C. 364), including personal services in the District of Columbia and printing and binding, $14,000.

ENFORCEMENT OF THE CONNALLY HOT OIL ACT

For expenses necessary for controlling the interstate shipment of contraband oil as required by law (15 U. S. C.

amounts received during the current fiscal year by each of the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force as proceeds from the sale of scrap or salvage material, shall be available during the current fiscal year for expenses of transportation, demilitarization, and other preparation for sale or salvage of military supplies, equipment, and matériel: *Provided,* That a report of receipts and disbursements under this limitation shall be made quarterly to the Appropriation Committees of the Congress.

(467) SEC. 630. *Appropriations and contract authority contained in this chapter shall not be subject to the provisions of subsections (c) to (i), inclusive, of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by section 1111 of this Act, during the existence of an emergency affecting the national security.*

TITLE VII—REDUCTION IN APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 701. The contract authorization granted under the head "Ordnance for New Construction," in title IV of the "National Military Establishment Appropriation Act, 1950," is reduced by the sum of $31,460,000 and the amount of the limitation imposed by the proviso under said head on the total obligations to be incurred for armor, armament, and ammunition, for construction, conversion, or replacement approved during the fiscal year 1950, is also reduced by the sum of $31,460,000.

This chapter may be cited as the "Defense Appropriation Act, 1951".

(468) CHAPTER X–A—GENERAL REDUCTIONS IN APPROPRIATIONS AND CONTRACT AUTHORIZATIONS

Reductions in appropriations and contract authorizations contained in this Act are hereby made in the sum of $600,000,000.

Not more than the following sums may be obligated by any agency or department provided for in this Act, viz:

(1) For civilian personnel, not more than an amount 10 per centum below the amount proposed in the President's budget estimates for fiscal year 1951, except that in the Department of Defense where no more than the amount of the President's budget estimate minus 2 per centum shall be obligated. This paragraph shall not apply to nurses, doctors, or other medical personnel, including orderlies, in the Public Health Service and the Veterans' Administration.

(2) For travel, not more than a total for all departments and agencies of $319,000,000, and not more than 5 per centum less than the estimates provided for military personnel travel and not more than 20 per centum less than the amount provided for civilian personnel travel, than the estimates therefor contained in the President's budget message for the fiscal year 1951.

(3) For transportation of things, for all departments and agencies, not more than $720,000,000: *Provided further,* That in no case shall the amount obligated exceed a figure 10 per centum below the estimates submitted by the President in his budget message for 1951 for each item for all agencies except the Department of Defense, and for the Department of Defense not more than 5 per centum less than the estimates of the President, transmitted in said budget message.

(4) For communications services, not more than $59,000,000, and not more for any department other than the Department of Defense than the amount of the President's budget estimates for 1951 minus 10 per centum, and for the Department of Defense not more than a figure 5 per centum below the President's budget estimates for 1951.

(5) For rents and utilities, not more than $205,000,000, and for all establishments other than the Department of Defense not more than the President's budget estimates for fiscal year 1951 minus 10 per centum.

(6) For printing and reproduction, not more than $52,000,000, and not more in any case than the President's budget estimates for 1951 minus 10 per centum.

(7) For other contractual services, not more than $1,301,000,000, and for all departments other than the

~~Department of Defense not more than the President's budget estimates for 1951 minus 10 per centum.~~

~~(8) For supplies and materials, not more than $3,888,000,000, and for all departments of the Government except the Department of Defense and the Veterans' hospitals not more than the President's budget estimates for 1951 minus 10 per centum.~~

~~(9) For equipment, not more than $3,577,000,000, and for all departments other than the Department of Defense, not more than the President's budget estimates for 1951 minus 10 per centum.~~

~~(10) For lands and structures, for all departments of the Government, except the Department of Defense not more than the President's budget estimates for 1951 minus 5 per centum.~~

regard to the four-year limitation contained in section 522 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946: Provided further, That in the event the President assigns to the Department of State responsibilities and obligations of the United States in connection with the government, occupation, or control of foreign areas in addition to Germany, the authorities contained in this appropriation may be utilized by the Department of State in connection with such government, occupation, or control of such foreign areas: Provided further, That when the Department of the Army, under the authority of the Act of March 3, 1911, as amended (10 U. S. C. 1253), furnishes subsistence supplies to personnel of civilian agencies of the United States Government serving in Germany, payment therefor by such personnel shall be made at the same rate as is paid by civilian personnel of the Department of the Army serving in Germany.

(489) *AID TO PALESTINE REFUGEES*

For contributions by the United States to the United Nations for the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, as authorized by title III of the Foreign Economic Assistance Act of 1950 (Public Law 535, approved June 5, 1950), $27,450,000.

This chapter may be cited as the "Foreign Aid Appropriation Act, 1951".

CHAPTER XI—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Departments and Agencies

SEC. 1101. Unless otherwise specifically provided, the maximum amount allowable during the current fiscal year, in accordance with section 16 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 78), for the purchase of any passenger motor vehicle (exclusive of busses, ambulances, and station wagons), is hereby fixed at $1,400.

SEC. 1102. Unless otherwise specified and during the current fiscal year, no part of any appropriation contained in this or any other Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any officer or employee of the Government of the United States (including any agency the majority of the stock of which is owned by the Government of the United States) whose post of duty is in continental United States unless such person (1) is a citizen of the United States, (2) is a person in the service of the United States on the date of enactment of this Act who, being eligible for citizenship, had filed a declaration of intention to become a citizen of the United States prior to such date, or (3) is a person who owes allegiance to the United States: *Provided,* That for the purpose of this section, an affidavit signed by any such person shall be considered prima facie

evidence that the requirements of this section with respect to his status have been complied with: *Provided further*, That any person making a false affidavit shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $4,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penal clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law: *Provided further*, That any payment made to any officer or employee contrary to the provisions of this section shall be recoverable in action by the Federal Government. This section shall not apply to citizens of the Republic of the Philippines or to nationals of those countries allied with the United States in the prosecution of the war.

SEC. 1103. Appropriations of the executive departments and independent establishments for the current fiscal year, available for expenses of travel or for the expenses of the activity concerned, are hereby made available for living quarters allowances in accordance with the Act of June 26, 1930 (5 U. S. C. 118a), and regulations prescribed thereunder, and cost-of-living allowances similar to those allowed under section 901 (2) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, in accordance with and to the extent prescribed by regulations of the President, for all civilian officers and employees of the Government permanently stationed in foreign coun-

tries: *Provided,* That the availability of appropriations made to the Department of State for carrying out the provisions of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 shall not be affected hereby.

SEC. 1104. No part of any appropriation for the current fiscal year contained in this or any other Act shall be paid to any person for the filling of any position for which he or she has been nominated after the Senate has voted not to approve of the nomination of said person.

SEC. 1105. No part of any appropriation contained in this or any other Act shall be used to pay in excess of $4 per volume for the current and future volumes of the United States Code Annotated and such volumes shall be purchased on condition and with the understanding that latest published cumulative annual pocket parts issued prior to the date of purchase shall be furnished free of charge, or in excess of $4.25 per volume for the current or future volumes of the Lifetime Federal Digest.

SEC. 1106. Funds made available by this or any other Act for administrative expenses in the current fiscal year of the corporations and agencies subject to the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended (31 U. S. C. 841), shall be available, in addition to objects for which such funds are otherwise available, for personal services and rent in the District of Columbia; printing and binding; examination of budgets and estimates of appropriations in the field;

services in accordance with section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); and the objects specified in the sections of this title under the head "Departments and agencies", all the provisions of which shall be applicable to the expenditure of such funds unless otherwise specified in the Act by which they are made available: *Provided*, That in the event any functions budgeted as administrative expenses are subsequently transferred to or paid from other funds, the limitations on administrative expenses shall be correspondingly reduced.

SEC. 1107. No part of any funds of or available to any wholly owned Government corporation shall be used for the purchase or construction, or in making loans for the purchase or construction of any office building at the seat of government primarily for occupancy by any department or agency of the United States Government or by any corporation owned by the United States Government.

SEC. 1108. Funds of corporations and agencies, subject to the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, covered by the provisions of this or any other Act shall be available during the current fiscal year for payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672).

SEC. 1109. No part of any appropriation contained in this

or any other Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation included in this or any other Act, shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of the United States, is not a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary

or wages for which are paid from any appropriation or fund contained in this or any other Act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law: *Provided further*, That, as applicable to the Departments of Agriculture and Interior, nothing in this section shall be construed to require an affidavit from any person employed for less than sixty days for sudden emergency work involving the loss of human life or destruction of property, and the payment of salary or wages may be made to such persons from applicable appropriations for services rendered in such emergency without execution of the affidavit contemplated by this section.

SEC. 1110. No funds made available by this or any other Act shall be withdrawn from one appropriation account for credit to another, or to a working fund, except as authorized by law: *Provided*, That, except as otherwise specifically provided by law, any funds so withdrawn and credited shall be available for the same purposes, and subject to the same limitations, conditions, and restrictions, as provided by the Act appropriating such funds: *Provided further*, That any such withdrawal and credit shall be made, without warrant action, by check: *Provided further*, That no funds withdrawn

and credited pursuant to section 601 of the Act of June 30, 1932, as amended (47 Stat. 417; 31 U. S. C. 686), shall be available for any period beyond that provided by the Act appropriating such funds.

SEC. 1111. Section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U. S. C. 665), is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3679. (a) No officer or employee of the United States shall make or authorize an expenditure from or create or authorize an obligation under any appropriation or fund in excess of the amount available therein; nor shall any such officer or employee involve the Government in any contract or other obligation, for the payment of money for any purpose, in advance of appropriations made for such purpose, unless such contract or obligation is authorized by law.

"(b) No officer or employee of the United States shall accept voluntary service for the United States or employ personal service in excess of that authorized by law, except in cases of emergency involving the safety of human life or the protection of property.

"(c) (1) Except as otherwise provided in this section, all appropriations or funds available for obligation for a definite period of time shall be so apportioned as to prevent obligation (490) *or expenditure* thereof in a manner which would

indicate a necessity for deficiency or supplemental appropriations for such period; and all appropriations or funds not limited to a definite period of time, and all authorizations to create obligations by contract in advance of appropriations, shall be so apportioned as to achieve the most effective and economical use thereof. As used hereafter in this section, the term 'appropriation' means appropriations, funds, and authorizations to create obligations by contract in advance of appropriations.

"(2) In apportioning any appropriation, reserves may be established to provide for contingencies, or to effect savings whenever savings are made possible by or through changes in (491) ~~requirements,~~ *requirements or* greater efficiency of operations (492)~~, or other developments~~ subsequent to the date on which such appropriation was made available. Whenever it is determined by an officer designated in subsection (d) of this section to make apportionments and reapportionments that any amount so reserved will not be required to carry out the purposes of the appropriation concerned, he shall recommend the rescission of such amount in the manner provided in the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, for estimates of appropriations.

"(3) Any appropriation subject to apportionment shall be distributed by months, calendar quarters, operating seasons, or other time periods, or by activities, functions, proj-

ects, or objects, or by a combination thereof, as may be deemed appropriate by the officers designated in subsection (d) of this section to make apportionments and reapportionments. Except as otherwise specified by the officer making the apportionment, amounts so apportioned shall remain available for obligation, in accordance with the terms of the appropriation, on a cumulative basis unless reapportioned.

"(4) Apportionments shall be reviewed at least four times each year by the officers designated in subsection (d) of this section to make apportionments and reapportionments, and such reapportionments made or such reserves established, modified, or released as may be necessary to further the effective use of the appropriation concerned, in accordance with the purposes stated in paragraph (1) of this subsection.

"(d) (1) Any appropriation available to the legislative branch, the judiciary, or the District of Columbia, which is required to be apportioned under subsection (c) of this section, shall be apportioned or reapportioned in writing by the officer having administrative control of such appropriation. Each such appropriation shall be apportioned not later than thirty days before the beginning of the fiscal year for which the appropriation is available, or not more than thirty days after approval of the Act by which the appropriation is made available, whichever is later.

"(2) Any appropriation available to an agency, which is required to be apportioned under subsection (c) of this section, shall be apportioned or reapportioned in writing by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. The head of each agency to which any such appropriation is available shall submit to the Bureau of the Budget information, in such form and manner and at such time or times as the Director may prescribe, as may be required for the apportionment of such appropriation. Such information shall be submitted not later than forty days before the beginning of any fiscal year for which the appropriation is available, or not more than fifteen days after approval of the Act by which such appropriation is made available, whichever is later. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall apportion each such appropriation and shall notify the agency concerned of his action not later than twenty days before the beginning of the fiscal year for which the appropriation is available, or not more than thirty days after the approval of the Act by which such appropriation is made available, whichever is later. When used in this section, the term 'agency' means any executive department, agency, commission, authority, administration, board, or other independent establishment in the executive branch of the Government, including any corporation wholly or partly owned by the United States which is an instrumentality of the United

States. (493)~~Nothing in this subsection shall be so construed as to interfere with the initiation, operation, and administration of agricultural price support programs.~~ *No funds (other than funds for administrative expenses) available for price support, surplus removal, and related operations, with respect to agricultural commodities shall be subject to apportionment pursuant to this section.* The provisions of this section shall not apply (494)*to appropriations for the transportation of mail or* to any corporation which obtains funds for making loans, other than paid in capital funds, without legal liability on the part of the United States.

"(e) (1) No apportionment or reapportionment which, in the judgment of the officer making such apportionment or reapportionment, would indicate a necessity for a deficiency or supplemental estimate shall be made except upon a determination by such officer that such action is required because of (A) any laws enacted subsequent to the transmission to the Congress of the estimates for an appropriation which require expenditures beyond administrative control; or (B) emergencies involving the safety of human life, the protection of property, or the immediate welfare of individuals in cases where an appropriation has been made to enable the United States to make payment of, or contributions toward, sums which are required to be paid to individuals either in specific amounts fixed by law or in accordance with formulae prescribed by law.

"(2) In each case of an apportionment or a reapportionment which, in the judgment of the officer making such apportionment or reapportionment, would indicate a necessity for a deficiency or supplemental estimate, such officer shall immediately submit a detailed report of the facts of the case to the Congress. In transmitting any deficiency or supplemental estimates required on account of any such apportionment or reapportionment, reference shall be made to such report.

"(f) (495)*(1)* The officers designated in subsection (d) of this section to make apportionments and reapportionments may exempt from apportionments (496)*trust funds and working funds expenditures from which have no significant effect on the financial operations of the Government, working capital and revolving funds established for intra-governmental operations,* receipts from industrial and power operations available under law and any appropriation made specifically for—

"(1) interest on, or retirement of, the public debt;

"(2) payment of claims, judgments, refunds, and draw-backs;

"(3) any item determined by the President to be of a confidential nature;

"(4) payment under private relief Acts or other laws requiring payments to designated payees in the total amount of such appropriation;

(497)"*(5) grants to the States under title I, IV, or X of the Social Security Act, or under any other public assistance title in such Act.*

(498)~~"(5) contingent expenses of the Senate or of the House of Representatives.~~

(499)"*(2) The provisions of subsection (c) of this section shall not apply to appropriations to the Senate or House of Representatives or to any Member, committee, Office (including the office of the Architect of the Capitol), officer, or employee thereof.*

"(g) Any appropriation which is apportioned or reapportioned pursuant to this section may be divided and subdivided administratively within the limits of such apportionments or reapportionments. The officer having administrative control of any such appropriation available to the legislative branch, the judiciary, or the District of Columbia, and the head of each agency, subject to the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, shall prescribe, by regulation, a system of administrative control (not inconsistent with any (500)~~other~~ accounting procedures prescribed by or pursuant to law) which shall be designed to (A) restrict obligations (501)*or expenditures* against each appropriation to the amount of apportionments or reapportionments made for each such appropriation, and (B) enable such officer or agency head to fix responsibility for the

creation of any obligation (502)*or the making of any expenditure* in excess of an apportionment or reapportionment.

"(h) No officer or employee of the United States shall authorize or create any obligation (503)*or make any expenditure* (A) in excess of an apportionment or reapportionment, or (B) in excess of the amount permitted by regulations prescribed pursuant to subsection (g) of this section.

"(i) (1) In addition to any penalty or liability under other law, any officer or employee of the United States who shall violate subsection (a), (b), or (h) of this section shall be subjected to appropriate administrative discipline, including, when circumstances warrant, suspension from duty without pay or removal from office; and any officer or employee of the United States who shall knowingly and willfully violate subsection (a), (b), or (h) of this section shall, upon conviction, be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned for not more than two years, or both.

"(2) In the case of a violation of subsection (a), (b), or (h) of this section by an officer or employee of an agency, or of the District of Columbia, the head of the agency concerned or the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, shall immediately report to the President, through the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and to the Congress all pertinent facts together with a statement of the action taken thereon."

SEC. 1112. No part of the funds of, or available for

expenditure by any corporation or agency included in this Act (504), *including the government of the District of Columbia,* shall be available to pay for annual leave accumulated by any (505)*civilian* officer or employee during the calendar year 1950 and unused at the close of business on (506)~~December 31, 1950~~ *June 30, 1951*: *Provided,* That this section shall not apply to officers and employees whose post of duty is outside the continental United States (507)*: And provided further, That this section shall not apply with respect to the payment of compensation for accumulated annual leave in the case of officers or employees who leave their civilian positions for the purpose of entering upon active military or naval service in the Armed Forces of the United States.*

SEC. 1113. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 6 of the Act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 555), or the provisions of any other law, the Secretary of State may, in his absolute discretion, during the current fiscal year, terminate the employment of any officer or employee of the Department of State or of the Foreign Service of the United States whenever he shall deem such termination necessary or advisable in the interests of the United States.

Notwithstanding the provisions of section 6 of the Act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 555), or the provisions of any other law, the Secretary of Commerce may, in his absolute discretion, during the current fiscal year, terminate

the employment of any officer or employee of the Department of Commerce whenever he shall deem such termination necessary or advisable in the best interests of the United States.

(508) ~~SEC. 1114. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or position under the United States Government which may become vacant during the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1950: *Provided*, That this inhibition shall not apply—~~

~~(a) to not to exceed 10 per centum of all such vacancies in any ageney caused by separation from such ageney;~~

~~(b) to positions filled from within the ageney;~~

~~(c) to offices or positions required by law to be filled by appointment of the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;~~

~~(d) to scientific and technical positions in the Atomic Energy Commission and the Armed Services;~~

~~(e) to nurses, doctors, or other medical personnel, including orderlies, in the Public Health Service and the Veterans' Administration;~~

~~(f) to law enforcement officers;~~

~~(g) to temporary, emergency, seasonal, or cooperative positions;~~

~~(h) to commissioned, commissioned warrant, war-~~

~~rant, and enlisted personnel, and cadets of the Coast Guard, and the undergraduates of the United States Military and Naval Academies, or~~

~~(i) to any agency in the legislative or judicial branches of the Government, or the municipal government of the District of Columbia.~~

SEC. 1114. (1) Except as hereinafter provided, each appropriation, reappropriation, and contract authorization or reauthorization, made by this Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, to any department or agency in the executive branch of the Government (including funds of Government corporations authorized by this Act for administrative expenses), is hereby reduced by 10 per centum.

(2) In order to provide for the most effective use of appropriations and contract authorizations reduced by this section, the head of each department and agency in the executive branch of the Government is hereby authorized to make adjustments and transfers between such appropriations, and between such contract authorizations, within his department or agency; but no such appropriation or contract authorization shall be increased under the authority of this section to an amount in excess of that provided in other chapters of this Act.

(3) The reductions provided for in this section shall not apply to the following:

(a) Title II of chapter IV; chapter X; so much of title I of chapter X–B as is contained in the paragraphs headed "Economic Cooperation", "International Children's Welfare Work", and "Mutual Defense Assistance"; and the amount appropriated to the General Services Administration for carrying out the provisions of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act of July 23, 1946;

(b) Appropriations in title I of chapter VIII for the Executive Office of the President under the headings "Compensation of the President", "The White House Office", "Emergency Fund for the President", and "Executive Mansion and Grounds";

(c) Appropriations and contract authorizations for the atomic energy program;

(d) Trust funds;

(e) Funds of Government corporations excluding those made available in this Act (1) for administrative expenses and (2) by appropriation from the general fund of the Treasury;

(f) Amounts (other than under the Veterans' Administration) for furnishing medical and hospital services and domiciliary care, excluding (1) administrative expenses not directly connected with the operation of a specific hospital,

dispensary, or clinic, and (2) expenses for employee health service programs;

(g) Amounts provided in this Act for payment of obligations incurred under prior appropriations or authorizations, and obligated balances of reappropriations;

(h) Appropriations of, or measured by, receipts;

(i) Amounts appropriated by this Act for the operation of law enforcement agencies, including the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Bureau of Customs, Immigration and Naturalization Services, the Coast Guard, and the Secret Service; or for the payment of compensation and expenses of agents and auditors of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, and such other officers and employees of other agencies whose duties primarily pertain to intelligence operations (including funds transferred pursuant to section 6 (a) of the Act of June 20, 1949; 63 Stat. 211) or to the investigation, apprehension, prosecution, or detention of persons suspected or convicted of offenses against the criminal laws of the United States;

(j) Amounts provided for any program of the Veterans' Administration, excluding (1) administrative expenses not directly connected with the operation of a specific hospital, dispensary, clinic, or facility, and (2) expenses for employee health service programs;

(k) Amounts provided for payments to States or political subdivisions thereof;

(l) Amounts provided to make payment of or contributions toward pensions, retirement and disability annuities and benefits, employees' death or injury benefits, or other items of a similar nature; and

(m) Appropriations for refunds, awards, and indemnities.

(509) *SEC. 1115. During the current fiscal year, no part of any money appropriated in this or any other Act shall be used during any quarter of such fiscal year to purchase typewriting machines (except bookkeeping and billing machines) at a price which exceeds 90 per centum of the lowest net cash price, plus applicable Federal excise taxes, accorded the most-favored customer (other than the Government, the American National Red Cross, and the purchasers of typewriting machines for educational purposes only) of the manufacturer of such machines during the six-month period immediately preceding such quarter.*

(510) *SEC. 1116. No payment shall be made from appropriations in this Act to any officer on the retired lists of the Regular Army, Regular Navy, Regular Marine Corps, Regular Air Force, Regular Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service for a period of two years after retirement who for himself or for others*

is engaged in the selling of or contracting for the sale of or negotiating for the sale of to any agency of the Department of Defense, the Coast Guard, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Public Health Service any supplies or war materials.

This Act may be cited as the "General Appropriation Act, 1951".

Passed the House of Representatives May 10, 1950.

Attest: RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk.

Passed the Senate with amendments August 4 (legislative day, July 20), 1950.

Attest: LESLIE L. BIFFLE,
Secretary.

81ST CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 7786

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

AUGUST 4, 1950

Ordered to be printed with the amendments of the Senate numbered

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Can the amendments to be proposed by the Senator from Illinois be stated and voted on en bloc?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall be willing to have that done. I have prepared the amendments in groups, according to the chapters of the bill to which they are offered; and for the sake of neatness I think it would be better to have the amendments stated in that way, by chapters.

So I send the first group of amendments to the desk and ask that they be stated and considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments will be considered en bloc, and they will be stated at this time.

The CHIEF CLERK. The following amendments are proposed:

On page 72, line 8, strike the figure "$6,000,000" and insert "$5,750,000."

On page 81, line 17, strike the figure "$6,200,000" and insert "$5,900,000."

On page 83, line 18, strike the figure "$4,600,000" and insert "$4,000,000."

On page 89, line 2, strike the figure "$22,500,000" and insert "$15,000,000."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, these proposals, I hope, will be voted on en bloc. They would effect total reductions of $8,650,000 in the appropriations for the Department of Commerce. In most cases, the amendments would result in having the bill provide for the same appropriations as those made for these purposes last year.

In the case of forest highways, the amendments propose a reduction of $7,500,000 in the appropriation, because of the large amount of funds appropriated for that purpose in the past.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments of the Senator from Illinois, which are to be voted on en bloc. [Putting the question.]

The "noes" seem to have it; and the "noes" have it, and the amendments are rejected.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I offer another group of amendments which I send to the desk and ask to have stated and considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments will be considered en bloc, and will now be stated en bloc.

The CHIEF CLERK. The following amendments are proposed:

On page 128, line 16, strike the figure "$1,382,000" and insert "$1,227,000."

On page 128, line 19, strike the figure "$1,861,000" and insert "$1,800,000."

On page 129, line 14, strike the figure "$714,000" and insert "$700,000."

On page 130, line 2, strike the figure "$281,000" and insert "$250,000."

On page 130, line 8, strike the figure "$2,788,000" and insert "$2,700,000."

On page 134, line 11, strike the figure "$2,000,000" and insert "$1,500,000."

On page 135, line 4, strike the figure "$9,896,400" and insert "$9,000,000."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, these are proposals for reductions in the appropriations for administrative expenses for the Department of Labor. In the past I have been charged with proposing reductions for Government departments other than the Department of Labor, and with treating the Department of Labor more gently. However, that is not the case. These reductions would total $1,225,000.

Mr. President, this afternoon, when I told a fellow Senator that I intended to offer these amendments, he said to me, "You are suffering from an extreme case of masochism." I did not at the time know just what that word meant, but I later found out that it meant "one who likes to inflict pain upon himself."

Mr. President, I assure the Senate that this is not true, yet I admit that it is not at all pleasant for me to offer these amendments, in the face of a tired and somewhat hostile Senate; but the pruning knife should be used on the appropriations items for all the departments—on those for which one may have a sentimental affection, as well as on the others.

I do not think these amendments, if adopted, would cripple the Department of Labor in the slightest. In fact, the Department could still go ahead with its program if it saved an additional $1,225,000.

I suppose these amendments will find favor with many Senators who voted down amendments pertaining to flood control and navigation appropriations. These amendments will give some Senators a chance to crack down on the Department of Labor. I hope Senators will indulge in their sadistic desires in that connection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments proposed by the Senator from Illinois. [Putting the question.]

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I am glad that my amendments received two or three votes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the Chair state the result. The "noes" seem to have it; the "noes" have it, and the amendments are rejected.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I call up, finally, by amendment lettered "B," and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 366, before the period in line 16, it is proposed to insert a colon and the following: "*Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated herein shall be used for construction of the Pine Flat Reservoir or the Isabella Reservoir, Calif., unless (1), within 6 months following the date of enactment of this act, the Secretary of the Army shall have received reports with respect to the division of costs of such projects among flood control, irrigation, and other water uses from the Bureau of Reclamation and local organizations and, within 9 months following the date of enactment of this act, the Secretary of the Army, with the concurrence of the Secretary of the Interior, shall have made a determination as to the allocation of such costs, and (2) repayment contracts, complying with the provisions of the reclamation laws and covering the portion of such costs allocated to irrigation and assigned for repayment by the owners of such lands, shall have been entered into by the Secretary of the Interior with irrigation, reclamation, or water districts or associations embracing at least 75 percent of the lands within the respective projects."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President——

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wonder whether my good friend, the Senator from California, will withhold the point of order for 5 minutes, until I can explain the purpose of the amendment. I hope the Senator will not try to drop the guillotine upon my hapless head too quickly.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to be courteous to the Senator, and of course I wish him to have an opportunity to express his purpose. I wonder whether he will file his statement for the RECORD.

However, I shall withhold the point of order.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator very much.

Let me say first that the first part of my amendment is in line with a proposal made by the senior Senator from Arizona last year in reference to the Isabella Reservoir alone. It was approved by the Senate then, but rejected in conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California withhold the point of order?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I withhold the point of order temporarily, Mr. President, but I wish it understood that I do not desire to lose my right to the floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from California.

Let me say that the amendment relates to the appropriation of funds for the continuing of construction of the Pine Flat Reservoir and of the Isabella Reservoir, in California, the total estimated costs for which are about $65,000,000; $13,250,000 is the amount of the appropriations now carried in this bill for these projects, but this amendment does not propose to reduce this figure. It merely imposes certain conditions on the expenditure of the funds.

Mr. President, this amendment is designed to meet a situation in which there is great danger that the allotment provisions, the acreage limitations, and the antispeculation features of the reclamation laws will be nullified. The amendment would condition the expenditure of further funds, under the appropriation for these two projects, upon a new allocation of the cost assigned to irrigation, and upon the making of repayment contracts in compliance with Federal reclamation laws, by owners of 75 percent of the lands within the project.

Now, Mr. President, the Nation has been providing hundreds of millions of dollars and will eventually spend billions of dollars in the future for irrigation projects, on condition that at least three terms be met: First, that the costs specifically chargeable to irrigation, that is

to say, the principal costs, may be repaid to the Government by those who benefit from it. The interest is forgiven. Second, that there shall be compliance with antispeculation features of the law, so that no one will get speculative profits on the sale of excess lands out of the money invested by the community in the project. Third, that the expenditures by the public are designed to promote the family-sized farm, with a 160-acreage limitation, which in effect is a 320-acreage limitation, because both man and wife are given 160 acres.

Now, the application of the reclamation law to the Kings and Kern River project, to which these two dams relate, has been denied by the water users' representatives, who have said that the reclamation law does not apply, although in my judgment it was clearly intended by Congress as the record of the debate on the bill in 1944 will show.

No repayment agreements have been made by the water users' association in Kings and Kern River Valleys, despite extended communications and negotiations.

No agreements having been signed to make repayment or to impose the 160-acre limitation, the construction of these dams and reservoirs, even without the completion of the irrigation ditches, will enable the landowners to secure a large part of the irrigation benefits through the seepage of underground water. And as pointed out in the letters of the President and of Commissioner Straus, which I inserted in the RECORD last Tuesday, it will then be difficult if not impossible for the Government to enforce the repayment provisions of the law.

The current estimated cost of these two projects is $65,000,000. For Pine Flat alone, on the Kings River, it is $51,121,000, which makes the original offer of $10,000,000 which these people made for repayment, and the figure of $14,250,000, which the Bureau recommended in 1946, quite unreal today. It is now said that irrigation will enjoy 60 percent of the benefits of the Pine Flat Reservoir. When the original estimate of the cost was $19,700,000, and in 1946 when its estimated cost was $36,500,000, then the original repayment figures of from $10,000,000 to $14,000,000 was all right, but now the cost of Pine Flat has gone up to $51,000,000. The irrigation benefits are estimated at 60 percent, but the landowners are refusing to meet the added cost.

On the Isabella project on the Keru River no offers of repayment of any amount have been made.

If we do not deal with this issue now, we shall find that all through the Central Valley in California we shall be constructing reservoirs and irrigation ditches without the water users signing up and agreeing to obey the law, and then, once the ditches have been built, once the reservoirs are there, the landowners will get the benefits and the Nation will hold the bag. The water users in other parts of the valley who have already signed up repayment contracts in compliance with the law can then justly claim discrimination, and our reclamation policies will be seriously endangered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, before renewing my point of order I desire to read to the Senate and to place in the RECORD a brief telegram addressed to me under date of August 3. It is from Carmel, Calif., is signed by Gilbert H. Jertberg, and reads as follows:

CARMEL, CALIF., *August 3, 1950.*

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Proposed rider to appropriation bill is a strong arm, arbitrary proposal obviously inspired by Bureau of Reclamation to get results it cannot get by propaganda and negotiations. It is contrary to Pine Flat project unanimously passed by Congress. It would be utterly unjust to Kings River water users, who are honestly and sincerely attempting to preserve their rights, maintain local administration in the public interest, and at the same time pay a fair price for irrigation benefits of Pine Flat. Rider would not permit sufficient time for negotiaion of fair contract and would thereby stop work and cause blame to be placed on local water users to the delight of the propaganda mill of the Bureau. Local water users at their own expense, without Federal aid, have built up great irrigation system through democratic processes and have demonstrated their capacity to administer these resources in the public interest. The 35,000 farm families in this area should not be clubbed into a contract, but should be permitted to deal with their Government in a fair and independent manner. In my opinion, the rider should be vigorously opposed and thoroughly defeated in the interest of fair play and democratic processes.

GILBERT H. JERTBERG.

My point of order is that the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois is out of order, both by reason of the fact that it is legislation on the appropriation bill, and also that it provides for certain contingencies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has read the amendment. It is obvious that the point of order is well taken, and it is sustained. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wonder whether the Senator from California would withdraw his point of order, and the Chair would reverse his ruling, if I now modify my amendment so as to eliminate the first proviso of the amendment. It would then read:

Provided further, That none of the funds appropriated herein shall be used for construction of the Pine Flat Reservoir or the Isabella Reservoir, California, unless—

I now omit the first proviso—

unless repayment contracts, complying with the provisions of the reclamation laws and covering the portion of such costs allocated to irrigation and assigned for repayment by the owners of such lands, shall have been entered into by the Secretary of the Interior with irrigation, reclamation, or water districts or associations embracing at least 75 percent of the lands within the respective projects.

Mr. President, this is not legislation. In its present form it is a restriction that we shall not go on with the construction unless there is an assurance that the people who benefit from the construction will agree to abide by the existing laws under which these appropriations are to be made.

This suggestion was first made in the Senate hearings, not by the Bureau of Reclamation, but by Mr. M. C. Hermann, Quartermaster Adjutant of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Department of California. It was earlier proposed by the President. It will merely limit the expenditure to require compliance with reclamation law and should be added to the bill as a restriction on the appropriation. It is not affirmative legislation.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I renew my point of order on that, because it provides for a contingency. I still think it is out of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is well taken, and it is sustained. The bill is open for further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 7786) was read the third time.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I shall support the pending bill, but with certain very definite reservations.

In my judgment, the bill is wholly unrealistic. It contains too many chunks of fat—fat which the United States may sorely need during the critical period ahead. And I am not talking about "pork."

The appropriations provided for are based on the situation as it existed prior to June 27, when the President ordered our Armed Forces into war. The bill does not take into consideration events which have occurred since that time. Recent developments have completely changed the picture.

As pointed out by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] 2 days ago, the President has submitted supplemental requests for appropriations totaling approximately $16,640,000,000. This total includes $10,500,000,000 for the Department of Defense, $4,000,000,000 for additional military aid to Europe, $260,000,000 for atomic energy, $600,000,000 for stockpiling, $89,000,000 for the Voice of America, $46,000,000 for the Post Office Department deficit, and $950,000,000 for additional planes for the Navy.

Before June 27, we had the word of Secretary of Defense Johnson that our national defense were "sufficient unto the moment." We know now that our national defenses are not sufficient unto the moment. Yet, the appropriations proposed in the pending bill for nondefense spending are based on the thinking previous to June 27.

I joined economy-minded Senators in supporting the Bridges-Byrd amendment which, as finally approved, provided for an over-all reduction of 10 percent of funds for most nondefense items. This amendment was desirable. I congratulate those responsible for a worthwhile accomplishment—but the reduction provided for is wholly insufficient to meet the realities of the situation.

I cannot justify the exemption of ECA from the operation of this amendment. I cannot justify saying to the American

people, "You must draw in your belts; you must do without those new roads, those new public buildings, and many other badly needed projects here at home," and at the same time saying to the governments of the Marshall plan countries, "Go right ahead with your electric power projects, your new public buildings, your new roads, in your colonies, everywhere—the United States will finance them all. Uncle Sam will pay the bills."

It is tragic for this country to continue to give away to Britain and other Marshall-plan countries huge quantities of vital materials of war, such as iron, steel, aluminum, and copper, only to have those same countries sell the same items to Russia and her satellites. Yet the Senate rejected an amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] which would have corrected this situation. In doing so it refused to lift a finger against the action of Great Britain, for example, in selling twice as much electrical machinery to Russia during May 1950 as she sold during April 1950.

Mr. President, for a number of years the administration has pursued a policy of managed inflation. The idea has been to keep the fires of inflation burning—just slowly burning. The vast spending programs provided for in the pending bill would have continued this managed-inflation policy. The Korean war threatens to turn managed inflation into rampant inflation, with all its dreadful consequences.

Some of us have opposed managed inflation. All of us agree that an immediate effort should be made to curb rampant inflation. Few of us seem willing to do what is necessary to attack the problem at its roots. Where there is no will, there is no way.

The pending bill represents politics as usual. Every vote-buying program has been retained. There has been no retreat from the prewar political program, with its liberal infusions of socialism. Mr. President, must disaster overcome us before the Congress will put our finances on a war basis?

Nevertheless, the business of Government must go on. Above all, adequate funds must be provided for our national defense and to win the Korean war. A portion of the appropriations provided for in the pending bill are for strengthening our Armed Forces. I have voted for all defense appropriations in the past. I desire to vote for defense appropriations now. To do so we must swallow some bitter pills. They are made no less bitter on account of an obvious effort to give some of them a palatable political coating. But we have no alternative. Accordingly, I shall vote for the pending bill, but with misgivings and a premonition of evil.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the final passage of the bill.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a copy of the so-called Byrd-Bridges amendment, together with a memorandum from Frederick J. Lawton, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, with accompanying tables.

There being no objection, the amendment, memorandums, and tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Amendment proposed by Mr. BYRD (for himself, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. WHERRY, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. CORDON, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. HOEY, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. ECTON, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. IVES, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. THYE, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. JENNER, Mr. TAFT, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. DARBY, Mr. KEM, Mr. MALONE, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. MARTIN, and Mr. BRICKER) (H. R. 7786): In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken by the committee amendment on page 476 and 477, beginning in line 21 (sec. 1114), insert the following:

"SEC. 1114. Except as hereinafter provided, each appropriation, reappropriation, and contract authorization or reauthorization, made by this act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, to any department or agency in the executive branch of the Government (including funds of Government corporations authorized by this act for administrative expenses), is hereby reduced by 10 percent.

"SEC. 1115. In order to provide for the most effective use of appropriations and contract authorizations reduced by section 1114, the head of each department and agency in the executive branch of the Government is hereby authorized to make adjustments and transfers between such appropriations, and between such contract authorizations, within his department or agency; but no such appropriation or contract authorization shall be increased under the authority of this section to an amount in excess of that provided in other chapters of this act.

"SEC. 1116. The reductions provided for in section 1114 shall not apply to the following:

"(a) Title II of chapter IV; chapter X; so much of title I of chapter X–B as is contained in the paragraph headed 'Mutual Defense Assistance'; and the amount appropriated to the General Services Administration for carrying out the provisions of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act of July 23, 1946;

"(b) Appropriations in title I of chapter VIII for the Executive Office of the President under the headings 'Compensation of the President', 'The White House Office', 'Emergency Fund for the President', and 'Executive Mansion and Grounds';

"(c) Appropriations and contract authorizations for the atomic energy program;

"(d) Trust funds;

"(e) Funds of Government corporations excluding those made available in this act (1) for administrative expenses and (2) by appropriation from the general fund of the Treasury;

"(f) Amounts (other than under the Veterans' Administration) for furnishing medical and hospital services and domiciliary care, excluding (1) administrative expenses not directly connected with the operation of a specific hospital, dispensary, or clinic, and (2) expenses for employee health service programs;

"(g) Amounts provided in this act for payment of obligations incurred under prior appropriations or authorizations, and obligated balances of reappropriations;

"(h) Appropriations of, or measured by, receipts;

"(i) Amounts appropriated by this act for the operation of law enforcement agencies, including the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Bureau of Customs, Immigration and Naturalization Services, and the Secret Service; or for the payment of compensation and expenses of agents and auditors of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, and such other officers and employees of other agencies whose duties primarily pertain to intelligence operations (including funds transferred pursuant to section 6 (a) of the act of June 20, 1949; 63 Stat. 211) or to the investigation, apprehension, prosecution, or detention of persons suspected or convicted of offenses against the criminal laws of the United States;

"(j) Amounts provided for any program of the Veterans' Administration, excluding (1) administrative expenses not directly connected with the operation of a specific hospital, dispensary, clinic, or facility, and (2) expenses for employee health service programs;

"(k) Amounts provided for payments to States or political subdivisions thereof;

"(l) Amounts provided to make payment of or contributions toward pensions, retirement and disability annuities and benefits, employees' death or injury benefits, or other items of a similar nature; and

"(m) Appropriations for refunds, awards, and indemnities."

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., July 17, 1950.

Memorandum for Senator HARRY F. BYRD:

In accordance with your request, we have analyzed the proposed amendment as it appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 14. This analysis is not a 100 percent refined job because a number of items involved relate to parts of appropriations, which parts only are affected by the amendment. It is, however, substantially accurate as we interpret the amendment.

Some items which may be exempted under more than one head have, in the attached table, been eliminated in the first amendment which affects them. An example of this is stockpiling, which in its entirety is eliminated under section 1003 (a), although part of the appropriation fund is for the liquidation of prior contract authorizations and would be covered by section 1003 (g). We have treated loan authorizations to noncorporate activities in the same manner as appropriations and contract authorizations, assuming that this was the intent of the amendment.

FREDERICK J. LAWTON,
Director.

Analysis of Bridges-Byrd amendment adjusted to take into account changes made in foreign aid chapter by action from the floor

AMOUNTS CONTAINED IN H. R. 7786 AS REPORTED BY THE SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE, ADJUSTED TO INCLUDE INCREASES IN THE FOREIGN AID CHAPTER RESULTING FROM FLOOR ACTION

[000,000 omitted]

Appropriations	$32,581
Contract authorizations	2,133
Reappropriations	333
Loan authorizations (Rural Electrification Administration and Farmers Home Administration, ECA through Export-Import Bank)	800
Administrative expense limitations on Government corporations	81
Trust accounts carried in bill	63
Apropriations of or measured by receipts specifically authorized in bill	62
Total authorizations contained in H. R. 7786	36,103

AMOUNTS OF AUTHORIZATIONS EXEMPT FROM THIS PROVISION, ADJUSTED TO TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THE SMITH AND M'CARRAN-O'MAHONEY AMENDMENTS

Section 1001, agencies outside the executive branch of the Government: Legislative, the judiciary, and contribution to the District of Columbia	—$115

Section 1003, title II of chapter IV, chapter X; and so much of title I of chapter X-B as is contained in the paragraph under the head "Mutual defense assistance" and the amount appropriated to GSA for carrying out the provisions of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act of July 23, 1946:

(a) Title II, chapter IV	$527
Chapter X	14,681
So much of title I of chapter X-B as is contained in the paragraph under the head "Mutual defense assistance"	1,678
Amount appropriated to General Services Administration for carrying out the provisions of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act of July 23, 1946	730
	−17,616
(b) Appropriations in title I of chapter VII for the Executive Office of the President under the headings "Compensation of the President," "The White House Office," "Emergency fund for the President," and "Executive Mansion and grounds"	−2
(c) Apropriations and contract authorizations for the atomic-energy program	−948
(d) Trust funds	−63
(e) Funds of Government corporations excluding those made available in this act (1) for administrative expenses, and (2) by appropriation from the general fund of the Treasury	--------
(f) Amounts (other than under the Veterans' Administration) for furnishing medical and hospital services and domiciliary care, excluding (1) administrative expenses not directly connected with the operation of a specific hospital, dispensary, or clinic, and (2) expenses for employee health-service programs	−48
(g) Amounts provided in this act for payment of obligations incurred under prior appropriations or authorizations, and obligated balances of reappropriations	−931
(h) Appropriations of, or measured by, receipts	−62
(i) Amounts appropriated by this act for the operation of law enforcement agencies, including the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Bureau of Customs, Immigration and Naturalization Services, and Secret Service; or for the payment of compensation and expenses of agents and and auditors of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, and such other officers and employees of other agencies whose duties primarily pertain to intelligence operations (including funds transferred pursuant to sec. 6 (a) of the act of June 20, 1949; 63 Stat. 211, or to the investigation, apprehension, prosecution, or detention of persons suspected or convicted of offenses against the criminal laws of the United States	−247

Section 1003, title II of chapter IV, chapter X, etc.—Continued

(j) Amounts provided for any program of the Veterans' Administration, excluding (1) administrative expenses not directly connected with the operation of a specific hospital dispensary, clinic, or facility, and (2) expenses for employee health service programs	−$5,266
(k) Amounts provided for payments to States or political subdivisions thereof	−1,827
(l) Amounts provided to make payment of or contributions toward pensions, retirement and disability annuities and benefits, employees' death or injury benefits, or other items of similar nature	−781
(m) Appropriations for refunds, awards, and indemnities	−73
Floor amendments to foreign aid chapter	−2,839
Amount of authorizations in the bill subject to 10 percent reduction	5,300

Schedule of amounts included in H. R. 7786 as reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee (exempt under sec. 1003 (f))

Indian Service	$10,800,000
Panama Canal	2,300,000
Penal institutions	1,000,000
Freedman's Hospital	2,500,000
St. Elizabeths Hospital (direct)	2,000,000
Public Health Service	29,300,000
Air Force (not identifiable)	----------
	47,900,000

Excludes Veterans' Administration; health programs; administrative expenses not identifiable with a particular hospital, dispensary, or clinic.

Schedule of amounts included in H. R. 7786 as reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee (exempt under sec. 1003 (g))

CHAPTER III

State Department: Salaries and expenses, Philippine Rehabilitation	$10,000,000
Justice Department: Federal prison system; buildings and equipment, penal institutions	540,000
Commerce Department:	
CAA:	
Establishment of air-navigation facilities	22,000,000
Federal-aid airport program	34,000,000
Construction of public airports, Territory of Alaska	3,200,000
Air navigation development	2,885,000
Bureau of Public Roads:	
Elimination of grade-crossings	4,600,000
Federal-aid postwar construction program	385,000,000
Forest highways	22,500,000

CHAPTER V

Federal Security Agency: Howard University, construction of buildings	1,662,000
Public Health Service:	
Grants for hospital construction	100,000,000
Operating expenses, National Cancer Institute	5,000,000
Public Health Service—Con.	
Mental health activities	$2,375,000
Operating expenses, National Heart Institute	5,350,000
Construction of research facilities	11,100,000
St. Elizabeths Hospital:	
Construction and equipment	100,000
Construction and equipment of two treatment buildings	1,500,000

CHAPTER VII

Interior Department:	
Office of Secretary, construction, Southwestern Power Administration	5,000,000
Bonneville Power Administration; Construction, Bonneville power transmission system	17,000,000
Bureau of Land Management, construction	200,000
Bureau of Indian Affairs, health, education, and welfare service (permanent indefinite)	1,000,000
Bureau of Indian Affairs, construction	8,737,500
Bureau of Reclamation, construction and rehabilitation	4,595,700
Bureau of Mines, construction	550,000
National Park Service, construction and land acquisition	7,935,000
Fish and Wildlife Service, construction	50,000
Territories and island possessions, construction of roads, Alaska	8,000,000
Territories and island possessions, Alaska Railroad, special fund (permanent indefinite special account)	17,000,000

CHAPTER VIII

Independent offices (excluding AEC):	
American Battle Monuments Commission, construction of memorials and cemeteries	5,000,000
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, construction and equipment	15,000,000
U. S. Maritime Commission, ship construction	30,000,000
VA, hospital and domiciliary facilities	160,000,000
General Services Administration:	
Acquisition and construction of Federal office building, Nashville, Tenn	1,200,000
Federal Courts Building, District of Columbia	6,000,000
GAO Building, Washington, D. C	15,358,194
Renovation and modernization, Executive Mansion	3,400,000
Alaska public works	4,000,000
Advance planning of non-Federal public works	14,100,000
Total cash to liquidate contract authorization	930,938,394

Schedule of amounts included in H. R. 7786 as reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee (exempt under sec. 1003 (i))

Department of Justice:	
Federal Bureau of Investigation	$57,400,000
Immigration and Naturalization Service	31,400,000
District Attorney	6,447,000

Treasury Department:	
Bureau of Customs	$36,866,360
Secret Service	3,368,000
Internal Revenue	100,000,000
Bureau of Narcotics	1,908,000
Sec. 6 (a) of act of June 20, 1949 (63 Stat. 211)	9,500,000
Total	246,829,360

Schedule of amounts included in H. R. 7786 as reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee (exempt under sec. 1003 (k))

(Exempt under sec. 1003 (k))

	Millions
Federal Security Agency:	
Payments to States, Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended	$20.6
Grants to States for public assistance	1,200.0
Grants to States for maternal and child welfare	22.0
Control of venereal diseases	11.9
Control of tuberculosis	6.3
Assistance to States, general	14.2
Promotion of vocational education	20.0
Grants for hospital construction	150.0
Other	10.0
Department of Agriculture:	
National school lunch program	$83.5
Payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska and Puerto Rico	27.1
Payment to States, experimental stations	12.0
Housing and Home Finance Agency:	
Slum clearance and urban development program (annual contributions)	9.3
Department of Commerce:	
War and emergency damage, Territory of Hawaii	3.0
Federal-aid airport program	36.7
Department of Labor: Grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service administration	178.5
Other agencies	22.0
Total	1,827.0

Schedule of amounts included in H. R. 7786 as reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee (exempt under sec. 1003 (l))

(Exempt under sec. 1003 (l))

Civil Service Commission:	
Panama Canal construction annuity fund	$2,803,177
Civil Service retirement and disability fund	305,000,000
Treasury Department: Retired pay, Coast Guard	$15,575,000
Railroad Retirement Board: Railroad retirement appropriated fund	457,832,724
Total	781,210,901

Schedule of amounts included in H. R. 7786 as reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee (exempt under sec. 1003 (m))

(Exempt under sec. 1003 (m))

Philippine War Damage Commission	$40,200,000
Federal Security Agency: Bureau of Employees Compensation appropriation	25,000,000
General Service Administration: Refunds under Renegotiation Act	7,400,000
Total	72,600,000

Schedule of amounts included in the foreign-aid chapter of H. R. 7786 which were exempt by amendments offered from the floor

Economic cooperation	$2,726,761,473
International children's welfare work	12,500,000
Spanish loan	100,000,000

Reductions in amounts carried in general appropriation bill, 1951, as reported by Senate committee under Bridges-Byrd amendment

Agency	Appropriations	Contract authorizations	Loan authorizations	Administrative expenses	Grand total
District of Columbia—Federal contribution					
Legislative establishment					
State Department	$18,465,307	$700,000		$76,750	$19,242,057
Justice Department	1,491,000	70,000		71,500	1,632,500
Commerce Department	22,399,800	2,401,600			24,801,400
Judiciary					
Treasury Department	39,486,800				39,486,800
Post Office Department					
Labor Department	3,007,310				3,007,310
Federal Security Agency	10,051,625	428,800			10,480,425
Related labor agencies	1,297,420				1,297,420
Agriculture Department	64,567,366		$70,035,000	2,048,400	136,650,766
Interior:					
Reclamation	32,056,400	300,000			32,356,400
Other	23,243,188	3,483,000		12,148	26,738,336
Independent offices:					
Executive Office of the President	371,200				371,200
General Services Administration	[1] 14,224,228	3,486,700			[1] 17,710,928
Housing and Home Finance Agency	1,640,000			2,563,900	4,203,900
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	4,472,563	1,250,000			5,722,563
U. S. Maritime Commission	[1] 11,616,779	6,300,000			[1] 17,916,779
Veterans' Administration	[1] 38,755,600				[1] 38,755,600
Other	21,133,950	150,000		456,800	21,740,750
Army, Civil:					
Corps of Engineers	73,154,600				73,154,600
Other	3,137,862			82,000	3,219,862
National Security Council					
National Security Resources Board					
Department of Defense:					
Office of the Secretary of Defense					
Army					
Navy					
Air Force					
Economic cooperation					
Assistance to Korea	9,000,000				9,000,000
International Children's Welfare Work					
International development (point 4)	2,690,000				2,690,000
Mutual defense assistance					
Government and relief in occupied areas	28,800,000				28,800,000
Government in occupied Germany	2,700,000				2,700,000
Aid to Palestine refugees	2,745,000				2,745,000
Reconstruction Finance Corporation				2,670,000	2,670,000
Export-Import Bank of Washington				96,500	96,500
Total	430,507,998	18,570,100	70,035,000	8,077,998	527,191,096
Total amount to which cuts apply	4,305,079,980	185,701,000	700,350,000	80,779,980	5,271,910,960

Footnotes at end of table.

Reductions in amounts carried in general appropriation bill, 1951, as reported by Senate committee under Bridges-Byrd amendment—Con.

Agency	Total subject to 10-percent amendment cut	Total exempt from 10-percent amendment cut	Total carried in H. R. 7786 (including reappropriations)	Total available under 10-percent amendment cut
District of Columbia—Federal contribution		$12,000,000	$12,000,000	$12,000,000
Legislative establishment		79,305,795	79,305,795	79,305,795
State Department	$192,420,570	19,829,998	212,250,568	193,008,511
Justice Department	16,325,000	127,042,000	143,367,000	141,734,500
Commerce Department	248,014,000	508,885,000	756,899,000	732,097,600
Judiciary		23,478,665	23,478,665	23,478,665
Treasury Department	394,868,000	157,937,360	552,805,360	513,318,560
Post Office Department		526,500,000	526,500,000	526,500,000
Labor Department	30,073,100	178,500,000	208,573,100	205,565,790
Federal Security Agency	104,804,250	1,643,488,760	1,748,293,010	1,737,812,585
Related labor agencies	12,974,200	457,832,724	470,806,924	469,509,504
Agriculture Department	1,366,507,660	134,662,914	1,501,170,574	1,364,519,808
Interior:				
Reclamation	323,564,000	3,540,000	327,104,000	294,747,600
Other	267,383,360	60,348,670	327,732,030	300,993,694
Independent offices:				
Executive Office of the President	3,712,000	3,001,553	6,713,553	6,342,353
General Services Administration	177,109,280	782,043,199	959,152,479	941,441,551
Housing and Home Finance Agency	42,039,000	9,250,000	51,289,000	47,085,100
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	57,225,630	15,000,000	72,225,630	66,503,067
U. S. Maritime Commission	179,167,790	39,999,997	219,167,787	201,251,008
Veterans' Administration	387,556,000	5,774,979,400	5,813,735,000	5,774,979,400
Other	217,407,500	1,300,743,185	1,518,350,685	1,496,609,935
Army, Civil:				
Corps of Engineers	731,546,000		731,546,000	658,391,400
Other	32,198,620		32,198,620	28,978,758
National Security Council		160,000	160,000	160,000
National Security Resources Board		3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense		358,300,000	358,300,000	358,300,000
Army		4,088,377,521	4,088,377,521	4,088,377,521
Navy		4,678,754,300	4,678,754,300	4,678,754,300
Air Force		5,551,275,000	5,551,275,000	5,551,275,000
Economic cooperation		[1] 2,726,761,473	2,726,761,473	2,726,761,473
Assistance to Korea	90,000,000		90,000,000	81,000,000
International Children's Welfare Work		[1] 12,500,000	12,500,000	12,500,000
International development (point 4)	26,900,000		26,900,000	24,210,000
Mutual defense assistance		1,678,023,729	1,678,023,729	1,678,023,729
Government and relief in occupied areas	288,000,000		288,000,000	259,200,000
Government in occupied Germany	27,000,000		27,000,000	24,300,000
Aid to Palestine refugees	27,450,000		27,450,000	24,705,000
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	26,700,000		26,700,000	24,030,000
Export-Import Bank of Washington	965,000	[2] 100,000,000	100,965,000	100,868,500
Total	5,271,910,960	30,707,420,843	35,979,331,803	35,452,140,707
Total amount to which cuts apply				

[1] Exempt under the Smith amendment.
[2] Exempt under McCarran-O'Mahoney amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in order to save time, I ask unanimous consent that a statement which I wanted to make as a speech on the floor, relative to the meat inspection amendment, be placed in the RECORD at this point as a statement.

There being no objection, Mr. WHERRY's statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Bridges-Byrd amendment reducing appropriations for nondefense items in the general appropriations bill by 10 percent is so written that the Secretary of Agriculture has authority to maintain the full personnel strength of the Meat Inspection Service.

The budget message presented by the President in January requested an appropriation of $12,959,000 for fiscal year 1951. The House and Senate each voted an appropriation of $12,800,000, $159,000 below the budget estimate, but $223,000 above the appropriation for 1950.

The appropriation of $12,800,000 is the top amount which the Secretary is authorized to spend in fiscal 1951. He may spend less if he so desires. In the fiscal year 1949, for instance, the Meat Inspection Service spent $292,234 less than the $12,555,000 appropriated.

The average number of employees of the Meat Inspection Service was 3,299 in 1949 and is estimated at 3,267 in 1950. If the full budget estimate had been voted by the Senate, 3,220 employees would have been employed in fiscal 1951, according to the budget estimate.

The effect of the Bridges-Byrd amendment is to reduce every appropriation title subject to the reduction formula by 10 percent. Technically, the Meat Inspection Service will reflect this 10 percent reduction. The necessity for this technical reduction of appropriations arises from the requirement that appropriation figures be clear in the final bill for purposes of Federal budgeting and accounting.

The second section of the Bridges-Byrd amendment, however, authorizes transfers between departmental appropriations up to the amounts appropriated elsewhere in the bill. If the Secretary of Agriculture considers meat inspection to be of such importance, he may transfer from less important appropriations sufficient funds to provide $12,800,000 for the Meat Inspection Service in fiscal 1951.

The funds appropriated for the Meat Inspection Service represent approximately 1½ percent of the total amount appropriated for the Department of Agriculture. A transfer of slightly more than one-tenth of 1 percent of funds appropriated to the Secretary can keep the meat inspection at the level provided by the appropriation agreed upon in the House and Senate elsewhere in the bill.

While the appropriations bill was on the Senate floor, legislative history was written and appears on page 11899 of the RECORD. Senator RUSSELL, of Georgia, chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture of the Senate Appropriations Committee, declared: "We have provided a 10 percent cut in the Department, and left it up to the Secretary of Agriculture to make the cut. The Secretary of Agriculture knows the relative values of the various offices. If he cuts meat inspectors unduly, we can deal with it in the same deficiency bill in which we deal with other items for which it will be necessary for us to make deficiency appropriations."

In this connection, and so that there may be no mistake as to congressional intent, I submit the record of proceedings on this floor yesterday on my amendment to assure maintenance of the meat inspection service at full program, because of its vital importance to the public health and the production of dressed meat supplies adequate to meet our civilian and military requirements:

"Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be read and immediately considered.

"The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

"The CHIEF CLERK. On page 180, before the period in line 9, it is proposed to insert a colon and the following: 'Provided, That nothing contained in this act shall be construed to reduce or authorize any reduction in this appropriation or in the number of meat inspectors authorized to be paid from this appropriation.'

"Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the amendment is probably very trivial to be considered along with a $52,000,000,000 appropriation bill. I think it involves 256 meat inspectors and provides that they shall not be laid off, as a measure of protecting the health of the country.

"Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, was it the intention of the Senator to cut the reduction applicable to the Department of Agriculture, or simply provide that this part of the activities of the Department of Agriculture should not be affected in the adjustment of the cut by the Secretary of Agriculture between various divisions, bureaus, and offices in the Department of Agriculture?

"Mr. WHERRY. The latter part of the Senator's statement is what I intended. The Bridges amendment permits the Secretary to transfer employees to different departments. My amendment would permit the retention of these inspectors without a cut, notwithstanding the Bridges amendment.

"Mr. HOLLAND. And it would not reduce the amount of the reduction accomplished under the Bridges amendment?

"Mr. WHERRY. Oh, no.

"Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

"Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, there is no question about the importance of meat inspection, but there are other items in the agricultural chapter of the appropriation bill which are just as important. Some Senator remarked to me a few minutes ago that no sooner would this amendment be agreed to than Senators would be marching down the aisle with amendments on other items.

"Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I think the Forest Service employees are just as important as meat inspectors, and if this amendment shall be agreed to, it is my purpose to suggest an amendment providing that the Forest Service employees be exempted.

"Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I do not think we should approach this matter in this way. We have provided a 10-percent cut in the Department, and left it up to the Secretary of Agriculture to make the cut. The Secretary of Agriculture knows the relative values of the various offices. If he cuts meat inspectors unduly, we can deal with it in the same deficiency bill in which we deal with other items for which it will be necessary for us to make deficiency appropriations.

"Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

"Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

"Mr. MAYBANK. I merely wish to say that I voted to reduce appropriations for the Marshall plan. That is now not included in the reduction which has been made. Other departments were cut, including the Department of Agriculture, which will have to take most of the cut. I voted against that cut. I thoroughly agree with the Senator from Georgia that we should not start exempting sections of the Agricultural Department appropriations. I voted against cutting the appropriations for the agencies of the Government, but voted to cut the appropriations for the foreign activities.

"Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, it would be necessary to offer a number of amendments to other items to exempt them, and if we start on such a practice, Senators will have been able to go on record as voting for a 10-percent cut, and then proceed to vote for amendments which will eliminate any possibility of reducing the appropriation $1. After we have just voted for a 10-percent cut, we should not start to make exemptions. If that is kept up and similar action is taken on all items all of us would like to exempt, we will have made a great play of publicity in cutting appropriations, and then forestalling the cuts by amendments.

"Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

"Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

"Mr. CORDON. Is it not a fact that under the provisions of the amendment just agreed to the authority rests with the head of the department to make any transfers which may be needed, or advisable, or desirable, to increase the efficiency and protect the essential services of his department?

"Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct.

"Mr. CORDON. And we do not need any such provision as that now proposed, do we?

"Mr. RUSSELL. No.

"Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

"Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

"Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, now that I have that statement from the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and from the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], and before any Senator proposes to modify the amendment or take exception to it, I should like also to ask the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] if he agrees with the statement made by the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Oregon that the Secretary has power to transfer these funds.

"Mr. BRIDGES. Yes."

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, when the Congress convenes next year I think it will seriously consider the repeal of the rule which provides that an appropriation bill may be considered in one package. I am convinced, as the result of the experience we have had this year, that the work we are now going through has saved no money, so far as decreases in appropriations are concerned. I am convinced that we have consumed more time than was necessary in handling this appropriation bill collectively than would have been consumed had we considered the bill in separate categories. I have talked with many Senators and have found none who disagreed with this particular thought.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. With reference to the Senator's last observation, I should like to state that the Senator from Illinois did not talk to me about the matter, and I do not want the RECORD to show that it is the general opinion of Senators. I may be alone, but as a member of the Appropriations Committee, while I agree that the one-package bill can be improved in many ways, I think it gives a broad picture, and I deeply appreciate the so-called one-package appropriation bill. I hope that a future Congress will not repeal it, but will perfect it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I was not consulted by the majority leader, and I want to express my views as being directly opposite to those entertained by him. I feel that both in the Appropriations Committee and on the floor of the Senate, and particularly through the adoption of the amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], of which I had the honor to be a sponsor, money has been saved. I feel that that amendment alone has saved a large amount of money. Therefore, I would say that I am wholeheartedly in favor of the omnibus appropriation bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the clerks at the desk be authorized to change sections numbers and any references to sections or chapters to conform to the action taken by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I desire to make another statement. I did not know that anything was to be said about procedure of having a unified, omnibus appropriation bill. I want to say that I think the old plan of division into a number of bills is infinitely better. It is better for the Government, better for the taxpayers, better for those who are in charge of the bill, and better for all of us than having one bill. I hope Senators will not make up their minds too quickly on the subject. It is a terrible task to handle a one-package appropriation bill. I speak from experience, because I am the first one in the Senate who has had charge of a bill of this kind. So far as I know it is the most terrible experience I have had in my whole life. I hope very much that the Senate and the House will agree to go back to the old plan.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I most respectfully urge that we give very careful consideration before we change to the old plan from the present unified, overall appropriation bill. I do not say that the present system is the best system, but I believe it is a step in the right direction. It can be improved with experience. As one member of the Committee on Appropriations I sat on six subcommittees, and I feel that I know more about the present appropriation bill than I ever knew about any other bill that has come before the Senate. I think the table printed at page 3 of the report is itself worth more to the Senate, in giving a clear picture of the financial state of the Government than any other statement I have seen in the brief time I have been a Member of the Senate.

I sincerely hope the majority leader will think very carefully and prepare thoughtfully any bill on the subject which he may have in mind to the next session of Congress.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to speak for not more than 2 minutes. I join in the expressions that have been made by my colleagues on this side of the aisle that it would be a great mistake to return to the old system. I have no doubt that a number of improvements could be made in the presentation of this type of bill, perhaps in cutting down the number of subcommittees on which members of the Committee on Appropriations must serve. However, I think that for the first time in the history of the Government, or at least in a great many years, we have had one place where Congress and the American people could focus on what the Federal Government is costing them. I think that is worth-while. I believe that when we throw the white spotlight of publicity on what the cost of Government is, we take a great and constructive step forward in bringing this vast Federal structure under some control.

Mr. CORDON. As another humble worker in the vineyard of appropriations, I wish to join my colleagues on this side of the aisle, and I hope a number of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, who perhaps do not wish to voice their opinion at this time, in urging that we do not abandon the one-package appropriation procedure. I realize that we are faced with another hurdle, which lies ahead of us. It is one which none of us knows exactly how we shall surmount. I am sure, however, that under the leadership of our distinguished chairman we shall surmount it and come out ultimately with a purged and better over-all appropriation measure than the United States has seen in many years. We have some problems to work out, but they can be met, and we can come out ultimately with a far more constructive,

sound, and logical procedure than we have known in the past.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H. R. 7786) was passed.

TRIBUTES TO SENATOR McKELLAR

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I do not intend to submit an amendment, but I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for 3 minutes on a subject germane to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from New Mexico is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the State of Tennessee, throughout the history of the Nation, has contributed great men to public life and to everyday life. Of course, we all know of Andrew Jackson, John Sevier, and Andrew Johnson. We all know of James K. Polk, who obtained more land for this country than any other President of the United States. We all know of the activities of Sam Houston in Tennessee, of Gen. Nathan B. Forrest, of Edward Ward Carmack, of Bob Taylor, of Cordell Hull, and of the late Speaker, Joe Byrns.

I may say to the Senate that, knowing the history of the country—and I pride myself in that—I have never seen a more devoted public servant—barring natural mistakes, probably; yes—but not a more patriotic American, devoting his time to the cause of his Nation, than the President pro tempore of this body, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. I thought it only proper that I should pay my respects to the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR]. [Applause, Senators rising.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). The Chair feels sure that the Senator from New Mexico has expressed full well the sentiments of all the Members of the Senate, as evidenced by their applause and also by the expressions on their faces.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, if I may have 30 seconds, I may say that, as ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee, I have worked for many years with the distinguished chairman of this committee. On behalf of the minority Members of the Senate, I wish to say that we concur in the words of praise spoken by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico. [Applause.]

NEED FOR EXCESS-PROFITS TAX

Mr. McFARLAND obtained the floor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. This morning it was my privilege to appear before the Committee on Finance to urge the adoption of an excess-profits-tax amendment which I presented earlier in the week. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a summary of my remarks before the committee.

There being no objection, Mr. O'MAHONEY's statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEND THE PROFIT DOLLAR TO WAR UNDER AN EXCESS-PROFITS TAX NOW

Unless we are willing to use the profits of the profit system to defend that system in the present all-out ideological conflict with communism, we had better prepare to confront disaster.

Corporate profits are running at an all-time high and are rapidly increasing. Inflationary pressures which were apparent early in the second quarter of this year have been greatly increased by the Korean crisis, and will be further accelerated as soon as the new defense appropriation bills are enacted.

It is not too much to say that by the passage of a bill appropriating $10,000,000,000 for immediate military expenditure and $4,000,000,000 for arming western Europe, as requested by the President, we shall be opening the flood gates of inflation unless we take immediate steps to control this deluge of dollars by new taxes which will prevent private purchasing power from competing with newly created Government purchasing power for the purchase of a short supply of goods and services.

INFLATION BEGAN BEFORE KOREA

The economic facts are plain for all to read. Before Korea consumer credit and bank loans were running at new highs. Government credit, extended by authority of Congress for domestic programs, and Government expenditures in excess of Government receipts, were so increasing the supply of dollars that prices were rising even before the Korean attack began.

Consumer credit outstanding in June 1950 had reached the all-time high of $19,600,000,000. This was almost $1,000,000,000 more than in 1949, and thirteen billions in excess of 1945. Total bank loans and investments in June 1950 amounted to $128,400,000,000, as compared with $120,200,000,000 for 1949, $116,300,000,000 for 1947, and $105,500,000,000 for 1944.

Commodity prices which in 1948 and 1949 were falling from the all-time high of late 1947 and early 1948 began to turn upward early in 1950. In June 1950, the wholesale price index was 157.8 (on the 1926 base), as compared with 155 for 1949, but on July 4 the weekly index had climbed to 159, and 3 weeks later to 163.7. All classes of commodities, industrial and agricultural, have, according to the BLS, been rising more steeply since the outbreak of the war.

On July 21 the BLS reported that the consumer price index which had been relatively stable for 15 months prior to May 20, had begun to rise even before the North Korean attack. By June 15 it had risen nearly 2 percent, to 170.2 on the 1935–39 index. Then came the Korean attack. What has been happening since is evidenced by the fact that new highs were established in July for most commodities, and that, despite some minor declines in a few commodities during the month, the average prices for 28 commodities on spot markets had increased 3.8 percent over the week ended July 25. This meant an increase of 13.6 percent above the prices only a month before.

Thus there can be no disputing the fact that a new and dangerous inflationary trend had appeared before the Korean attack and that it has moved progressively upward since the attack although Government expenditures under the new appropriation bills have not yet begun.

Surely this is warning enough to those of us who will be responsible for the fiscal policies of this Nation that we cannot afford to temporize with this dangerous situation. We must authorize the Government expenditures, but these expenditures can result only in disaster unless at the same time we are willing to curtail civilian spending through a realistic tax program.

It will not be sufficient to rely upon the curtailment of nonessential Government expenditures because even with drastic cuts all along the line on that front the inflationary forces will not be held in check unless we also cut civilian spending.

The military expenditures will have a cumulative effect. Government cash will be laid out for the purchase of military supplies at rising prices. This will generate higher incomes and higher profits and the inflationary snowball will continue to roll.

There can be no doubt that we are in our present dilemma because in the preparation for World War II we did not adopt a sufficiently drastic tax program. We did not have a pay-as-you-go policy then; we were content to pay 45 percent of the current cost out of taxes and to issue IOU's for 55 percent.

There have been other continuing costs flowing directly from the war which the government has had to bear, such as veterans' pensions and benefits, and notably interest upon the national debt. Surely it requires no argument to prove that we should permit nothing to weaken our determination to follow a pay-as-you-go policy now. We cannot think of piling a Korean war debt on top of the unpaid war debt of World War II, and delude ourselves into the belief that we are protecting the profit system.

PAY AS YOU GO OR FACE DISASTER

Unless we are willing, by a rigid tax program now, not only to strike at war profiteering and speculative activity, but to pay as we go, we must be prepared to come face to face with disaster for what we so proudly call the American way of life. The annual interest upon the national debt which now amounts to $5,500,000,000, and which is more than half of all the expenditures of the Federal Government for all purposes in 1939, cannot be increased by new interest obligations upon a new war debt without endangering not only profits, but the system that produces profits.

Fortunately the profit picture as it now presents itself is sufficient to guarantee the success of a pay-as-you-go system. Corporate profits have reached levels never dreamed possible before the war. In 1940, before we actually became involved, they amounted to $9,300,000,000. They jumped to a new high of twenty-five and one-tenth billions in 1943 and receded slightly to twenty-four and three-tenths billions in 1944. But corporate profits after taxes in each war year except 1945 were larger than corporate profits before taxes in 1940. They ranged from nine and four-tenths billions in 1941 to ten and eight-tenths billions in 1944 after the tax bill of World War II had been paid.

Obviously, corporate profits throughout World War II could have made a much larger contribution to the current cost of the war than they were called upon to do. Ever since the speedy reconversion of 1945–46, corporate profits in the new fully employed economy have been running at far higher levels than during the war. For 1947, profits before taxes amounted to thirty and five-tenths billions; they rose to thirty-three and nine-tenths billions in 1948; fell off to twenty-seven and six-tenths billions in 1949; jumped again in the first quarter of 1950 to twenty-nine and two-tenths billions. The universal testimony from the most conservative centers of finance in New York tells us that in the second quarter of this year they are going higher still.

CORPORATE PROFITS REACH NEW HIGH

The National City Bank of New York in its Monthly Letter issued on August 2, told its customers that two out of every three corporations had increased their earnings in the first half of 1950 as compared with 1949. The National City Bank surveyed the net income of 500 corporations throughout the American economy and reported that after the deduction of Federal income taxes, at the present 38 percent rate, the net income totaled approximately $2,568,000,000. This, the National City Bank tells us, is an increase of 27 percent over the first quarter of 1949, making an increase of 20 percent for the first

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COLUMBIA BASIN PROJECT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8345) to amend the Columbia Basin Project Act with reference to recordable contracts.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Columbia Basin Project Act (act of March 10, 1943, ch. 14, 57 Stat. 14) be amended as follows:

(1) By adding a new paragraph, to be the second paragraph of subsection (c) of section 2, as follows:

"Notwithstanding the limitations of the preceding paragraph but subject to such rules and regulations as may be prescribed therefor by the Secretary, the privilege of executing recordable contracts is hereby extended as follows: (i) To any landowner as to a tract of land to which he, or his predecessor if he holds as an heir or devisee, held legal or equitable title on October 28, 1947; (ii) to any landowner as to a tract of land as to which he has held legal or equitable title for not less than 10 years (including the period of holding by predecessors where title is held as an heir or devisee), or as to which he furnishes proof in writing satisfactory to the Secretary as to the terms of the transaction and consideration paid by him (or by his predecessor where title is held as an heir or devisee) for the tract and as to which there is a finding by the Secretary that the transaction was bona fide and for a consideration not in excess of the full fair market value of the tract, valued as of the date of that transaction without reference to or increment by reason of the project. Any such recordable contract may be executed only on or before December 31, 1951, or on or before a date to be fixed by the Secretary as to each irrigation block in which the lands are situated, such date to be approximately 2 years before the commencement of the development period for that block."

(2) By deleting the last sentence of subdivision (ii) of subsection (e) of section 2.

(3) By amending subsection (a) of section 8 to read as follows:

"Fraudulent misrepresentation as to the true consideration involved in the conveyance of, or contract to convey, any freehold estate in land covered by recordable contract or which is sought to be covered by a recordable contract under subsection 2 (c) hereof, in the affidavits required or which may be required under that subsection shall constitute a misdemeanor punishable by a fine not exceeding $500 or by imprisonment not exceeding 6 months, or by both such fine and imprisonment."

(4) By amending the second sentence of subsection (b) of section 4 to read as follows: "In addition, land sale and exchange contracts shall be on a basis that, in the Secretary's judgment, provides for the return, in a reasonable period of years, of not less than the appraised value of the land and improvements thereon, and provides, in the case of any lands to be included in farm units, for the application of provisions similar to those of the recordable contracts provided under subsection 2 (c) hereof."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, after the words "Notwithstanding the", insert the word "time."

Page 2, line 1, delete the word "predecessor", and substitute in lieu thereof the following: "ancestors or devisors."

Page 2, line 5, delete the word "predecessors," and substitute in lieu thereof the following: "his ancestors or devisors."

Page 2, line 9, delete the word "predecessor," and substitute in lieu thereof the following: "ancestors or devisors."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADMISSION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1858) to permit the admission of alien spouses and minor children of citizen members of the United States Armed Forces.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended (8 U. S. C., 213 (c)), alien spouses or unmarried minor children of United States citizens serving in, or having an honorable discharge certificate from the armed forces of the United States during World War II shall, if otherwise admissible under the immigration laws, be eligible to enter the United States with nonquota immigration visas issued under the provisions of section 4 (a) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended (8 U. S. C. 204 (a)): *Provided*, That in the cases of such alien spouses of United States citizens serving in, or having an honorable discharge certificate from the Armed Forces of the United States during World War II, the marriage shall have occurred before 90 days after enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 5, strike out "90 days" and insert "6 months."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSPORTATION OF GAMBLING DEVICES IN INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3357) to prohibit transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BARING. I object, Mr. Speaker.

CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3584) to amend the act of June 9, 1906 (34 Stat. 227), entitled "An act granting land to the city of Albuquerque for public purposes."

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act approved June 9, 1906 (34 Stat. 227), entitled "An act granting land to the city of Albuquerque for public purposes," is hereby amended by adding thereto the following:

"SEC. 2. The city of Albuquerque is authorized to convey, without restrictions as to use, not to exceed one-half of the acreage patented under this act: *Provided, however*, That all the proceeds derived from such sale or sales shall be used for the construction of a public auditorium, erected either under the sole sponsorship of the city of Albuquerque or, if located upon land owned by the University of New Mexico, as a joint project with that university."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 8678) was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY ACT OF 1949

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3875) to amend section 9 of the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 9 of the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949 (act of June 20, 1949, ch. 227, sec. 9, 63 Stat. 212) is hereby amended by deleting the figure "$10,000" and substituting in lieu thereof the figure "$13,100."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. That completes the call of the eligible bills on the Consent Calendar.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ASPINALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. WHITE of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a news release.

Mr. HEDRICK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article written by Soterios Nicholson, which appeared in the June issue of the Atlantis, an article on Macedonia.

Mr. HUBER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a statement from the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. (at the request of Mr. GRAHAM) was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. WITHROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. FORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article by Dr. Lutz.

Mr. CLEVENGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include two editorials.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in four instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HESELTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. SCUDDER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include two newspaper articles.

Mr. LECOMPTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. O'KONSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances.

Mr. WADSWORTH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial appearing in the Le Roy Gazette-News entitled "An Open Letter To the President."

Mr. D'EWART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article entitled "Growth of Marketing and Purchasing Cooperatives."

Mr. RAINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial appearing in the Montgomery Advertiser.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BATTLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address.

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article on America's most rugged highway.

Mr. COUDERT (at the request of Mr. MICHENER) was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

CONFERRING JURISDICTION ON STATE OF NEW YORK IN ACTIONS TO WHICH INDIANS ARE PARTIES

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return for immediate consideration to Calendar No. 658 the bill (S. 192) to confer jurisdiction on the courts of the State of New York with respect to civil actions between Indians or to which Indians are parties.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1951

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill H. R. 7786, an act making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees:

Managers on the part of the House:

Messrs. CANNON, RABAUT, NORRELL, TABER, and:

on Chap. I, Messrs. BATES of Kentucky, YATES, FURCOLO, STOCKMAN, and WILSON of Indiana;

on Chap. II, Messrs. McGRATH, KIRWAN, ANDREWS, CANFIELD, and SCRIVNER;

on Chap. III, Messrs. ROONEY, FLOOD, PRESTON, STEFAN, and CLEVENGER;

on Chap. IV, Messrs. GARY, FERNANDEZ, PASSMAN, CANFIELD, and COUDERT;

on Chap. V, Messrs. FOGARTY, HEDRICK, McGRATH, SCRIVNER, and ANDERSEN;

on Chap. VI, Messrs. WHITTEN, STIGLER, KRUSE, ANDERSEN, and HORAN;

on Chap. VII, Messrs. KIRWAN, JACKSON of Washington, GORE, JENSEN, and FENTON;

on Chap. VIII, Messrs. THOMAS, GORE, ANDREWS, CASE of South Dakota, and PHILLIPS of California;

on Chap. IX, Messrs. KERR, GORE, HEDRICK, WIGGLESWORTH, and STEFAN;

on Chap. X, Messrs. MAHON, SHEPPARD, SIKES, PLUMLEY, and WIGGLESWORTH;

on Chap. X–A, Messrs. GORE, HEDRICK, PASSMAN, WIGGLESWORTH, and STEFAN;

on Chap. X–B, Messrs. GARY, ROONEY, BATES of Kentucky, WIGGLESWORTH, and STEFAN;

on Chap. XI, Messrs. GORE, HEDRICK, PASSMAN, WIGGLESWORTH, and STEFAN.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Will the chairman take a minute to explain how the conferees will operate under this arrangement?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, we expect to go to conference tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock. The bill will be taken up by chapters seriatim. As a chapter is reached the entire subcommittee which wrote that particular chapter, and which therefore is more familiar with it than anyone else on the committee, along with the other managers on the part of the House, will take up the chapter with the Senate conferees.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. This means, then, that the four Members who were first named will sit through the entire conference?

Mr. CANNON. They are the ranking members on the central subcommittee which reported the bill to the House and will sit with the respective subcommittees throughout the conference.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. And the Members who are assigned to a particular chapter will receive notification as their particular chapter is approached?

Mr. CANNON. When a chapter is taken up, the conferees on the next succeeding chapter will be notified. We hope to proceed with as little delay as possible, subject always to the approval of the managers on the part of the Senate.

AUTHORIZING FEDERAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS IN MAJOR DISASTERS

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up a resolution (H. Res. 742) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8396) to authorize Federal assistance to States and local governments in major disasters, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield.

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may have until midnight tonight to file reports on the bills H. R. 9194 and H. R. 9313.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe there is any objection whatever to the pending rule or to the bill which the rule makes consideration in order.

The bill provides assistance to States and local governments in alleviating suffering from damage resulting from major disasters. It authorizes the President to coordinate all Government agencies in such emergencies. It provides the framework for the Federal Government, under which prompt action will result in meeting the needs of certain areas. It establishes a general Government policy in respect to emergency relief in future disasters, and so on.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], if he has any requests for time.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time on this side.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. This is a measure for relief of other people where distress happens in peacetime?

Mr. COX. This is for relief in time of peace.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. In view of the fact that the commanding officer of the marines down at the convention

to land or interests in land acquired by the War Department or the Department of the Interior, as the case may be" has no applicability to acquisitions for reclamation purposes.

The portion of section 355 of the Revised Statutes first above quoted was enacted on September 11, 1841, and was, of course, in effect when the Acting Attorney General's unpublished opinion of March 24, 1904, was given. The opinion of September 26, 1946, regards the practice which developed as a result of the earlier opinion as an "erroneous construction" of the statute which could not receive the further acquiescence of the Attorney General.

Pursuant to the Attorney General's opinion of September 26, 1946, as implemented by a letter dated June 17, 1948, from Assistant Attorney General Vanech to the chief counsel of the Bureau of Reclamation, the Department of Justice now requires that all land acquisitions by the Bureau of Reclamation be referred to the Lands Division of the Justice Department for examination of titles and the preparation of title opinions.

Two courses of procedure have been set up. Under one, the regional counsel for the Bureau of Reclamation makes a complete preliminary determination as to validity of title and arrangements for the procurement of curative data, and then, if he determines that the title is free from doubt of consequence, prepares a closing opinion on the basis of which payment is made. At this stage the entire file is referred to the Lands Division of Justice in Washington for review and the preparation of a final opinion by the Department of Justice.

Under the second procedure the Bureau's attorneys obtain the basic title papers and make certain, as a minimum in the case of abstracts, that they are sufficiently complete and current to enable the Department of Justice to make a satisfactory title examination. The case is then referred to the Attorney General for examination and the preparation of a preliminary opinion. When the preliminary title opinion has been prepared it is necessary for Bureau attorneys again to handle procurement of curative papers and, if these cannot be obtained, to propose alternative couses of action to the Department of Justice. When title defects have been removed in a manner that, in the judgment of the Bureau attorney, meets the requirements of Justice's preliminary opinion, payment is made to the vendor and the documents are returned to the Department of Justice for examination and issuance of a final opinion.

Under the first procedure, so far as the determination of title is concerned, any review given after the closing of the transaction by a regional counsel of the Bureau is a duplication of effort. Under the second procedure, the work that Bureau attorneys must perform is but little different from that which they would do if they actually prepared the preliminary opinions. And because of delays of transmitting papers to Washington the second procedure of necessity results in some delay in the closing of transactions.

The procedures above described are relatively new. They became effective on October 1, 1948. Delays thus far have been those that are naturally to be expected in any drastic change of systems. When the new procedures have become familiar to all Bureau attorneys and land officers we expect that these delays will be reduced and we hope that time between procurement of title data and closing, while somewhat longer than under Bureau procedure, will not be objectionably so. But even with good service, we think that there will be, and inherently so, unnecessary duplication of effort.

The determination of the validity and sufficiency to title to lands or interests in lands is, as every Member of Congress who has practiced law knows, essentially a local matter. This is so because of the great variation in State property laws and in locally acceptable practices in regard to titles. Attorneys who devote a considerable portion of their time to title examinations and related work on a particular project or in a particular area are bound to become experts on these local laws and the locally acceptable methods of correcting title defects. They also acquire a wealth of local factual information and knowledge as to local title practices that no centralized office, remote from the areas where the lands are situated, can hope to acquire. Moreover, efficient handling of title matters requires that the examining attorneys be in constant contact not only with the administrative officers who are responsible for the appraisal and acquisition of land but also with local abstract and title companies, local lawyers, and landowners with whom they must work in clearing title. Our limited experience thus far under the new Justice procedures have shown us that there is a tendency for Justice attorneys in Washington to impose initially requirements that they would not impose were they thoroughly conversant with local statutes and decisions and other pertinent local conditions.

There is, however, a far more fundamental basis for objection to the intervention of the Department of Justice in the Bureau's land-acquisition program. Justice attorneys or any attorney not working closely with the reclamation program simply cannot have the same full understanding of the problems of Bureau land acquisition as the attorneys who are working every day in the reclamation field, particularly in matters involving the Bureau's construction program.

For a better understanding of the problems at hand, it may help to illustrate, by a typical large reclamation project, the relation between the construction program and land acquisition. In connection with the Columbia Basin project in the State of Washington, land-acquisition officers and attorneys for the Bureau of Reclamation have heretofore handled the acquisition of all lands purchased for the site of Grand Coulee Dam and the 150-mile reservoir created thereby, for the equalizing dam and reservoir, and for O'Sullivan Dam and Reservoir. There remain to be acquired, over the next several years, lands and interests in lands for Long Lake Dam and the reservoir to be created thereby, some 4,000 miles of canals and laterals of which probably one-half will be acquired through purchase (the other half being located across lands subject to reserved right-of-way provided by the act of August 30, 1890 (26 Stat. 371, 391)), and many miles of rights-of-way for roads, transmission lines, and other project facilities. The lands to be acquired lie in nine counties.

Similar projects may be found in each of the other six regions of the Bureau. Some of the larger ones are the Central Valley project in California, the Colorado-Big Thompson project in Colorado, and the Missouri River Basin program in the States of Colorado, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming.

Acquisitions of the lands needed for these works present several problems quite unlike those encountered in the selection and acquisition of the sites for Federal public buildings. The location of the features of an irrigation system is governed by the topography and other characteristics of the areas to be crossed and to be irrigated. A canal system sprawls over a wide expanse and it frequently happens that a given portion of a canal system is put under contract to be built before detailed locations can be determined. The speed of the acquisition program is, therefore, governed by that of the construction program and must be handled so as not to delay that program.

The land-acquisition program presents another unusual aspect. In most situations the acquisitions are of but part of an owner's holdings, and the owner is one with whom this Department will continue to have other contractual relations for many years in connection with the operation of the irrigation system. It is of more than usual importance, therefore, to handle all phases of the original acquisition so that good relations with the landowners will be established and maintained.

In the light of this background as to the nature of the legal work involved and the special problems encountered in the acquisition program, our reasons for believing that it is to the advantage of this Department and the Government as a whole to permit the continuation of our past title examination procedures with respect to the Bureau of Reclamation acquisition program are these:

1. There is need to have, in the agency which has the responsibility for the construction of these complex engineering works, complete administrative control of the title-examining procedure.

This need for administrative control is primarily because of the direct bearing that the closing of land transactions has on construction schedules. By administrative control of its attorneys, the agency which has the responsibility for the maintenance of construction schedules can direct the activities of attorneys to title matters needing preferred attention, and can direct and provide for the essential close-working relationship between attorneys and land-acquisition officers and with the landowners. This control was afforded under the procedure heretofore employed in the Bureau of Reclamation under the sanction of a long-standing interpretation of the Federal reclamation law. It will be at least partially lacking under the procedure now required by the Attorney General.

2. The work can be done more expeditiously and with less expense to the Government under the procedure heretofore employed than that necessary under the procedures prescribed pursuant to the Attorney General's opinion.

This Department learned long ago that the efficient and expeditious handling of title work requires delegation of final title responsibility to attorneys in the field. Such attorneys can handle the work more expeditiously because they, in preparing the preliminary and final opinions, have direct and immediate access to all the acquiring agency's land-acquisition files. This permits the resolution of many questions without the delays attendant on correspondence. Expedition in the closing of land transactions in this fashion results in direct savings in cost and has an indirect bearing on success in negotiating transactions at prices favorable to the United Staes.

There will, moreover, be no saving to the Government—in fact, there will be added expense—in having the sufficiency of titles passed upon finally by the Department of Justice, for it will be necessary for Bureau attorneys to perform substantially the same functions that they now perform in determining the validity of titles. The Attorney General is authorized, and it is his practice, to call upon the land-acquiring agency to "procure any evidence of title which the Attorney General may deem necessary" and the expenses incurred in complying with his requirements are charged to the acquiring agency. The work of the attorneys of the Department of Justice, in other words, will largely be that of reviewing cases prepared by Bureau attorneys.

The reclamation program requires the maintenance of a staff of attorneys in each region to handle other important legal work without regard to title work. The title load, however, is a variable one, depending on the pace of the construction program. It is possible, therefore, to fit the title load into the other legal workloads of regional legal staffs and thereby maintain a high degree of efficiency in the use of attorneys. This is a

point of economy over and above that to be realized from the avoidance of unnecessary legal review.

Since the Congress provides counsel to various agencies of the Government to permit the handling on a day-to-day basis on the legal aspects of the problems of those agencies and has provided such counsel on a regional basis in connection with the Bureau of Reclamation's program, it would seem to be poor economy to fail to take full advantage of the services of those counsel, particularly in matters so essentially local in character as the examination of title to land.

3. Bureau regional counsel and their staff attorneys have demonstrated that they are competent to do the work, and are well organized and trained to do it.

The record of Bureau attorneys in handling title work is not open to question. In the 40 years and more that they have been handling this work there has been no instance, I am advised, of any loss attributable to title defects in lands acquired in the reclamation program. Their record for speed in handling the work, moreover, is excellent.

Bureau attorneys are organized on a regional basis. It has been our policy, as above stated, to give to each regional counsel final responsibility for title matters, thereby avoiding bringing such matters to a central office. Since these regional counsel, of necessity, must be acquainted with local law on land and water rights in connection with other of their responsibilities, they are better able to handle title matters than the staff in a central office. Moreover, it will be apparent to you from the description of the special problems of the Bureau's acquisition program, that the attorneys responsible for title examination in that program, to do the most effective job, must be able to exercise judgment in the application of technical rules of property law. That judgment can only be properly exercised by attorneys who, through daily work with the Bureau's whole program, know the various factors that enter into such a judgment.

It is for these reasons—not because I question the competency of the Department of Justice to handle title work adequately, efficiently, and economically—that I recommend the enactment of S. 1606.

If the bill is subject to amendment, I should like to suggest that it be amended in order to accomplish other purposes which, though not directly related to a determination of the validity of titles, are pertinent to the section of the reclamation law with which S. 1606 deals. Section 7 of the act of June 17, 1902, authorizes the acquisition of rights or property to carry out the provisions of that act and payment for such acquisitions from the reclamation fund. The act of June 17, 1902, has been amended many times and a number of special statutes have been enacted which alter or increase the authority vested in the Secretary of the Interior in connection with the construction, operation, and maintenance of reclamation projects. Furthermore, some projects are financed with appropriations from the general fund of the Treasury instead of the reclamation fund. In these circumstances, it is desirable that the authority to acquire land and interests in land be explicitly linked with the entire body of reclamation law instead of with the initial act only, and that the language authorizing payment for such acquisitions do not refer to a single fund only. To accomplish both of these purposes as well as the purpose of S. 1606, it is suggested that, following the enacting clause, the following language be substituted for that of S. 1606:

"That section 7 of the act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388, 389, 43 U. S. C. 421), is hereby amended to read as follows:

" 'SEC. 7. That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire such rights or property as he determines to be necessary and desirable for the construction or operation and maintenance of projects undertaken pursuant to this act and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto. Such acquisitions shall be at prices and with titles satisfactory to him.' "

Inasmuch as I understand that your committee wishes an immediate report on this bill, I have not ascertained from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget its relation to the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

J. A. KRUG,
Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. McCARRAN. I object to the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard. The bill will go over.

EQUITIES OF PERMANENT CLASSIFIED CIVIL SERVICE EMPLOYEES

The bill (S. 660) to amend the act of June 27, 1944, Public Law 359, and to preserve the equities of permanent classified civil service employees of the United States was announced as next in order.

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. McKELLAR. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In view of the numerosity of conferees, the Chair suggests that the list of names of the conferees be inserted in the RECORD without being read at this time.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the list of conferees be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the list of conferees appointed on the part of the Senate was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Chapter I—District of Columbia: Mr. HILL, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. HUNT, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. WHERRY, and Mr. YOUNG;

Chapter II—Legislative Branch: Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. CORDON;

Chapter III—State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary: Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. GREEN, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. FERGUSON;

Chapter IV—Treasury and Post Office: Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. CORDON, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. SALTONSTALL;

Chapter V—Labor-Federal Security: Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. KNOWLAND, and Mr. GURNEY;

Chapter VI—Agriculture Department: Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. GURNEY, and Mr. FERGUSON;

Chapter VII—Interior Department: Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. WHERRY, and Mr. GURNEY;

Chapter VIII—Independent Offices: Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. CORDON, and Mr. SALTONSTALL;

Chapter IX—Civil Functions: Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mr. CORDON.

Chapter X—Defense Establishment: Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mr. WHERRY.

Chapter X-A—General Reductions in Appropriations: Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mr. WHERRY;

Chapter X-B—Foreign Aid: Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mr. WHERRY;

Chapter XI—General Provisions: Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mr. WHERRY.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, or does he wish to make a statement?

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to make a statement.

The Committee on Appropriations met this morning and adopted unanimously a resolution with respect to the appointment of conferees. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks without my reading it.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEETING OF THE SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE ON TUESDAY, AUGUST 8, 1950, TO CONSIDER THE APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON THE GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1951

Senator RUSSELL made the following motion, which was agreed to unanimously on a voice vote:

"Resolved, That the chairman of the Appropriations Committee recommend to the Vice President the appointment of conferees to deal with each chapter of the general appropriation bill, 1951, on the same basis on which conferees on the part of the Senate were appointed in the calendar year 1949 to deal with the separate bills which are identical with the separate chapters in the general appropriation bill, 1951, that the ratio of those appointed on the part of the Senate to the Conference Committee as between the two parties be the same as between the two parties in the calendar year 1949 (District of Columbia 4–3; Legislative, 3–2; State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, 4–3; Treasury and Post Office, 5–3; Labor-Federal Security, 3–2; Agriculture, 5–3; Interior, 3–2; Independent Offices, 4–3; Civil Functions, 5–3; National Defense, 5–4; Foreign Aid, 5–4), that the individual subcommittee chairmen appoint the ranking members on their subcommittees unless any Member desires to be relieved of duty on the conference, in which

case the subcommittee chairman is to tender the appointment to the next ranking member of the subcommittee, that the members of the conference on the part of the Senate on each chapter of the bill be authorized to bind the full committee on that chapter but that at the conclusion of the conference all of the conferees sign the conference report, and that with respect to the appointment of Senate conferees on chapters X–A, X–B, and XI, the same policy be followed as was followed on the foreign-aid appropriation bill in the calendar year 1949."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Sitting for the moment in the chair of the minority leader, I understand that conferees will be appointed for each chapter of the appropriation bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In the same manner that conferees were appointed for the separate appropriation bills in 1949?

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is not only correct, but I may add that the ratio in which they were appointed in 1949 is exactly the same ratio as today.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Am I to understand that the conferees on each one of the titles are to reach conclusive agreements subject only to the matters coming finally before the full committee?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is my understanding of the resolution introduced by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] which deals with the subject.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Under the rule the agreements are final and can be reopened by the whole committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Absolutely.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I agree completely with what the Senator from Massachusetts has said about the resolution. As I understand, the conferees are to be appointed for each chapter, and when the conferees on each chapter have reached an agreement, that is the final agreement on that chapter, except of course that all conferees are to sign the final conference report, because no conference report could be agreed to unless the majority of the Senate conferees signed it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is my understanding.

Mr. McKELLAR. In order that it may be thoroughly understood by all Senators, I should like to read the resolution:

MEETING OF THE SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE ON TUESDAY, AUGUST 8, 1950, TO CONSIDER THE APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON THE GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1951

Senator RUSSELL made the following motion, which was agreed to unanimously on a voice vote:

"*Resolved*, That the chairman of the Appropriations Committee recommend to the Vice President the appointment of conferees to deal with each chapter of the general appropriation bill, 1951, on the same basis on which conferees on the part of the Senate were appointed in the calendar year 1949 to deal with the separate bills which are identical with the separate chapters in the general appropriation bill, 1951, that the ratio of those appointed on the part of the Senate to the conference committee as between the two parties be the same as between the two parties in the calendar year 1949 (District of Columbia, 4–3; Legislative, 3–2; State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, 4–3; Treasury and Post Office, 5–3; Labor-Federal Security, 3–2; Agriculture, 5–3; Interior, 3–2; Independent Offices, 4–3; Civil Functions, 5–3; National Defense, 5–4; Foreign Aid, 5–4), that the individual subcommittee chairmen appoint the ranking members on their subcommittees unless any member desires to be relieved of duty on the conference, in which case the subcommittee chairman is to tender the appointment to the next ranking member of the subcommittee, that the members of the conference on the part of the Senate on each chapter of the bill be authorized to bind the full committee on that chapter but that at the conclusion of the conference all of the conferees sign the conference report, and that with respect to the appointment of Senate conferees on chapters X–A, X–B, and X–I, the same policy be followed as was followed on the foreign-aid appropriation bill in the calendar year 1949."

That seems to me to be perfectly plain, and I hope the Senate will accept the plan. I have read it into the RECORD so that Senators may be familiar with it.

EQUITIES OF PERMANENT CLASSIFIED CIVIL SERVICE EMPLOYEES

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. A parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Has Calendar No. 692, Senate bill 660 been called?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is the last bill called, and the Chair has not put the question as to whether there is objection to its consideration.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I desire to object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kansas objects.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Kansas will withhold the objection.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I shall be glad to.

Mr. FREAR. A parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FREAR. Is it permissible to offer an amendment from the floor of the Senate on behalf of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON]?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Not unless the Senate agrees to consider the bill. If the bill goes over, the Senator may offer the amendment and have it printed and lie on the table.

Mr. FREAR. But not for present consideration?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Not for present consideration, unless the objection to present consideration is withdrawn.

Mr. FREAR. Then I ask the Senator from Kansas to permit the bill to go to the foot of the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Delaware that the bill go to the foot of the calendar?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I would have no objection to the bill going to the foot of the calendar, but I must say that when it is called again I shall object.

Mr. FREAR. I ask unanimous consent that the bill go to the foot of the calendar, and I thank the Senator from Kansas.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will go to the foot of the calendar.

WELFARE OF COAL MINERS

The bill (S. 1031) amending Public Law 49, Seventy-seventh Congress, providing for the welfare of coal miners, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Jersey objects.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey withhold his objection?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I gladly withhold it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, the distinguished Senators from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], from Alabama [Mr. HILL], from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] joined me as sponsors of this bill. It was favorably and unanimously reported by a subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. The able Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] and the able Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] were members of the subcommittee. Through an extravagance of generosity the honor of being chairman of the subcommittee was conferred upon me.

The full committee, with not more than one dissenting vote, recommended that the Senate pass the bill—the object of which is to provide additional safety for the coal miners of the Nation. The necessity for that additional safety could not be exaggerated. Since the Nation recently began to defend itself against the aggression of the communistic hordes of northern Korea, more have been accidentally killed or injured in the coal mines of this country than have been killed or injured on the battlefields of the war in which we are now engaged.

It is my hope that the distinguished Republican Senators, Mr. CAPEHART, of Indiana, Mr. LANGER, of North Dakota, and Mr. MORSE, of Oregon, may be able to prevail upon their two Republican colleagues, who during the past year have again and again prevented the consideration of this bill, to withhold their objections today in order that this meritorious measure may be passed by the Senate without further delay.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey withhold his objection for one more moment?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I gladly withhold my objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). The Senator from Utah is recognized.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The general objection to the bill while it was being considered by the committee, as expressed by certain mine superintendents, was that the country was making good progress in providing for safety in the mines, on the State level, and that therefore the bill was unnecessary, that it might cause friction between State administration and Federal administration.

Mr. President, that objection is not any longer valid. In view of the fact that practically all the coal mines of the country are becoming mechanized, that new machinery is being installed, and new methods of mining are being developed, it is perfectly proper and appropriate that the Government should use all possible facilities for the protection of the miners.

If the present emergency becomes more universal, our Nation being dependent upon coal for its primary energy, we all know a great number of men will be sent into the mines.

After having gone through all the hearings I for one protest vigorously against postponement of action and trust the Senate will not stand in the way of providing the best means the Government possibly can adopt of protecting the lives of those men on whom everyone will be dependent.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I regret exceedingly to disagree with the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] and the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. Pennsylvania has been mining coal for much more than a hundred years. We have provided in our State law for every possible safety device we can think of. The last 1,000,000 tons of coal mined in our State has been mined without a fatality. Whatever Federal inspectors come into our State do so in an advisory capacity. Dual control is confusing. If the bill were enacted I believe it would simply further centralize power in Washington. That is something which I feel is detrimental to the development of our industry and to the safety of our people. I regret exceedingly to oppose the unanimous consent request for consideration of the bill, but it is necessary for me to do so.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Is it the distinguished Senator's view that proper safeguards can be provided at the local and State levels?

Mr. MARTIN. I will answer the distinguished Senator by saying yes, absolutely. I believe we must decentralize such matters as these. The States are more familiar with local conditions and local requirements than is the Federal Government. Enactment of the bill into law would, I am afraid, destroy many of the safety devices we have developed in Pennsylvania over more than 100 years of activity.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, as the coauthor of the bill I had hoped no objection would be raised to it. Considerable coal is mined in Indiana, and I know our miners and the people of Indiana are in favor of the bill. I feel we should take whatever steps are necessary to protect the miners. Coal mine accidents are very serious. It seems to me that Federal inspection, such as we are now talking about, would simply be a plus, an addition to the inspection the States themselves make. I regret exceedingly that there should be objection to the bill. I recognize the position of those who object to it, and I know they are sincere and conscientious in their objection, but I was very hopeful the bill might be passed at the present session of Congress.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I regret exceedingly that I am in the position here today where I am constrained to object by request. I appreciate very much the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia and the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Utah.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. May I inquire what other Senators have objected to the bill?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. The junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] objects to it. He is temporarily absent at this time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the Senator from West Virginia and other Senators who have spoken in favor of the bill. I should like to read into the RECORD at this time what the Secretary of the Interior said to the committee, which is included in the committee report:

> Because of this lack of appropriate investigatory powers, hazardous conditions in many mines have been left uncorrected, and responsibility for many of the disasters that have taken place has never been fixed.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois read with greater volume?

Mr. LUCAS. I am reading from page 1 of the report No. 695.

> Power to make mandatory inspections of coal mines, both at periodic intervals and upon the occurrence of an accident, is absolutely necessary if the Department is to carry on efficient health and safety work, for the power to obtain information is necessarily basic to all its accident and disease prevention activities. The progressive increase in the inherent hazards of coal mining which growing mechanization of the industry has brought about makes it more imperative now than ever before that Federal protection be reinforced and extended through the granting of adequate inspection powers and enlargement of the reporting and educational duties to which these powers are incident.[1]

Mr. President, that statement by the Secretary of the Interior regarding the safety and security of the miners who go into the bowels of the earth to dig coal is an important one. I distinctly recall what happened after the great mine disaster at Centralia, Ill., only 2 or 3 years ago. A committee was appointed at that time by the United States Senate to make an investigation into that mine disaster. But, after all, we in the Senate of the United States had no power to do what should have been done in the way of proper recommendations from the Federal standpoint in an endeavor to prevent disasters of a similar kind in the future.

It may be true that some States have sufficient safeguards for the protection of miners who go into the earth to dig coal. But a number of States do not provide the proper kind of inspection and examination which a Federal group, if it had the power, could make. The bill is a very important one from the standpoint of protection of the miners from accident and death.

I know that many persons do not like to have power to inspect and examine mines centralized in Washington. But I undertake to say that there are many States which do not have provisions for properly safeguarding the security of the miners. Perhaps they do not have the money to provide safeguards for those who dig coal. It is my earnest hope that the bill may become the law of the land.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Education and Public Welfare which reported the bill I wish to say I am strongly in favor of it. I also come from a coal mining State. Many very severe accidents have occurred in the coal mines of my State. The government and the people of Montana are very much in favor of the bill. I believe it would be very unwise not to pass the bill now, because almost every day we read in the newspapers stories of serious coal-mine accidents. During the past year or so some very serious coal-mine accidents have occurred in Montana mines. I hope the objection to the bill will be withdrawn.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I appreciate the contributions which have been made to the discussion of the bill by the distinguished Senator from Illinois. I wish I could withhold objection. Under the circumstances I do not feel I can do so. A question of honor is involved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The bill will go over.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I should like to make a statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. LANGER. As one of the cosponsors of the bill, I announce that when the call of the calendar has been completed I shall make a motion to consider the bill. As the majority leader has just stated, the bill is a very important one. I believe it to be one of the most important bills on the calendar. In view of the fact that miners are dying because mine owners have not taken proper precautions for their safety or because proper State laws have not been enacted, I believe it would be a shameful thing not to pass this bill. As I said, I intend to move that the bill be taken up after the calendar has been called.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania will be recognized as soon as the next bill on the calendar has been announced. There will then be before the Senate a measure, and the Senator can address himself to the subject matter of the previous bill if he so desires.

The bill (S. 1976) for the relief of Mrs. Juan Antonio Rivera, Mrs. Raul Valle Antelo, Mrs. Jorge Diaz Romero, Mrs. Otto Resse, and Mrs. Hugo Soria was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I wish to address my remarks to the bill which has just been under discussion. As one of the sponsors of the bill, I share the views of those who have already spoken in favor of it. I believe Pennsylvania has mine safety laws which probably are much further advanced than the mine safety laws of many other States, but I

a hundred cents worth of value for each of the billions of dollars which the Congress appropriates, we should begin this vital reorganization task immediately, before any additional duties relating to war controls, such as food rationing and price controls go into effect.

I fear that if we grant these additional offices to the Secretary by this separate bill, we may never get a chance to approve a plan which would reorganize the Department along efficient operating lines. For that reason, it is vital that the granting of any additional offices be linked with the reorganization of the Department as recommended by the Hoover Commission. In my opinion, a vote for this bill is in effect a vote against the Hoover Commission suggestions since the only practical method of achieving those results is to turn down this bill in order that a complete reorganization plan may be submitted for congressional consideration.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I shall not detain the House further than to observe that I believe the Members understand clearly the proposition now being submitted. I have no further comment to make.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] in the nature of a substitute to the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN) there were—ayes 76, noes 28.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LANHAM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 8850) to establish two additional offices of Assistant Secretaries of Agriculture and office of an Administrative Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 819, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, the Clerk has just read the bill by title, which, according to the amendment which has been adopted, should have been amended.

The SPEAKER. An amendment to the title of the bill cannot be offered until after the bill has passed, which the Chair is sure will be done.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN moves to recommit the bill, H. R. 8850, to the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 123, nays 222, not voting 85, as follows:

[Roll No. 249]

YEAS—123

Allen, Calif.	Gary	Nicholson
Allen, Ill.	Golden	Nixon
Andresen, August H.	Goodwin	Norblad
Andrews	Gossett	O'Hara, Minn.
Angell	Graham	Philbin
Arends	Gross	Phillips, Calif.
Auchincloss	Gwinn	Plumley
Bates, Mass.	Hale	Potter
Beall	Harden	Poulson
Bennett, Mich.	Herter	Reed, Ill.
Bishop	Heselton	Rees
Boggs, Del.	Hoffman, Ill.	Rich
Bolton, Ohio	Hoffman, Mich.	Riehlman
Brambletl	Hull	Robeson
Brown, Ohio	Jackson, Calif.	Rogers, Mass.
Bryson	James	Sadlak
Byrnes, Wis.	Javits	Sanborn
Camp	Jenison	Scott, Hardie
Canfield	Jenkins	Scrivner
Case, N. J.	Jennings	Scudder
Case, S. Dak.	Jonas	Secrest
Chiperfield	Judd	Shafer
Clevenger	Kean	Short
Cole, N. Y.	Kearns	Smith, Wis.
Corbett	Keating	Stanley
Cotton	Kunkel	Stefan
Coudert	LeCompte	Taber
Cunningham	LeFevre	Towe
Curtis	Lodge	Van Zandt
Dague	Lovre	Vorys
Davis, Ga.	McConnell	Vursell
Davis, Wis.	McDonough	Wadsworth
Donohue	Mack, Wash.	Weichel
Eaton	Macy	Wheeler
Ellsworth	Martin, Mass.	Widnall
Elston	Merrow	Wigglesworth
Fallon	Meyer	Wilson, Ind.
Fenton	Michener	Wolcott
Ford	Miller, Md.	Wolverton
Fulton	Miller, Nebr.	Woodruff
Gamble	Murray, Tenn.	
	Nelson	

NAYS—222

Abbitt	Bates, Ky.	Breen
Abernethy	Battle	Brooks
Addonizio	Beckworth	Brown, Ga.
Albert	Bennett, Fla.	Buchanan
Allen, La.	Bentsen	Buckley, Ill.
Andersen, H. Carl	Biemiller	Buckley, N. Y.
Aspinall	Blatnik	Burdick
Bailey	Bolling	Burke
Barden	Bolton, Md.	Burleson
Baring	Bonner	Burnside
Barrett, Pa.	Bosone	Burton
	Boykin	Byrne, N. Y.
Cannon	Holmes	Patten
Carlyle	Hope	Perkins
Carnahan	Horan	Peterson
Cavalcante	Howell	Pickett
Celler	Huber	Poage
Chelf	Irving	Polk
Chesney	Jackson, Wash.	Preston
Christopher	Jacobs	Price
Clemente	Jensen	Priest
Cole, Kans.	Jones, Ala.	Rabaut
Colmer	Jones, Mo.	Rains
Combs	Jones, N. C.	Ramsay
Cooley	Karsten	Rankin
Cooper	Kee	Redden
Cox	Kelley, Pa.	Rhodes
Crook	Kelly, N. Y.	Ribicoff
Crosser	Kennedy	Richards
Davenport	Keogh	Rodino
Davies, N. Y.	King	Rogers, Fla.
Dawson	Kirwan	Rooney
Deane	Kruse	Roosevelt
DeGraffenried	Lane	Sasscer
Delaney	Lanham	Saylor
Denton	Larcade	Sheppard
Dollinger	Lichtenwalter	Sikes
Doughton	Lind	Simpson, Ill.
Doyle	Linehan	Sims
Durham	Lucas	Smathers
Eberharter	Lyle	Smith, Va.
Elliott	Lynch	Spence
Engle, Calif.	McCarthy	Staggers
Feighan	McCormack	Steed
Fisher	McGuire	Stigler
Flood	McKinnon	Stockman
Forand	McMillan, S. C.	Sullivan
Frazier	McSweeney	Tackett
Fugate	Mack, Ill.	Talle
Furcolo	Madden	Tauriello
Garmatz	Magee	Teague
Gathings	Mahon	Thomas
Gilmer	Mansfield	Thompson
Gordon	Marsalis	Thornberry
Gorski	Marshall	Trimble
Granahan	Mills	Underwood
Granger	Mitchell	Wagner
Grant	Monroney	Walsh
Green	Morgan	Welch
Guill	Morris	Whitaker
Hardy	Morton	White, Calif.
Harris	Multer	White, Idaho
Hart	Murdock	Whitten
Harvey	Murphy	Whittington
Havenner	Noland	Wickersham
Hays, Ark.	Norrell	Wier
Hays, Ohio	O'Brien, Ill.	Willis
Hedrick	O'Brien, Mich.	Wilson, Okla.
Heffernan	O'Hara, Ill.	Withrow
Heller	O'Konski	Woodhouse
Herlong	O'Sullivan	Yates
Hill	O'Toole	Young
Hobbs	Pace	Zablocki
Hoeven	Passman	
Holifield	Patman	

NOT VOTING—85

Anderson, Calif.	Hand	Pfeiffer, William L.
Barrett, Wyo.	Hare	Phillips, Tenn.
Blackney	Harrison	Powell
Boggs, La.	Hébert	Quinn
Brehm	Hinshaw	Reed, N. Y.
Bulwinkle	Johnson	Regan
Carroll	Karst	Rivers
Chatham	Kearney	Sabath
Chudoff	Keefe	Sadowski
Crawford	Kerr	St. George
Davis, Tenn.	Kilburn	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
D'Ewart	Kilday	Shelley
Dingell	Klein	Simpson, Pa.
Dolliver	Latham	Smith, Kans.
Dondero	McCulloch	Smith, Ohio
Douglas	McGrath	Sutton
Engel, Mich.	McGregor	Taylor
Evins	McMillen, Ill.	Tollefson
Fellows	Marcantonio	Velde
Fernandez	Martin, Iowa	Vinson
Fogarty	Mason	Walter
Gavin	Miles	Werdel
Gillette	Miller, Calif.	Williams
Gore	Morrison	Wilson, Tex.
Gregory	Moulder	Winstead
Hagen	Murray, Wis.	Wood
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Norton	
Hall, Leonard W.	O'Neill	
Halleck	Patterson	
	Pfeifer, Joseph L.	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hand for, with Mr. Morrison against.

Mr. Gavin for, with Mr. Karst against.

Mr. William L. Pfeiffer for, with Mr. Joseph L. Pfeifer against.
Mr. Smith of Ohio for, with Mr. Quinn against.
Mr. Kearney for, with Mr. Dingell against.
Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr., for, with Mr. Sadowski against.
Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. Harrison against.
Mr. Latham for, with Mr. McGrath, against.
Mr. Wilson of Texas for, with Mr. Klein against.
Mr. Crawford for, with Mr. Walter against.
Mr. Dondero for, with Mr. Vinson against.
Mr. Blackney for, with Mr. Powell against.
Mr. Fellows for, with Mrs. Norton against.
Mr. Kilburn for, with Mrs. Douglas against.
Mrs. St. George for, with Mr. Hébert against.
Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. O'Neill against.
Mr. McGregor for, with Mr. Fogarty against.
Mr. Gillette for, with Mr. Miles against.
Mr. Leonard W. Hall for, with Mr. Miller of California against.

General pairs until further notice:
Mr. Sabath with Mr. Anderson of California.
Mr. Kerr with Mr. Barrett of Wyoming.
Mr. Gore with Mr. Brehm.
Mr. Regan with Mr. Reed of New York.
Mr. Williams with Mr. McCulloch.
Mr. Moulder with Mr. D'Ewart.
Mr. Winstead with Mr. Dolliver.
Mr. Gregory with Mr. Martin of Iowa.
Mr. Kilday with Mr. Hinshaw.
Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Johnson.
Mr. Sutton with Mr. Werdel.
Mr. Wood with Mr. Velde.
Mr. Fernandez with Mr. Hagen.
Mr. Chudoff with Mr. Smith of Kansas.
Mr. Boggs of Louisiana with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.

Mr. WHEELER changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. CASE of New Jersey changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COOLEY: Amend the title of the bill to read as follows: "to establish an additional office of Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, and for other purposes."

The amendment was agreed to.

RETURN OF H. R. 2854—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read:

To the House of Representatives:

In compliance with the request contained in the resolution of the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring therein), I return herewith H. R. 2854, entitled "An act for the relief of Wade H. Noland."

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 23, 1950.*

LOUISE PETERS LEWIS—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 694)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I am returning herewith, without my approval, H. R. 7540 "For the relief of Louise Peters Lewis."

On October 12, 1949, I returned to the House of Representatives enrolled bill H. R. 683 "For the relief of Louise Peters Lewis" with a message setting forth the reasons I was unable to give it my approval.

H. R. 7540 would grant the same relief in slightly different language, the difference in no way affecting the merits of the claim. Despite the most careful examination of this bill and the reports of the House and Senate Committee on the Judiciary accompanying it, I am unable to see that any new facts, circumstances, or reasoning have been presented or that there was any error made in considering the facts, circumstances, or reasons previously presented that would justify different action on my part.

Accordingly, I am unable to give my approval to this bill.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 23, 1950.*

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

The message and the accompanying papers are referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON THE GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time during this week to consider the conference report on the bill (H. R. 7786), the omnibus appropriation bill, 1951, when reported, notwithstanding the provisions of clause 2, rule XXVIII.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand that the measure could not be taken up today anyway, because there is a conference scheduled for tomorrow morning which would have to be disposed of prior to the report's being taken up.

Mr. CANNON. That is true. We expect to take it up tomorrow if permission for consideration without printing in the RECORD is secured on this request.

Mr. TABER. Some questions have been raised with reference to certain chapters on which an agreement has been arrived at. Some of the Members have not been able to see those chapters to know exactly what was done. There are one or two where language changes are involved, and the membership is quite anxious to know just what those changes are before we pass on them. If this request is to go through, it will be necessary that these printed reports, insofar as they have been acomplished, be made available to the membership right away. I think that would be the way to proceed, because on the independent offices chapter, and one or two other chapters, there is quite involved language waiting, and I would think that the membership should be supplied with these conference reports right away if we are going to agree to the gentleman's request.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman understands there will be a bill ahead of us tomorrow, the GI family allowance bill. We will necessarily follow that bill, and expect to have the complete conference report available for distribution before it is called up.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. For the information of the House as well as for my own information I should like to ask if it is the intention of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations after the conference report is disposed of to bring up the final deficiency bill carrying the emergency appropriations and those asked for by the President?

Mr. CANNON. We expect to report that bill to the House tomorrow and take it up the following day, if that is agreeable.

Mr. McCORMACK. I might say that under those circumstances we will have a Saturday session. I wanted the information so the Members could be advised and govern themselves accordingly. That means we will have a Saturday session.

Mr. TABER. I would be willing if these language items in the report that are hanging can be made available to the members of the committee to allow this consent request to go through; but I do think that the members of the committee are entitled to see just what the language changes are ahead of time.

Mr. McCORMACK. Without getting into the colloquy between my friend from New York and my friend from Missouri on the conference report or any portion of it, I made an observation a moment ago that I wish to qualify. If we dispose of these two matters by Friday, then the situation would be different in relation to Saturday. I do not

feel, if we dispose of the conference report and the final deficiency bill by Friday that the legislation remaining on the program would call for a Saturday session. So I want that to appear in the RECORD, because my previous statement was a flat statement that there would be a Saturday session. There will be if we do not dispose of the final deficiency appropriation bill.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I want to ask just what the situation is regarding the printing of the bill. We have for the first time a one-package budget which means that we bring the entire bill with all of its 10 or more chapters to the floor at one time, not as in previous years, each department separately. There are many items in all sections in which various Members of the House are interested. My concern is, as I think expressed already by the gentleman from New York, about printed copies of the bill. Will there be printed copies of the bill and printed copies of the report available for all Members of the House when we discuss the conference report if it is brought in under the request made by the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the gentleman from New York, which includes the inquiry of the gentleman from California, as both gentlemen are doubtless aware, that portion of the conference report on the chapter dealing with the Independent Offices appropriation to which the gentleman from New York has referred, is already in print and will be made available to the members of the committee this afternoon.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I am not asking specifically about that. Like all other Members of the House, there are items in other sections of the bill that we will not see until the conference report comes to the floor. Will there be a printed copy of the bill and printed copy of the report in our hands?

Mr. CANNON. As soon as sufficient copies can be secured from the Printing Office they will be made immediately available to all Members.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Several subcommittees have had conferences with the Senate and we have come to agreements on the amounts to be allowed for most departments. But there is one very important item that has not yet been decided, that is the question of the percentage cuts contained in the Byrd-Bridges amendment adopted by the Senate which calls for a 10 percent cut in some departments of the Government, and the Thomas-Taber-Jensen amendments which also provided for reductions in the cost of government which was passed by the House, also the foreign aid item has not yet been agreed to in conference. Will the conferees come to a meeting of minds as to what those percentage cuts shall be and will that all be included in the conference report as it comes to the House under the request the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] has just made so that the membership of the House will know what each of the thousands of items in the bill are to receive when we consider the conference report in the House?

Mr. CANNON. We meet in what I trust will be the final conference tomorrow morning. At that time the matters to which the gentleman refers will be taken up and disposed of and will be included in the conference report. No report will be brought to the House that is not complete or does not include all chapters of the bill. The material and information which the gentleman desires will be carried in the report when presented to the House.

Mr. JENSEN. Of course, it is customary after the full Appropriations Committee considers a bill that it lay over three legislative days in order to give the Congress and the American people an opportunity to know what is in the bill. The request of the gentleman would foreclose the Members of the House from having any time to study the bill as it comes out of conference; neither will it give the press an opportunity to inform the American people. Time is not so pressing to get out of here that we should be in such haste to pass this bill which amounts to considerably over $30,000,000,000 without full consideration. I think the Members of Congress should know exactly what is in the conference report when it comes to the floor instead of bringing it to the floor incomplete.

Mr. CANNON. The 3 days to which the gentleman refers do not apply to conference reports. That applies to bills reported originally by the committee. Clause 2 of rule XXVIII, and that is the only provision that affects the situation, provides that a conference report shall be printed in the RECORD. There is no other provision for delay and none is customary under the practice of the House.

Mr. JENSEN. And shall lay over 1 day?

Mr. CANNON. It lies over 1 day when it is printed in the RECORD. That is why we are making this unanimous-consent request. I have conferred with the gentleman from New York, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, and he is agreeable to taking up the conference report tomorrow if copies are provided in advance to members of the committee. We hope to dispose of it on tomorrow, and on the following day take up the last deficiency bill and dispose of that in 1 day, and so complete the appropriation program for the session.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman will admit that unless the conferees agree on these percentage cuts that are in the general provisions, and the gentleman knows the amendments that were offered in the House and Senate and passed by the House and Senate, to which I referred, along with the foreign-aid item, not a single Member of Congress will know exactly what any item is going to receive unless it is agreed to by the conferees before the conference report comes to the House. Let us take an item for a thousand dollars, as an example; the conferees agree under the Taber - Thomas - Jensen - Byrd-Bridges amendments that the item should be cut 5 percent, so the amount will be $950. But the Members will not know whether it will be a 5-percent cut or a 6-percent cut or a 10-percent cut or no cut, so we are appropriating in the dark unless the conferees bring in a complete bill on every chapter together including the proposed percentage cuts to which I have referred.

Mr. CANNON. I can assure the gentleman that no Member of the House will be asked to pass upon this conference report, or any part of it, until everyone has been afforded an opportunity to familiarize himself with every feature of the report.

Mr. TABER. May I ask one more question? Does the House act first upon this conference report or does the Senate?

Mr. CANNON. The House acts first. We have the papers and vote first.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I have listened very carefully to the colloquy between the chairman of the committee and the gentleman from Iowa, and I failed to hear or understand that the deficiency bill will be printed and in the hands of the Members of this House before they are called upon to vote on it.

Mr. CANNON. It will be reported tomorrow but will not be taken up until the following day. Copies will be in the hands of my friend from Idaho tomorrow, and he will have from then until the following afternoon to study the bill in detail.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. In other words, the printed copy of the conference report and the printed copy of the deficiency bill will be in the hands of the Members of Congress and can be studied by them before we are called upon to vote?

Mr. CANNON. Printed copies of both will be available to all Members of the House tomorrow.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is it not the gentleman's opinion that whatever the conference report may contain, it will be adopted; that there is no use talking about it?

Mr. CANNON. I trust that the conference report will be so satisfactory to all members of the Committee on Appropriations on both sides of the aisle and to all Members of the House as to meet with their complete approval.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. What the gentleman means is it does not make any difference how we vote over there, the conference report will be adopted anyway; is that it?

Mr. CANNON. If this House votes down the conference report it will not be adopted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

FEDERAL-AID ROAD ACT

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 7941) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. WHITTINGTON, BUCKLEY of New York, LARCADE, FALLON, DONDERO, CUNNINGHAM, and MCGREGOR.

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES IN THE GOVERNMENT SERVICE

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 9430) to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize certain administrative expenses in the Government service, and for other purposes," approved August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 806), to simplify administration in the Government service, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. DAWSON. I will be glad to. This is a bill that came before our committee. It had adequate hearings and it was voted out unanimously by all members of the committee with the recommendation that it be passed.

This bill is entitled a bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize certain administrative expenses in the Government service, and for other purposes," approved August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 806), to simplify administration in the Government service, and for other purposes. The bill by its provisions touches upon the question of transportation and travel for civilians in Government:

> When civilian officers and employees of the United States are on duty at places designated by the heads of their respective departments or agencies as within zones from which their immediate families should be evacuated for military or other reasons which create imminent danger to life or property, or adverse living conditions seriously affecting the health, safety, or accommodations of said families, or upon transfer or assignment to duty of such civilian officers and employees to places where their immediate families are not, for the aforesaid reasons, permitted to accompany them, their immediate families and household goods may be transported at Government expense, under such regulations as the heads of their respective departments and agencies may prescribe.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman means that the man has to live up to his year contract or he is obliged to return the money to the Treasury?

Mr. DAWSON. That is right. It makes it a debt that is recoverable.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. How does that differ from the procedure at the present time?

Mr. DAWSON. Well, it is not recoverable now by law.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I understand the present law is that you have to live 3 years abroad before the Government will pay your expenses back.

Mr. DAWSON. Different departments have entered into different contracts. Sometimes it provides that a person shall stay for the period of a year, particularly, we will say, in Guam or Okinawa and places like that, where conditions are hazardous, or where the hardships are many. Then if they break their contract, after the Government has paid their expenses there, the Government can recover the money that it paid. This bill also makes provision that the Government may enter into a contract for foreign service up to 3 years with the same provision of travel and take care of transportation. If the parties then violate their contracts with the Government then the Government is not responsible for the travel.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Then all this does is to help the Government recover some money?

Mr. DAWSON. It does, sir.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And nothing else?

Mr. DAWSON. No, sir.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And it extends from 1 year to 3 years the period in which the contract can be made?

Mr. DAWSON. It makes 3 years the maximum in which the Government might enter into a contract. That does not mean the parties have to return, but it means they can still go for another 3 years without the Government paying their transportation back. It is a matter of simplifying the contract of transportation and travel and simply gives legislative authority to what has been done and what is being done as a matter of regulation.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Is this a unanimous report from the gentleman's committee?

Mr. DAWSON. This was a unanimous report, and it is supported by the Bureau of the Budget, the Department of the Army, and by the Comptroller General.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. When the gentleman states that this is a unanimous report, what he means is that there was no record vote against the report.

This bill has some merit—a little. Of course, just as practically all legislation does today, it opens the door to the payment of additional sums by the Government to individuals, in this case who are in the Federal employ. That is about what it amounts to.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman explain that point a little more thoroughly?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. As to how it opens the door?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, it lets a new class of employees have expenses when they come back. But I will say to the majority leader——

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I am on the minority.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I will say as the ranking minority member of that committee that I can see nothing to be gained by opposing it. I have noticed over the last 8 to 10 years that this type of legislation which always increases the compensation to be paid Federal employees goes through, and I have learned that lesson. You know what the Bible says about "kicking against the pricks," and this is one of those cases and there is no use, and I am not objecting.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I would say that what the gentleman from Michigan says is correct, in that it brings a new class of evacuees under the obligation of the Government of the United States to pay for their transportation, such as occurred recently in Seoul, where civilian employees of the Government had to be evacuated. This provides that those people will be given transportation home. We feel it is a moral right that they should be given that transportation home.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That is a little different from what the gentleman from Illinois first stated. He said that this would be to help the Government get some money.

Mr. DAWSON. It does help the Government get some money in one of its provisions, and I will come to another provision where it is for the purpose of taking care of civilian employees of Government who are in areas which the Government deems dangerous, either for military reasons or for reasons of health or hazardous for any other reason.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. How much money will this cost the Government?

Mr. DAWSON. To say how much it would cost, I could not answer that, because I do not contemplate there will be any additional cost, other than the expense we are now being put to as a result of now doing what this would authorize to be done. This gives legislative authority to cut through the red tape and to do what we are now doing.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. How are you getting the money to do it now? You say that you are not supposed to do it, but that you do do it. How are you doing it?

Mr. DAWSON. There are many things that are done through red tape where the authority rests generally with-

81st Congress } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES { Report
2d Session } { No. 2991

GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1951

August 24, 1950.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. Cannon, from the committee of conference, submitted the following

CONFERENCE REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 7786]

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

CHAPTER I.—DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to Chapter I of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 1.

JOE B. BATES,
SIDNEY R. YATES,
FOSTER FURCOLO,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
LOWELL STOCKMAN,
EARL WILSON,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

LISTER HILL,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
HOMER FERGUSON,
K. S. WHERRY,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to Chapter I of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, submit the following report in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

District of Columbia

Amendment No. 1—*Federal contribution:* Appropriates $9,800,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $11,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are in unanimous agreement that this reduction shall not establish a precedent for future annual appropriations, but is recommended for the fiscal year 1951 because of the emergency situation now facing the nation.

Joe B. Bates,
Sidney R. Yates,
Foster Furcolo,
Louis C. Rabaut,
W. F. Norrell,
Clarence Cannon,
Lowell Stockman,
Earl Wilson,
John Taber.
Managers on the Part of the House.

CHAPTER II.—LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to Chapter II of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 52.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 19, 21, 22, 24, 25, 27, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 36, 37, 38, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 50, and 53, and agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 11, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 23, 26, 28, 35, 39, 46, 47, 48, 49, and 51.

CHRISTOPHER C. MCGRATH,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
GEORGE ANDREWS,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
G. CANFIELD,
ERRETT P. SCRIVNER,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
DENNIS CHAVEZ,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
STYLES BRIDGES,
GUY CORDON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to Chapter II of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Legislative Branch

SENATE

Amendments Nos. 2–34: Provide appropriations for the Senate, which were not included in the bill as passed by the House. Of such amendments, those numbered 11, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 23, 26, and 28 would have been subject to points of order if considered originally in the House, and therefore are reported in disagreement. The conference report recommends that the House recede and concur with the remainder of such amendments.

Amendment No. 35—*Inquiries and investigations:* Reported in disagreement.

Amendments Nos. 36–48: Provide for or pertain to appropriations for the Senate, which were not included in the bill as passed by the House. Of such amendments, those numbered 39, 46, 47, and 48 would have been subject to points of order if considered originally in the House, and therefore are reported in disagreement. The conference report recommends that the House recede and concur with the remainder of such amendments.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

Amendment No. 49, providing funds for the Joint Committee on Nonessential Federal Expenditures, would have been subject to a point of order if considered originally in the House, and therefore is reported in disagreement.

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

Amendment No. 50—*Subway Transportation, Capitol and Senate Office Building:* Appropriates $2,600 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 51—*Senate Office Building:* Reported in disagreement, inasmuch as it would have been subject to a point of order if considered originally in the House.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

Amendment No. 52—*Editing and Publishing the Index-Digest of Publications of the Temporary National Economic Committee:* Strikes out the Senate proposal.

Amendment No. 53—*Library buildings, salaries and expenses:* Appropriates $698,680 proposed by the Senate, instead of $695,200 proposed by the House.

CHRISTOPHER C. MCGRATH,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
GEORGE ANDREWS,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
G. CANFIELD,
ERRETT P. SCRIVNER,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CHAPTER III.—DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND THE JUDICIARY

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to Chapter III of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 55, 60, 62, 63, 66, 73, 77, 79, 98, 102, 104, 105, 108, 110, 114, and 118.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 56, 58, 64, 67, 69, 70, 71, 74, 75, 76, 78, 80, 81, 82, 83, 85, 87, 88, 90, 91, 96, 99, 100, 101, 103, 109, 111, 112, 113, 115, and 116, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$77,800,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 57:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$6,500,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 59:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$54,449,297*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 61:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$2,900,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 65:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$508,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 84:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$1,350,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 86:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 86, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$98,500,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 89:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 89, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$16,000,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 93:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 93, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$3,500,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 95:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 95, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$5,150,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 97:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 97, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$11,500,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 106:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 106, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$24,897,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 117:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 117, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$995,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 68, 72, 92, 94, and 107.

JOHN J. ROONEY,
DANIEL J. FLOOD,
PRINCE H. PRESTON,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
KARL STEFAN,
CLIFF CLEVENGER,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

PAT MCCARRAN,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
STYLES BRIDGES,
HOMER FERGUSON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to Chapter III of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Department of State

Amendment No. 54—*Salaries and Expenses:* Appropriates $77,800,000, instead of $77,300,000 as proposed by the House and $78,300,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 55—*Representation Allowances:* Appropriates $675,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $900,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 56—*Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund:* Provides no appropriation or language, as proposed by the Senate, instead of appropriating $2,233,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 57—*Buildings Fund:* Appropriates $6,500,000, instead of $8,000,000 as proposed by the House and $5,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 58—*Emergencies in the Diplomatic and Consular Service:* Appropriates $9,900,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $10,600,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 59—*Contributions to International Organizations:* Appropriates $54,449,297, instead of $55,178,297 as proposed by the House and $53,753,067 as proposed by the Senate. The reduction in the House figure applies to "International Civil Aviation Organization".

Amendment No. 60—*Missions to International Organizations:* Appropriates $1,600,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $1,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 61—*International Contingencies:* Appropriates $2,900,000, instead of $3,000,000 as proposed by the House and $2,800,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 62 and 63—*International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico:* Authorizes the purchase of 4 automobiles for replacement only as proposed by the House, instead of the purchase of 8 automobiles of which 6 were to be for replacement only as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 64—*International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, Construction:* Appropriates $3,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $5,035,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 65—*American Sections, International Commissions:* Appropriates $508,000, instead of $500,000 as proposed by the House and $600,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 66—*American Sections, International Commissions:* Eliminates the Senate proposal to make $92,000 available for the examination and survey of the Red River of the North and its tributaries.

Amendment No. 67—*International Information and Educational Activities:* Appropriates $32,700,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $34,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 68—*International Information and Educational Activities:* Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 69—*International Information and Educational Activities:* Authorizes the transfer of not to exceed $2,875,000 to other appropriations of the Department of State as proposed by the Senate, instead of $3,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 70—*Philippine Rehabilitation:* Appropriates $10,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $13,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 71—*The Institute of Inter-American Affairs:* Appropriates $5,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $5,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 72—*The Institute of Inter-American Affairs:* Reported in disagreement.

Department of Justice

LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 73—*Salaries and Expenses, General Administration:* Appropriates $2,175,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $2,125,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 74—*Salaries and Expenses, General Legal Activities:* Appropriates $7,475,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $7,300,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 75—*Salaries and Expenses, Antitrust Division:* Appropriates $3,750,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $3,850,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 76—*Salaries and Expenses, United States Attorneys and Marshals:* Appropriates $12,847,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $12,600,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 77—*Fees and Expenses of Witnesses:* Appropriates $1,000,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $1,250,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 78—*Salaries and Expenses, Claims of Persons of Japanese Ancestry:* Appropriates $1,300,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $4,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 79—*Salaries and Expenses, Claims of Persons of Japanese Ancestry:* Makes available not to exceed $250,000 for administrative expenses as proposed by the House, instead of $300,000 as proposed by the Senate.

FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM

Amendment No. 80—*Buildings and Facilities:* Appropriates $800,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $900,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 81—*Buildings and Facilities:* Provides $170,000 cash for replacement of a power plant at the U. S. Penitentiary,

Atlanta, Georgia, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $270,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 82—*Buildings and Facilities:* Corrects total to conform with action on amendment No. 81 as proposed by the Senate.

OFFICE OF ALIEN PROPERTY

Amendment No. 83—*Salaries and Expenses:* Makes available $4,150,000 for the general administrative expenses as proposed by the Senate, instead of $4,240,000 as proposed by the House.

Department of Commerce

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Amendment No. 84—*Salaries and Expenses:* Appropriates $1,350,000, instead of $1,300,000 as proposed by the House and $1,400,000 as proposed by the Senate.

BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Amendment No. 85—*Seventeenth decennial census:* Appropriates $28,500,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $29,500,000 as proposed by the House.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 86—*Salaries and Expenses:* Appropriates $98,500,000, instead of $97,000,000 as proposed by the House and $99,775,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 87—*Establishment of air-navigation facilities:* Appropriates $27,500,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $32,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 88—*Establishment of air-navigation facilities:* Provides $22,000,000 of the amount contained in Amendment No. 87 for liquidation of prior contract authorizations as proposed by the Senate, instead of $26,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 89—*Establishment of air-navigation facilities:* Provides contract authority in an amount not to exceed $16,000,000, instead of $13,461,500 as proposed by the House and $20,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 90—*Federal-aid airport program. Federal Airport Act:* Appropriates $37,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $45,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 91—*Federal-aid airport program. Federal Airport Act:* Provides $34,000,000 of the amount contained in Amendment No. 90 for liquidation of prior contract authority as proposed by the Senate, instead of $42,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 92—*Air navigation development:* Reported in disagreement.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

Amendment No. 93—*Salaries and Expenses:* Appropriates $3,500,000, instead of $3,400,000 as proposed by the House and $4,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 94—*Salaries and Expenses:* Reported in disagreement.

BUREAU OF FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC COMMERCE

Amendment No. 95—*Departmental Salaries and Expenses:* Appropriates $5,150,000, instead of $5,000,000 as proposed by the House and $5,300,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 96—*Field Office Service:* Appropriates $2,155,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $2,050,000 as proposed by the House.

PATENT OFFICE

Amendment No. 97—*Salaries and Expenses:* Appropriates $11,500,000, instead of $11,300,000 as proposed by the House, and $11,530,000 as proposed by the Senate.

BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS

Amendment No. 98—*General Administrative Expenses:* Restores the House language which provides that not to exceed $3,000,000 to be derived from the administrative funds shall be available for continuing the construction of a laboratory for testing and research work.

Amendment No. 99—*Federal-aid postwar highways:* Appropriates $385,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $405,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 100—*Federal-aid postwar highways:* Corrects the amount to conform with action on Amendment No. 99 as proposed by the Senate.

NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS

Amendment No. 101: Provides a limitation of $700,000 for improvements to buildings, grounds and other plant facilities as proposed by the Senate, instead of $540,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 102—*Operation and Administration:* Appropriates $1,270,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $1,430,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 103—*Radio Propagation and Standards:* Appropriates $3,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $3,100,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 104—*Construction of Laboratories:* Appropriates $500,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $268,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 105—*Construction of Laboratories:* Authorizes contract authority in an amount not to exceed $5,675,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $3,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

WEATHER BUREAU

Amendment No. 106—*Salaries and Expenses:* Appropriates $24,897,000, instead of $24,447,000 as proposed by the House and $24,927,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 107—*Salaries and Expenses:* Reported in disagreement.

The Judiciary

CUSTOMS COURT

Amendment No. 108—*Salaries and Expenses:* Appropriates $417,465 as proposed by the House, instead of $411,465 as proposed by the Senate.

COURT OF CLAIMS

Amendment No. 109—*Salaries and Expenses:* Appropriates $575,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $587,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 110—*Repairs and Improvements:* Appropriates $10,700 as proposed by the House, instead of $140,700 as proposed by the Senate.

OTHER COURTS AND SERVICES

Amendment No. 111—*Salaries of Clerks of Courts:* Appropriates $4,470,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $4,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 112—*Salaries of Criers:* Appropriates $520,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $540,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 113—*Miscellaneous Expenses:* Appropriates $675,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $725,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 114—*Travel Expenses:* Appropriates $725,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $650,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 115—*Administrative Office of the U. S. Courts:* Appropriates $520,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $530,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 116—*Repairs and Improvements, District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia:* Appropriates $7,100 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $15,600 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 117—*Expenses of Referees:* Appropriates $995,000 to be derived from the referees' expense fund, instead of $960,000 as proposed by the House and $1,035,400 as proposed by the Senate.

Government Corporations

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Amendment No. 118—*The Institute of Inter-American Affairs:* Provides not to exceed $600,000 for administrative expenses of the funds available to the corporation, as proposed by the House, instead of $767,500 as proposed by the Senate.

John J. Rooney,
Daniel J. Flood,
Prince H. Preston,
Louis C. Rabaut,
W. F. Norrell,
Clarence Cannon,
Karl Stefan,
Cliff Clevenger,
John Taber,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CHAPTER IV.—TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to Chapter IV of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 134.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 120, 122, 123, 125, 127, 130, 131, 132, and 133, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 119:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 119, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$1,185,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 121:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 121, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$2,100,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 124:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 124, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$36,600,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 126:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 126, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$1,850,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 128:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 128, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$2,150,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 129:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 129, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$17,000,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

J. VAUGHAN GARY,
A. M. FERNANDEZ,
OTTO E. PASSMAN,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
G. CANFIELD,
FREDERIC R. COUDERT,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

BURNET R. MAYBANK,
CARL HAYDEN,
H. M. KILGORE,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
OLIN D. JOHNSON,
GUY CORDON,
STYLES BRIDGES,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to Chapter IV of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Treasury Department

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES

Amendment No. 119—*Salaries:* Appropriates $1,185,000, instead of $1,160,000 as proposed by the House and $1,207,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 120—*Miscellaneous Expenses:* Appropriates $308,500 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $300,000 as proposed by the House.

BUREAU OF ACCOUNTS

Amendment No. 121—*Salaries and Expenses:* Appropriates $2,100,000, instead of $1,875,000 as proposed by the House and $2,209,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 122—*Recoinage of Silver Coins:* Strikes out House language as proposed by the Senate.

BUREAU OF THE PUBLIC DEBT

Amendment No. 123—*Distinctive Paper for United States Currency and Securities:* Appropriates $1,845,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,745,000 as proposed by the House.

BUREAU OF CUSTOMS

Amendment No. 124—*Salaries and Expenses:* Appropriates $36,600,000, instead of $36,500,000 as proposed by the House and $36,806,360 as proposed by the Senate.

BUREAU OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Amendment No. 125—*Salaries and Expenses:* Appropriates $245,547,500 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $245,600,000 as proposed by the House.

BUREAU OF NARCOTICS

Amendment No. 126—*Salaries and Expenses:* Appropriates $1,850,000, instead of $1,750,000 as proposed by the House and $1,908,000 as proposed by the Senate.

BUREAU OF ENGRAVING AND PRINTING

Amendment No. 127—*Salaries and Expenses:* Appropriates $16,835,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $15,500,000 as proposed by the House.

SECRET SERVICE DIVISION

Amendment No. 128—*Salaries and Expenses:* Appropriates $2,150,000, instead of $2,100,000 as proposed by the House and $2,250,000 as proposed by the Senate.

COAST GUARD

Amendment No. 129—*Acquisition, Construction and Improvements:* Appropriates $17,000,000, instead of $15,000,000 as proposed by the House and $18,964,000 as proposed by the Senate.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Amendment Nos. 130, 131, and 132—*Deficiency in Postal Revenues:* Delete the House limitation of $401,500,000 as the maximum amount which can be drawn from the Federal Treasury for this purpose and inserts language allowing the use of an indefinite amount, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 133—*Transportation of Mails:* Inserts language to allow the use of this appropriation for payment of current and prior fiscal year settlements with foreign countries, as proposed by the Senate.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Amendment No. 134—*Administrative Expenses:* Authorizes not to exceed $26,000,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $26,700,000 as proposed by the Senate.

J. VAUGHAN GARY,
A. M. FERNANDEZ,
OTTO E. PASSMAN.
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
G. CANFIELD,
FREDERIC R. COUDERT,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CHAPTER V.—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to Chapter V of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 137, 141, and 152.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 139, 144, 145, 146, 149, 154, and 155, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 135:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 135, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: *forty-five passenger motor vehicles, of which seventeen shall be for replacement only*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 136:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 136, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$5,466,700*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 138:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 138, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$1,971,500*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 140:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 140, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$9,800,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 143:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 143, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: *and including $200,000 for transfer to the Department of Agriculture for research into utilization of plant material and vegetable sources of cortisone*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 147:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 147, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$2,090,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 150:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 150, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$250,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 153:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 153, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$523,100*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 156:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 156, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$8,582,500*; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 142, 148, and 151.

JOHN E. FOGARTY,
E. H. HEDRICK,
CHRISTOPHER C. MCGRATH,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
ERRETT P. SCRIVNER,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

DENNIS CHAVEZ,
PAT MCCARRAN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
CHAN GURNEY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to Chapter V of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Federal Security Agency

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

Amendments Nos. 135 and 136—*Salaries and expenses:* Appropriate $5,466,700, instead of $5,666,700 as proposed by the Senate and $5,066,700 as proposed by the House, including the purchase of not to exceed forty-five passenger motor vehicles, instead of not to exceed sixty-five proposed by the Senate and not to exceed seventeen proposed by the House.

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Amendment No. 137—*Promotion and further development of vocational education:* Appropriates $19,977,760 as proposed by the House, instead of $23,435,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 138—*Salaries and expenses:* Appropriates $1,971,500, instead of $2,023,420 as proposed by the Senate and $1,900,000 as proposed by the House.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Amendment No. 139—*Venereal diseases:* Appropriates $14,500,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $14,900,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 140—*Tuberculosis:* Appropriates $9,800,000 instead of $9,600,000 as proposed by the Senate, and $10,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 141—*Salaries and expenses, hospital construction services:* Appropriates $1,357,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $2,107,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 142—*National Institutes of Health, operating expenses:* Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 143: Restores the House language providing for transfer of funds to the Department of Agriculture for research into utilization of plant material and vegetable sources of cortisone, modified to make the transfer in the specific amount of $200,000.

Amendment No. 144—*National Cancer Institute:* Appropriates $20,686,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $20,086,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 145—*Mental health activities:* Appropriates $10,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $9,944,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 146—*National Heart Institute:* Appropriates $14,750,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $14,150,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 147—*Dental health activities:* Appropriates $2,090,000, instead of $2,140,000 as proposed by the Senate and $2,040,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 148—*Construction of research facilities:* Reported in disagreement.

SAINT ELIZABETH'S HOSPITAL

Amendment No. 149—*Salaries and expenses:* Appropriates $2,005,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,948,000 as proposed by the House.

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 150—*Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Federal Credit Unions:* Appropriates $250,000, instead of $300,000 as proposed by the Senate and $200,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 151—*Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance:* Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 152—*Salaries and expenses, Children's Bureau:* Appropriates $1,500,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $1,510,000 as proposed by the Senate.

OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

Amendment No. 153—*Salaries, Office of the General Counsel:* Appropriates $523,100, instead of $535,100 as proposed by the Senate and $511,100 as proposed by the House.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 154: Inserts a separate section proposed by the Senate, making certain appropriations of the Federal Security Agency in the bill available for travel expenses and for expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the function or activity for which any such appropriation is made.

Amendment No. 155: Corrects a section number.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Amendment No. 156—*Salaries and expenses:* Appropriates $8,582,500, instead of $8,615,000 as proposed by the Senate and $8,550,000 as proposed by the House.

JOHN E. FOGARTY,
E. H. HEDRICK,
CHRISTOPHER C. MCGRATH,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
ERRETT P. SCRIVNER,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CHAPTER VI.—DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to Chapter VI of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 159, 163, 170, 171, 174, 176, 185, 202, 203, 214, and 229.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 158, 160, 161, 162, 164, 165, 167, 168, 169, 199, 205, 206, 207, 210, 211, 213, 216, 218, 219, 226, 227, 228, 233, 235, 236, and 237, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 172:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 172, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$2,294,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 173:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 173, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$1,325,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 177:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 177, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$1,617,500*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 178:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 178, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$7,960,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 179:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 179, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$3,437,500*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 180:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment o the Senate numbered 180, and agree to the same with an amendmen as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$3,012,500* and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 181:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment o the Senate numbered 181, and agree to the same with an amendmen as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$452,500* and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 182:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment o the Senate numbered 182, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$2,723,750*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 183:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment o the Senate numbered 183, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$1,130,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 184:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 184, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$4,157,500*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 186:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 186, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$4,450,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 187:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 187, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$2,354,700*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 188:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 188, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$2,100,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 190:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 190, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$560,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 191:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 191, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$1,650,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 193:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 193, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$3,490,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 194:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 194, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$537,050*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 195:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 195, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$1,837,475*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 196:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 196, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$1,115,475*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 197:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 197, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$27,100,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 204:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 204, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$300,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 208:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 208, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$10,315,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 212:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 212, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$1,565,175*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 217:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 217, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$2,118,500*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 220:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 220, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$8,550,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 221:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 221, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$32,500,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 222:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 222, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$65,000,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 225:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 225, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$28,500,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 230:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 230, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$2,161,300*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 231:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 231, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$2,562,500*; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 157, 166, 175, 189, 192, 198, 200, 201, 209, 215, 223, 224, 232, 234, and 238.

JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
WILLIAM G. STIGLER,
EDWARD H. KRUSE, Jr.,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
WALT HORAN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
CARL HAYDEN,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
PAT MCCARRAN,
ELMER THOMAS,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
CHAN GURNEY,
HOMER FERGUSON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to Chapter VI of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Department of Agriculture

RESEARCH AND MARKETING ACT

Amendment No. 157: Reported in disagreement.

BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

Amendments Nos. 158 and 159—*Economic investigations:* Strike out House language to permit economic research on farm housing as proposed by the Senate and appropriate $2,600,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $2,720,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 160 and 161—*Crop and livestock estimates:* Strike out House language authorizing collection of data on farm construction as proposed by the Senate and appropriate $2,904,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $2,725,000 as proposed by the House.

OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR, AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 162: Corrects language as proposed by the Senate.

WORKING CAPITAL FUND, AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH CENTER

Amendment No. 163: Restores language establishing a working capital fund as proposed by the House.

RESEARCH ON AGRICULTURAL PROBLEMS OF ALASKA

Amendment No. 164: Appropriates $280,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $260,000 as proposed by the House.

OFFICE OF EXPERIMENT STATIONS

Amendment No. 165—*Payments to States and Territories:* Inserts language proposed by the Senate in connection with the transfer of Research and Marketing Act funds.

Amendment No. 166—*Payments to States and Territories:* Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 167—*Payments to States and Territories:* Authorizes $37,500 for research in Alaska as proposed by the Senate, instead of $27,500 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 168—*Payments to States and Territories:* Appropriates $12,416,208 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $7,406,208 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 169 and 170—*Salaries and expenses:* Correct date reference as proposed by the Senate and appropriate $237,500 as proposed by the House, instead of $252,500 as proposed by the Senate.

BUREAU OF HUMAN NUTRITION AND HOME ECONOMICS

Amendment No. 171: Appropriates $1,500,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $1,763,200 as proposed by the Senate.

BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY

Amendment No. 172—*Animal husbandry:* Appropriates $2,294,000, instead of $2,319,000 as proposed by the Senate and $2,250,000 as proposed by the House. The amount appropriated includes $19,000 proposed by the Senate to enable the Department to continue operation of the Morgan Horse Farm until the State Legislature can consider a proposal for State of Vermont to take it over. It is agreed unanimously by the conferees of both Houses that this activity must be disposed of by the end of the fiscal year 1951.

Amendment No. 173—*Diseases of animals:* Appropriates $1,325,000, instead of $1,350,000 as proposed by the Senate and $1,300,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 174—*Animal disease control and eradication:* Appropriates $7,950,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $7,952,500 as proposed by the Senate. Although Senate increase is eliminated, the conferees of both Houses agree that the Seattle stockyards should be given the same inspection service accorded similar stockyards throughout the country, within the funds approved.

Amendment No. 175—*Animal disease control and eradication:* Reported in disagreement.

BUREAU OF DAIRY INDUSTRY

Amendments Nos. 176 and 177: Eliminate language proposed by the Senate authorizing construction of housing at Beltsville and appropriate $1,617,500, instead of $1,735,000 as proposed by the Senate and $1,600,000 as proposed by the House.

BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL AND INDUSTRIAL CHEMISTRY

Amendment No. 178: Appropriates $7,960,000, instead of $8,500,000 as proposed by the Senate and $7,750,000 as proposed by the House. This amount provides partial restoration of House cut below 1950 level of operation. Funds for research on cortisone are provided in Chapter V of the bill.

BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY

Amendment No. 179—*Field crops:* Appropriates $3,437,500, instead of $3,475,000 as proposed by the Senate and $3,400,000 as proposed by the House. This amount includes $30,000 for research on new types of cotton.

Amendment No. 180—*Fruit, vegetable, and specialty crops:* Appropriates $3,012,500, instead of $3,075,000 as proposed by the Senate and $2,950,000 as proposed by the House. Funds for research into new sources of cortisone are included in Chapter V of the bill.

Amendment No. 181—*Forest diseases:* Appropriates $452,500, instead of $455,000 as proposed by the Senate and $450,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 182—*Soils, fertilizers, and irrigation:* Appropriates $2,723,750, instead of $2,767,500 as proposed by the Senate and $2,680,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 183—*Agricultural engineering:* Appropriates $1,130,000, instead of $1,140,000 as proposed by the Senate and $1,120,000 as proposed by the House.

BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY AND PLANT QUARANTINE

Amendments Nos. 184 and 185—*Insect investigations*: Appropriate $4,157,500, instead of $4,165,000 as proposed by the Senate and $4,100,000 as proposed by the House and restore House language authorizing the transfer of funds to the Public Health Service for studies on effects of insecticidal and fungicidal residue on human health.

Amendment No. 186—*Insect and plant-disease control*: Appropriates $4,450,000, instead of $4,651,000 as proposed by the Senate and $4,185,900 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 187—*Foreign plant quarantines*: Appropriates $2,354,700, instead of $2,384,400 as proposed by the Senate and $2,325,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 188—*Control of emergency outbreaks of insects and plant diseases:* Appropriates $2,100,000, instead of $2,350,000 as proposed by the Senate and $850,000 as proposed by the House. The additional contingency funds, which are provided to eliminate future deficiencies, are to be released only after both committees have approved final plans for their use.

Amendment No. 189—*Control of emergency outbreaks of insects and plant diseases:* Reported in disagreement.

CONTROL OF FOREST PESTS

Amendment No. 190—*Gypsy and brown-tail moths:* Appropriates $560,000, instead of $590,000 as proposed by the Senate and $539,500 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 191—*Forest Pest Control Act:* Appropriates $1,650,000, instead of $1,900,000 as proposed by the Senate and $900,000 as proposed by the House. The additional contingency funds of $750,000 are included to eliminate as far as possible future deficiencies.

Amendment No. 192—*Forest Pest Control Act:* Reported in disagreement.

Amendments Nos. 193, 194, 195, and 196—*White pine blister rust:* Appropriate $3,490,000, instead of $3,700,000 as proposed by the Senate and $3,280,000 as proposed by the House and adjust amounts to be transferred to the three agencies which carry out this program.

FOREST SERVICE

Amendment No. 197—*National forest protection and management:* Appropriates $27,100,000, instead of $29,320,500 as proposed by the Senate and $26,890,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 198—*Cooperative range improvements:* Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 199—*Forest and range management investigations:* Appropriates $3,030,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $2,995,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 200—*Forest and range management investigations:* Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 201—*Forest products:* Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 202—*Forest resources investigations:* Appropriates $880,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $1,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 203—*Forest development roads and trails:* Appropriates $10,348,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $12,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 204—*Acquisition of land for national forests, Weeks Act:* Appropriates $300,000, instead of $401,000 as proposed by the Senate and $100,000 as proposed by the House. The conferees of both Houses agree that none of these funds shall be used to purchase lands unless they are located entirely within national forest boundaries.

Amendments Nos. 205, 206, and 207—*Farm and other private forestry cooperation:* Approve corrections proposed by the Senate in sublimitation accounts.

FLOOD CONTROL

Amendment No. 208: Appropriates $10,315,000, instead of $9,880,000 as proposed by the Senate and $10,750,000 as proposed by the House. Within the funds available, special attention shall be given to the areas where work has been delayed.

Amendment No. 209: Reported in disagreement.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

Amendment No. 210: Omits surplus heading.

Amendment No. 211—*Soil conservation operations:* Appropriates $52,400,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $52,900,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 212—*Land utilization and retirement of submarginal land:* Appropriates $1,565,175, instead of $1,665,175 as proposed by the Senate and $1,490,000 as proposed by the House. The amount approved includes Senate increase for the San Simon Valley project.

Amendment No. 213—*Water conservation and utilization projects:* Appropriates $500,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $400,000 as proposed by the House.

PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 214—*Conservation and use of agricultural land resources:* Appropriates $282,500,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $283,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 215—*Conservation and use of agricultural land resources:* Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 216—*Sugar Act:* Appropriates $63,750,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $60,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 217—*Market News Service:* Appropriates $2,118,500, instead of $2,187,000 as proposed by the Senate and $2,050,000 as proposed by the House. The amount approved includes Senate increase for market news service on naval stores.

Amendment No. 218—*Marketing regulatory acts:* Appropriates $3,495,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $3,550,000 as proposed by the House.

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE

Amendment No. 219: Appropriates $7,204,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $6,854,000 as proposed by the House.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 220—*Salaries and expenses:* Appropriates $8,550,000, instead of $8,750,000 as proposed by the Senate and $8,150,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 221—*Loan authorization:* Authorizes rural telephone loans in the amount of $32,500,000, instead of $40,000,000 as proposed by the Senate and $25,000,000 as proposed by the House. The conferees agree that the fees for engineering and legal services on the larger loans should be reduced. They also feel that standardization of plans should be developed to make possible further savings to the consumers. In addition, the Rural Electrification Administration is expected to exercise its power generation authority only in line with its announced policy and the law.

FARMERS' HOME ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 222—*Loan authorization:* Authorizes $65,000,000 for farm tenancy and housing loans, instead of $71,350,000 as proposed by the Senate and $56,350,000 as proposed by the House. In addition, the Farmers' Home Administration will have a carry-over of approximately $7,000,000 from 1950 for farm housing loans, which will make a total of $72,000,000 available for 1951.

Amendment No. 223—*Loan authorization:* Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 224—*Loan authorization:* Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 225—*Salaries and expenses:* Appropriates $28,500,000, instead of $29,000,000 as proposed by the Senate and $27,700,000 as proposed by the House.

EXTENSION SERVICE

Amendments Nos. 226, 227, and 228—*Payments to States and Territories:* Appropriate $27,103,498 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $27,000,000 as proposed by the House and adjust language to increase payments to Alaska and Puerto Rico.

Amendment No. 229—*Salaries and expenses:* Appropriates $900,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $915,000 as proposed by the Senate.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Amendment No. 230: Appropriates $2,161,300, instead of $2,179,300 as proposed by the Senate and $2,143,300 as proposed by the House.

OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

Amendment No. 231: Appropriates $2,562,500, instead of $2,675,000 as proposed by the Senate and $2,450,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 232: Reported in disagreement.

OFFICE OF INFORMATION

Amendment No. 233: Approves language as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 234: Reported in disagreement.

TRAVEL LIMITATION

Amendment No. 235: Eliminates language proposed by the House limiting funds for travel expenses, in view of Senate substitute in Amendment No. 238.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Amendment No. 236—*Administrative expenses:* Authorizes $16,350,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $16,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 237—*Restoration of capital impairment:* Approves $66,698,457 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $170,515,131 as proposed by the House.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 238: Reported in disagreement.

JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
WILLIAM G. STIGLER,
EDWARD H. KRUSE, Jr.,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
WALT HORAN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CHAPTER VII.—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to Chapter VII of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 239, 240, 242, 245, 248, 250, 253, 256, 257, 258, 259, 266, 272, 280, 286, 287, 291, 292, 299, 308, and 309.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 241, 243, 244, 246, 247, 249, 255, 260, 261, 264, 267, 269, 274, 276, 282, 290, 293, 294, 297, 298, 301, 303, 304, 305, and 307, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 251:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 251, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$700,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 252:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 252, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken out and proposed by said amendment insert *Provided, That of appropriations herein made for the Bureau of Land Management expenditures in connection with the revested Oregon and California Railroad and reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands shall be reimbursed from the 25 per centum referred to in section c, title II, of the Act approved August 28, 1937, of the special fund designated the "Oregon and California Land Grant Fund" and section 4 of the Act approved May 24, 1939, of the special fund designated the "Coos Bay Wagon Road Grant Fund"*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 262:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 262, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$23,272,651*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 263:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 263, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$3,500,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 265:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 265, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$3,600,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 268:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 268, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken by said amendment insert *: Provided, That in addition to the amount appropriated herein, tribal funds may be advanced to Indian tribes during the current fiscal year for such purposes as may be designated by the governing body of the particular tribe involved and approved by the Secretary. Any tribal funds advanced under this authority shall be reported to the Congress in the annual Budget for the fiscal year 1952*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 270:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 270, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$5,875,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 271:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 271, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$5,116,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 273:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 273, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$295,828,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 281:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 281, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$7,200,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 283:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 283, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken out and proposed by said amendment insert *not to exceed $100,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), including such services at rates for individuals not to exceed $100 per day, when authorized by the Secretary*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 296:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 296, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$7,400,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 310:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 310, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$30,000,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 254, 275, 277, 278, 279, 284, 285, 288, 289, 295, 300, 302, and 306.

MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
HENRY M. JACKSON,
ALBERT GORE,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
BEN F. JENSEN,
IVOR D. FENTON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CARL HAYDEN,
ELMER THOMAS,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
KENNETH S. WHERRY,
CHAN GURNEY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to Chapter VII of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Department of the Interior

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Amendment No. 239—*Salaries and expenses:* Appropriates $2,315,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $2,100,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 240—*Standardization of geographic names:* Provides no appropriation, as proposed by the House, instead of making an appropriation of $14,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 241—*Enforcement of Connally Hot Oil Act:* Appropriates $180,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $200,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 242—*Southeastern power marketing area, operation and maintenance:* Appropriates $150,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $100,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 243 and 244—*Southwestern Power Administration, construction:* Appropriate $8,620,000 and provide contractual authority of $1,730,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of appropriating $10,350,000 and providing $6,000,000 contractual authority as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 245—*Southwestern Power Administration, operation and maintenance:* Appropriates $760,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $660,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The Southwestern Power Administration is expected to exercise its power generation and transmission authority only in line with its announced policy and the law.

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

Amendments Nos. 246 and 247—*Construction:* Appropriate $39,500,000 and provide contractual authority of $20,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of appropriating $41,500,000 and providing contractual authority of $21,750,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 248—*Operation and maintenance:* Appropriates $5,000,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $4,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

Amendment No. 249—*Management of lands and resources:* Appropriates $7,127,810 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $6,756,800, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 250—*Management of lands and resources:* Eliminates the Senate proposal to include express authorization to expend funds for weed control on the revested Oregon and California Railroad and Coos Bay Road lands, since such express authority is not needed.

Amendment No. 251—*Construction:* Appropriates $700,000, instead of $600,000 as proposed by the House and $800,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 252—*Administrative provisions:* Provides for reimbursement of all expenditures in connection with the revested Oregon and California Railroad and Coos Bay Road lands from the special funds maintained by 25% of the receipts from such lands. Such reimbursement for current expenses is to be made entirely from 25% of current year receipts. If 25% of current receipts is inadequate also to reimburse for the $700,000 appropriation for capital expenditures such current year deficiency can be made up from later receipts. This modifies the reimbursement proposal of both Houses.

Amendment No. 253—*Range improvements:* Eliminates the Senate proposal to insert a limitation of $350,000 on expenditure of receipts.

Amendment No. 254—*Payments to states (Proceeds of sales):* Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 255—*Payments to states (Proceeds of Sales):* Provides a limitation of $20,000 on such payments as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 256—*Payment to Oklahoma:* Eliminates the Senate proposal to insert a limitation of $4,000 on such payment.

Amendment No. 257—*Leasing of grazing lands:* Eliminates the Senate proposal to insert a limitation of $6,000 on expenditure of receipts.

Amendment No. 258—*Payments to states (Grazing fees):* Eliminates the Senate proposal to insert a limitation of $300 on such payments.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

Amendment No. 259—*Health, education and welfare services:* Eliminates the Senate proposal to authorize expenditure for research among mixed Indians and non-Indian groups.

Amendment No. 260—*Health, education and welfare services:* Appropriates $40,252,328 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $37,929,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 261—*Resources management:* Appropriates $10,814,576 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $10,542,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 262—*Construction:* Appropriates $23,272,651, instead of $22,422,000 as proposed by the House and $23,635,151 as proposed by the Senate. This action eliminates the sum of $500,000 which was added by the Senate for the construction of roads and trails, but restores the sum of $137,500 for land acquisition which was deleted by the Senate. The restoration of $137,500 for land acquisition is made with the understanding that it is not to be expended for

the acquisition of privately owned land to be held in trust so as to extend the boundaries of Indian reservations.

Amendment No. 263—*Construction:* Provides contractual authority of $3,500,000, instead of $2,500,000 as proposed by the House and $5,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 264—*Restriction on land acquisition:* Adopts the proposal of the Senate to limit the use of appropriations for the acquisition of land or water rights for Indians in specified states.

Amendment No. 265—*General administrative expenses:* Appropriates $3,600,000, instead of $3,500,000 as proposed by the House, and $3,644,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 266—*Administrative provisions:* Authorizes the purchase of 227 automobiles as proposed by the House, instead of 250 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 267—*Tribal funds:* Appropriates $2,437,965 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $2,430,965 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 268—*Tribal funds:* Authorizes the advancement of tribal funds to Indian tribes during the current fiscal year upon the designation by the governing body of the tribe and approval by the Secretary, and requires that such advances shall be reported to the Congress in the annual budget for the fiscal year 1952, thus reinstating with modification the language proposed by the House but deleted by the Senate.

Amendment No. 269—*Tribal funds:* Inserts a limitation upon the use of tribal funds for the acquisition of land or water rights in specified states, as proposed by the Senate.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

Amendment No. 270—*General investigations:* Appropriates $5,875,000, instead of $5,150,000 as proposed by the House and $6,500,000 as proposed by the Senate. This action provides $50,000 for investigation of the La Prele unit, Wyoming.

Amendment No. 271—*General investigations:* Provides that of the appropriation of $5,875,000 for general investigations the amount to be derived from the reclamation fund is $5,116,000, instead of $4,400,000 as proposed by the House and $5,791,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 272—*Construction and rehabilitation:* Eliminates the proposal of the Senate to authorize emergency re-construction of the La Prele unit, Wyoming, and initiation of construction on the Kennewick Division of the Yakima project, Washington.

Amendment No. 273—*Construction and rehabilitation:* Appropriates $295,828,000, instead of $297,467,000 as proposed by the House, and $294,713,000 as proposed by the Senate. This action ratifies the allocation of funds for construction and rehabilitation as set forth on pages 142 and 143 (and for the Missouri Basin project, on pages 147, 148, 149, and 150) of Senate report No. 1941, accompanying H. R. 7786, including ratification of the Senate action in providing $750,000 to initiate the work on the Folsom power facilities, Central Valley project, and including ratification of providing $504,000 (increase in appropriation of $228,000 together with $276,000 to be available through reprograming under House allowance) for construction of

the Brighton-Brush transmission line and substations, Colorado-Big Thompson project, but with the following exceptions to such ratification:

(a) In addition to $343,000 allowed by the Senate for the Fort Peck project, Montana, $750,000 is also allowed to complete construction of the Havre-Shelby transmission line and substations. This is in lieu of the $1,400,000 allowed by the House and of the entire disallowance of funds for this line as proposed by the Senate.

(b) The additional sum of $365,000 is provided for the Missouri Basin project to construct the Canyon Ferry-Great Falls transmission line and substations.

Amendment No. 274—*Construction and rehabilitation*: Provides that of the appropriation of $295,828,000, the sum to be derived from the reclamation fund shall be $25,135,700 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $22,897,700 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 275—*Construction and rehabilitation* (*contract authority*): Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 276—*Construction and rehabilitation:* Ratifies the action of the Senate in deleting the proposal of the House to earmark $1,000,000 for the construction of specified transmission lines in South Dakota.

Amendment No. 277—*Construction and rehabilitation* (*language authorizing South Dakota transmission lines*): Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 278—*Construction and rehabilitation* (*restriction on construction of Glendo unit*): Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 279—*Construction and rehabilitation* (*restriction on construction of Moorhead Dam*): Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 280—*Construction and rehabilitation:* Eliminates the proposal of the Senate to rescind the unused portion of the 1950 appropriation for construction of the Havre-Shelby transmission line and substations, Fort Peck project, Montana.

Amendment No. 281—*General administrative expenses:* Appropriates $7,200,000, instead of $7,000,000 as proposed by the House and $7,400,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 282—*General administrative expenses:* Inserts a provision limiting expenditures for information work to not more than $150,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 283—*Administrative provisions:* Provides that not to exceed $100,000 shall be available for services authorized under section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946, including such services at rates for individuals not to exceed $100 per day, when authorized by the Secretary. This modifies the proposals of both Houses in this connection.

Amendment No. 284—*Administrative provisions* (*administration of interstate compacts*): Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 285—*Administrative provisions* (*payments to school districts*): Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 286—*Administrative provisions:* Eliminates the proposal of the Senate to insert a provision limiting reimbursability of certain expenditures.

Amendment No. 287—*Administrative provisions:* Authorizes expenditures for studies of recreational uses of reservoir areas pursuant to law, as proposed by the House, instead of authorizing expenditures

for such studies on a non-reimbursable basis and with an express limit on expenditures for any one reservoir area, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 288—*Administrative provisions (Reimbursability of certain expenditures):* Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 289—*Transfer of Ephrata Air Force Base:* Reported in disagreement.

The Bureau of Reclamation was permitted to insert in the Senate Hearings, Part I, beginning at page 576, a statement of the Bureau's interpretation of some of the provisions of H. R. 7786 as passed by the House. Such interpretation should be considered as that sought to be established by the Bureau of Reclamation, and not necessarily as the intent of Congress. When interpretation is necessary, the Comptroller General should resolve questions in the light of all relevant factors.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

Amendment No. 290—*Surveys, investigations and research:* Appropriates $19,382,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $19,129,000 as proposed by the House.

BUREAU OF MINES

Amendments Nos. 291 and 292—*Conservation and development of mineral resources:* Appropriate $17,758,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $17,813,403 as proposed by the Senate; and eliminate the provision proposed by the Senate to authorize the reacquisition of certain properties in Montana.

Amendment No. 293—*Construction:* Appropriates $1,268,100 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,372,600 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 294—*Administrative provisions:* Authorizes the purchase of 150 automobiles as proposed by the Senate, instead of 145 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 295—*Administrative provisions (Transfer of land in Minnesota):* Reported in disagreement.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Amendment No. 296—*Maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities:* Appropriates $7,400,000, instead of $7,250,000 as proposed by the House, and $7,448,100 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 297—*Construction:* Appropriates $19,667,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $20,542,000 as proposed by the House.

This action on amendments Nos. 296 and 297 will necessitate some flexibility to permit adjustment of items originally scheduled under maintenance and rehabilitation and construction.

Amendments Nos. 298 and 299—*Construction:* Provide that of the construction appropriation the sum for liquidation of prior obligations shall be $7,935,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $8,935,000 as proposed by the House; and eliminate the proposal of the Senate to provide $100,000 in contract authorization.

Amendment No. 300—*Construction (Provision regarding Independence National Historical Park):* Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 301—*General administrative expenses:* Appropriates $1,314,500 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,264,500 as proposed by the House.

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

Amendment No. 302—*Management of resources (Payment for information):* Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 303—*Management of resources:* Appropriates $7,082,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $7,157,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 304—*Investigations of resources:* Appropriates $4,125,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $3,900,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 305—*Construction:* Appropriates $2,423,450 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $2,401,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 306—*Migratory bird conservation fund:* Reported in disagreement.

TERRITORIES AND ISLAND POSSESSIONS

Amendment No. 307—*Administration of territories and possessions:* Appropriates $3,392,180 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $3,329,500 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 308—*Construction of roads, Alaska:* Appropriates $20,400,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $18,883,212 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 309—*Claims, Alaska Road Commission:* Provides no appropriation as proposed by the House, instead of appropriating $12,893 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 310—*Construction, Alaska Railroad:* Appropriates $30,000,000, instead of $31,000,000 as proposed by the House and $28,700,000 as proposed by the Senate.

MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
HENRY M. JACKSON,
ALBERT GORE,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
BEN F. JENSEN,
IVOR D. FENTON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CHAPTER VIII.—INDEPENDENT OFFICES

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to Chapter VIII of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 316, 330, 331, 340, 341, 343, 346, 350, 357, 359, 362, and 371.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 311, 313, 314, 320, 321, 323, 324, 326, 327, 328, 329, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 347, 360, 364, 365, 366, 368, and 372, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 312:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 312, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$187,750*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 315:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 315, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken by said amendment insert *: Provided further, That no part of the foregoing appropriation or contract authorization shall be used in connection with the payment of a fixed fee to any contractor or firm of contractors engaged under a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract or contracts at any installation of the Commission, where that fee for community management is at a rate in excess of $90,000 per annum, or for the operation of a transportation system where that fee is at a rate in excess of $45,000 per annum*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 317:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 317, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$15,511,913*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 318:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 318, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$35,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 322:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 322, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$3,891,695*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 325:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 325, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert *$300*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 339:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 339, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$78,500,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 344:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 344, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$9,000,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 348:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 348, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$190,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 349:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 349, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$42,500,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 351:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 351, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$11,000,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 352:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 352, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$38,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 355:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 355, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$6,230,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 356:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 356, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$2,700,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 358:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 358, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$1,179,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 367:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 367, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$881,750,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 369:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 369, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the per centum proposed insert *5.5*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 370:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 370, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the per centum proposed insert *9*; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 319, 337, 338, 342, 345, 353, 354, 361, 363, and 373.

ALBERT THOMAS,
ALBERT GORE,
GEORGE ANDREWS,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
FRANCIS CASE (except as to amendment 363),
JOHN PHILLIPS (except as to amendment 363),
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
ELMER THOMAS,
HOMER FERGUSON,
GUY CORDON,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to Chapter VIII of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Executive Office of the President

BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

Amendment No. 311—*Salaries and Expenses:* Appropriates $3,412,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $3,386,000 as proposed by the House.

PHILIPPINE ALIEN PROPERTY CUSTODIAN

Amendment No. 312—*Administrative Expenses:* Appropriates $187,750, instead of $160,000 as proposed by the House and $215,500, as proposed by the Senate.

American Battle Monuments Commission

Amendment No. 313—*Salaries and Expenses:* Appropriates $670,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $695,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 314—*Construction of Memorials and Cemeteries:* Appropriates $8,500,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $8,680,000 as proposed by the House.

Atomic Energy Commission

Amendment No. 315—*Payment of Fees to Contractors:* Restores provision in the House bill, amended to clarify intent. In connection with this provision the conferees wish it understood that they are aware that these contracts contain a cancellation clause and that they are expecting the Commission to take immediate advantage of that clause.

Civil Service Commission

Amendments Nos. 316 and 317—*Salaries and Expenses:* Authorize the expenditure of $50,000 for performing the duties imposed upon the Commission by the Act of July 19, 1940 (Hatch Act), as proposed by the House, instead of $80,000 as proposed by the Senate; and appropriate $15,511,913, instead of $15,261,913 as proposed by the House and $15,761,913 as proposed by the Senate.

COMMISSION ON RENOVATION OF THE EXECUTIVE MANSION

Amendment No. 318—*Salaries and Expenses:* Appropriates $35,000, instead of $20,000 as proposed by the House and $50,000 as proposed by the Senate. Re-appropriation of unobligated balances totaling $30,000 provides a total of $65,000 for this purpose.

DISPLACED PERSONS COMMISSION

Amendment No. 319—*Salaries and Expenses:* Reported in disagreement.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Amendments Nos. 320 and 321—*Salaries and Expenses:* Authorize the expenditure of $256,500 for travel expenses as proposed by the Senate, instead of $247,500 as proposed by the House; and appropriates $4,013,300 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $3,938,300 as proposed by the House.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Amendments Nos. 322 and 323—*Salaries and Expenses:* Appropriates $3,891,695, instead of $3,866,695 as proposed by the House and $3,916,695 as proposed by the Senate; and strikes out the words "to the Bureau of Trade Practice Conferences" as proposed by the Senate.

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

Amendments Nos. 324 and 325—*Salaries:* Appropriate $32,689,500, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $34,500,000 as proposed by the House; and authorizes the expenditure of $300 for newspapers and periodicals, instead of $600 as proposed by the Senate.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 326—*Sites and Planning, Public Buildings Outside the District of Columbia:* Appropriates $22,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $28,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 327, 328, and 329—*Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act:* Appropriate $605,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $633,608,240 as proposed by the House; strikes out the provision of the House to the effect that not to exceed $25,000,000 may be expended in accordance with the purposes of the Act of July 23, 1946 through purchase contracts negotiated with operators as proposed by the Senate; and provides a contract authorization of $125,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $100,000,000 as proposed by the House. In connection with this activity the conferees wish to go on record as being in accord with the so-called "buy American policy" which was enacted in 1933. The conferees are of the opinion that this policy should continue in full force, and that every assistance should be extended by the government to the development of our domestic sources of raw materials. We point out that domestic development means double protection—a stock pile immediately acquired and the source of supply proved.

Amendments Nos. 330 and 331—*Alaska Public Works:* Strike out the proposal of the Senate authorizing a contract authorization in the amount of $4,000,000; and restores the provision of the House requiring that a certificate from the Secretary of Defense that the installation of such facility will be of value in connection with national defense.

Amendments Nos. 332 and 333—*Advance Planning of Non-Federal Public Works:* Appropriate $20,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $28,000,000 as proposed by the House; and provides a contract authorization in the sum of $27,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $32,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 334—*Grants for Plan Preparation, Water Pollution Control:* Appropriates $750,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $900,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 335—*Administrative Expenses, Water Pollution Control:* Appropriates $52,285 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $60,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 336—*Virgin Islands Public Works:* Appropriates $1,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,300,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 337 and 338—*Public Works Advance Planning:* Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 339—*Operating Expenses:* Appropriates $78,500,000, instead of $76,500,000 as proposed by the House and $82,725,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 340—*Purchase and Distribution of Typewriters:* Restores the two paragraphs contained in the House Bill relating to the acquisition and distribution of typewriters.

Housing and Home Finance Agency

OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

Amendments Nos. 341 and 342—*Salaries and Expenses:* Appropriate $4,200,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $4,900,000 as proposed by the Senate; and reports in disagreement the proposal of the Senate relating to expenses of inspections of projects financed through loans to educational institutions authorized by Title 4 of the Housing Act of 1950.

PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 343—*Annual Contributions:* Appropriates $7,500,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $9,250,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 344—*Administrative Expenses:* Appropriates $9,000,000, instead of $8,750,000 as proposed by the House and $11,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Interstate Commerce Commission

Amendment No. 345—*General Expenses:* Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 346—*Railroad Safety:* Appropriates $1,000,000, as proposed by the House, instead of $1,016,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 347—*Locomotive Inspection:* Appropriates $718,600, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $700,000 as proposed by the House.

Motor Carrier Claims Commission

Amendment No. 348—*Salaries and Expenses:* Appropriates $190,000, instead of $175,000 as proposed by the House and $227,800 as proposed by the Senate.

National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics

Amendments Nos. 349 and 350—*Salaries and Expenses:* Appropriate $42,500,000, instead of $40,890,630 as proposed by the House and $44,225,630 as proposed by the Senate; and restores the provision of the House providing that no part of the appropriation shall be available for the operation of a field office outside the continental or territorial limits of the United States.

Amendment No. 351—*Construction and Equipment:* Provides a contract authorization of $11,000,000, instead of $10,000,000 as proposed by the House and $12,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

National Capital Housing Authority

Amendments Nos. 352 and 353—*Maintenance and Operation of Properties:* Appropriate $38,000, instead of $35,000 as proposed by the House and $39,600 as proposed by the Senate; and reports in disagreement the provision of the Senate waiving the provisions of Section 507 of the Housing Act of 1950.

Philippine War Damage Commission

Amendment No. 354—*Eligibility of Persons Who Collaborated With the Enemy:* Reported in disagreement. Any recommendation submitted by the committee in connection with this amendment should in no way be considered justification for continuation of this activity beyond April 30, 1951, the statutory termination date for this part of the program.

Securities and Exchange Commission

Amendment No. 355—*Salaries and Expenses:* Appropriates $6,230,000, instead of $6,130,000 as proposed by the House and $6,330 000 as proposed by the Senate.

Smithsonian Institution

Amendment No. 356—*Salaries and Expenses:* Appropriates $2,700,000, instead of $2,606,490 as proposed by the House and $2,770,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 357—*Paleontological Investigations:* Strikes out the provision of the Senate proposing an appropriation of $20,000.

Amendment No. 358—*Salaries and Expenses, National Gallery of Art:* Appropriates $1,179,000, instead of $1,158,000 as proposed by the House and $1,200,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Tariff Commission

Amendment No. 359—*Salaries and Expenses:* Appropriates $1,290,700 as proposed by the House, instead of $1,340,700 as proposed by the Senate.

The Tax Court of the United States

Amendment No. 360—*Salaries and Expenses:* Appropriates $826,900, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $820,000 as proposed by the House.

United States Maritime Commission

Amendment No. 361—*Ship Construction:* Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 362—*Operating-Differential Subsidies:* Appropriates $26,450,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $30,108,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 363—*Limitation on Number of Ships Receiving Operating-Differential Subsidy:* Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 364—*Maritime Training:* Strikes out the provision of the House appropriating $3,342,660, and inserts the proposal of the Senate appropriating $4,348,520 including pay of cadet-midshipmen and other trainees as proposed by the Senate. For several years there has been disagreement in the two Houses as to the justice and desirability of providing the $65 monthly allowance for cadet-midshipmen. It has been pointed out that similar payments are made to cadets at the Military Academy and midshipmen at the Naval Academy. It also has been pointed out that the obligation to serve on the part of the two latter groups is greater than it is in the case of cadets attending the Maritime Academy. It is recommended that the subcommittees of the Committees on Appropriations of the two Houses having the subject in charge, or certain members thereof, conduct a study of the problem with a view to submitting a recommendation thereon by the beginning of the next regular session of the Congress.

Amendment No. 365—*State Marine Schools:* Strikes out the proposal of the House containing an appropriation of $668,000 together with an unobligated balance of not to exceed $25,000, and inserts the proposal of the Senate appropriating $1,102,050, including pay of cadet-midshipmen at $65 per month.

Amendment No. 366—*Vessel Operating Functions:* Corrects statute reference as proposed by the Senate.

Veterans Administration

Amendment No. 367—*Administration, Medical, Hospital and Domiciliary Services:* Appropriates $881,750,000, instead of $875,847,795 as proposed by the House and $887,621,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 368—*Limitation on Educational and Training Institutions:* Strikes out the proposal of the House regarding the eligibility of educational institutions for the training of veterans, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 369 and 370—*Payment for Technical and Clerical Services for the Preparation of Plans and Specifications:* Authorize the

use of not to exceed 5.5 per cent of appropriation and contract authorizations, instead of 4 per cent as proposed by the House and 6.7 per cent as proposed by the Senate, in connection with projects supervised by the Veterans Administration; and authorizes the use of not to exceed 9 per cent where such projects are under the supervision of other government agencies, instead of 7 per cent as proposed by the House and 10 per cent as proposed by the Senate.

WAR CLAIMS COMMISSION

Amendment No. 371—*Administrative Expenses:* Appropriates $600,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $700,000 as proposed by the Senate.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 372—*Section 110:* Excepts certain corporations from the general provisions of Title I, Chapter VIII, as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE II—CORPORATIONS

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

Amendment No. 373—*Public Housing Administration:* Reported in disagreement.

ALBERT THOMAS,
ALBERT GORE,
GEORGE ANDREWS,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
FRANCIS CASE
(except as to amendment 363),
JOHN PHILLIPS
(except as to amendment 363),
JOHN TABER
(except as to amendment 363),
Managers on the Part of the House.

CHAPTER IX.—CIVIL FUNCTIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to Chapter IX of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 384 and 395.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 382, 385, 386, 389, 391, 392, 394, 396, and 397, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 379:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 379, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$1,525,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 380:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 380, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: (*for replacement only*) *in the current fiscal year of three hundred and fifty passenger motor vehicles and one motorboat* (*to be acquired from surplus stock where practicable*) *and the purchase* (*not to exceed one, to be acquired from surplus stock where practicable*), *maintenance, repair, and operation of aircraft*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 381:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 381, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert the following: *: Provided further, That the various appropriations for rivers and harbors and flood control shall be available for payments to school districts as authorized by law*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 383:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 383, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$198,811,500*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 387:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 387, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$383,408,250*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 390:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 390, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$66,422,400*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 393:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 393, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert *$432,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 388 and 398.

CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN H. KERR,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
ALBERT GORE,
E. H. HEDRICK,
W. F. NORRELL,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
KARL STEFAN,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
ELMER THOMAS,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
JOHN C. STENNIS,
CHAN GURNEY,
GUY CORDON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to Chapter IX of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Civil Functions, Department of the Army

QUARTERMASTER CORPS

Amendment No. 374—*Cemeterial Expenses:* Appropriates $5,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $5,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 375—*Entombment of an Unknown American Serviceman, World War II:* Deletes provision of the House providing funds incident to the selection and burial of an unknown American serviceman of World War II, as proposed by the Senate.

SIGNAL CORPS

Amendment No. 376—*Alaska Communication System:* Appropriates $2,877,920 for construction in Alaska as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 377—*Alaska Communication System:* Deletes provision of the House limiting to $28,000 construction costs per housing unit and substitutes provision establishing an average cost of $24,000 per unit, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 378—*Alaska Communication System:* Enlarges provision of the House pertaining to inclusion of equipment in housing units, as proposed by the Senate.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Amendment No. 379—*Administrative Expense Limitation:* Authorizes a limitation of $1,525,000 instead of $1,450,000 as proposed by the House and $1,600,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 380—*Administrative Provisions:* Provides for the purchase of 350 passenger motor vehicles, one motor boat and one airplane instead of only 350 passenger motor vehicles as proposed by the House and 500 passenger motor vehicles, two motor boats and one airplane as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 381—*Administrative Provisions:* Provides for payments to school districts.

Amendment No. 382—*Rivers and Harbors:* Provides authority for investigations and for plans and specifications for authorized projects, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 383—*Rivers and Harbors:* Appropriates $198,811,500, instead of $185,878,000 as proposed by the House and $221,244,500 as proposed by the Senate. The amount agreed upon is 10 percent below the amount approved by the Senate. The Senate had approved $1,800,000 for planning and $2,585,000 for examinations and surveys, which amounts are included in the lump sum appropriation for rivers and harbors. Since the appropriation has been reduced 10 percent below the Senate figure, the amounts for planning and examinations and surveys are likewise reduced by the amount of 10 percent below the amounts approved by the Senate.

Amendment No. 384—*Old River, Cleveland, Ohio:* Deletes provision of the Senate providing $75,000 for dredging.

Amendment No. 385—*Alteration of Bridges over Navigable Waters:* Appropriates $900,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 386—*Flood Control:* Corrects language.

Amendment No. 387—*Flood Control:* Appropriates $383,408,250, instead of $341,055,000 as proposed by the House and $436,933,000 as proposed by the Senate. The amount agreed upon is 12 percent below the amount approved by the Senate. The Senate had approved $3,565,000 for planning and $6,500,000 for preliminary examinations, surveys and contingencies which amounts are included in the lump sum appropriation for flood control. Since the appropriation has been reduced 12 percent below the Senate figure the amounts for planning, preliminary examinations, surveys and contingencies are likewise reduced by the amount of 12 percent below the amounts approved by the Senate.

With respect to Amendments Nos. 383, 387, 390 and 393, the conferees are agreed that obligation and expenditure of funds shall be made under the criteria set forth in the letter of the President and the Corps of Engineers, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, July 21, 1950.

The honorable the SECRETARY OF THE ARMY.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In my message of July 19 to the Congress, I announced that I was directing the executive agencies—

"* * * to conduct a detailed review of Government programs, for the purpose of modifying them wherever practicable to lessen the demand upon services, commodities, raw materials, manpower, and facilities which are in competition with those needed for national defense. The Government, as well as the public, must exercise great restraint in the use of those goods and services which are needed for our increased defense efforts."

In order to adjust the programs of the Federal Government, I am writing to you and the heads of the other agencies whose programs involve substantial use of materials and other resources needed for the defense effort. Please reexamine your programs, giving particular attention, to the extent applicable, to the following:

(1) All civil public works, both direct Federal programs and grant-in-aid programs, should be screened with the objective, as far as practical, of deferring, curtailing, or slowing down those projects which do not directly contribute to defense or to civilian requirements essential in the changed international situation set forth in my message.

(2) Consistent with the restrictive policy already in force for housing credit, other credit programs should be tightened. The only exceptions should be those which directly contribute to meeting our defense and international responsibilities.

(3) Procurement of supplies and equipment should be held to minimum amounts, especially purchases of motor vehicles, typewriters, and other

equipment using critical materials. Inventories should be reduced to the lowest practical levels, and excess supplies and equipment should be made available immediately to the General Services Administration.

In addition, I shall expect that in the reexamination of the programs of your agency you will give first priority to those activities which contribute directly to national defense, including requests of other agencies for assistance.

I am asking the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to work closely with you in this review and to report to me on the steps which you have taken in revising your program to meet these objectives.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY TRUMAN.

TENTATIVE CRITERIA FOR REVIEW OF CIVIL WORKS PROGRAM OF CORPS OF ENGINEERS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PRESIDENT'S LETTER OF JULY 21, 1950

The civil-works program of the Corps of Engineers will be reviewed to insure that no new projects are initiated unless they make an important contribution to the war effort and that only those projects now under construction which meet one or more of the following specific criteria will be continued during the period of partial mobilization.

SPECIFIC CRITERIA

1. The project includes the development of power.
2. The project provides industrial or municipal water supply in critical areas.
3. The project is a dam and reservoir project where closure is under way or has been effected and should be completed to a point of useful operation.
4. The project is an important harbor or waterway.
5. The project protects important industries or major food-producing areas.
6. The project can be completed in the 1951 working season, and where termination costs would constitute an appreciable economic loss, the work in place would be damaged if not protected and if relatively small amounts of additional work will make the project fully effective.
7. The project involves almost entirely the movement of earth such as channel improvements or levees and does not compete in the use of critical materials.
8. Maintenance of completed projects, advance planning of selected authorized projects and the survey program should be continued.

With respect to those projects that meet the above criteria for continuation of construction, each individual feature of the project will be examined to determine whether it can be deferred without detriment to the major purpose of the project or to the work in place.

The conferees are further agreed that no construction or planning of any new project appropriated for in this chapter shall be started unless certified by the President as necessary to the war effort and amounts allowed for construction herein shall be available for reallocation to any project appropriated for in this chapter as the Corps of Engineers find necessary to meet the exigencies of the war effort and to maintain economical construction schedules.

Amendment No. 388—*Mandan, North Dakota, and James River:* Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 389—*Flood Control General (Emergency Fund):* Appropriates $2,700,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $3,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 390—*Flood Control, Mississippi River and Tributaries:* Appropriates $66,422,400, instead of $65,000,000 as proposed by the House and $66,778,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 391—*Emergency Fund for Flood Control on Tributaries of the Mississippi River:* Appropriates $450,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 392—*Flood Control, Sacramento River, California:* Appropriates $2,524,500 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $2,700,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 393—*Flood Control, Roseville, Ohio:* Appropriates $432,000, instead of $540,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 394—*Miscellaneous Civil Works:* Appropriates $16,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $12,000 as proposed by the House.

UNITED STATES SOLDIERS' HOME

Amendment No. 395—*Maintenance and Operation:* Appropriates $2,395,000 from the Soldiers' Home Trust Fund as proposed by the House, instead of $2,363,240 as proposed by the Senate.

PANAMA CANAL

Amendment No. 396—*Maintenance and Operation:* Appropriates $13,251,700 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $14,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 397—*Civil Government:* Appropriates $3,849,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $3,925,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 398—*General Provisions:* Reported in disagreement.

CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN H. KERR,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
ALBERT GORE,
E. H. HEDRICK,
W. F. NORRELL,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
KARL STEFAN,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CHAPTER X.—DEFENSE

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to Chapter X of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 408, 409, 441, and 455.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 452, 453, 454, 457, 458, 459, 460, 461, 462, 463, 464, 465, and 466, and agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 399, 417, 418, 451, 456, and 467.

GEORGE MAHON,
HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
ROBERT L. F. SIKES,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

ELMER THOMAS,
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
M. E. TYDINGS,
CHAN GURNEY,
STYLES BRIDGES,
HOMER FERGUSON,
KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to Chapter X of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Title I—Independent Offices

NATIONAL SECURITY RESOURCES BOARD

Amendment No. 399—*Salaries and expenses:* Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 400—*Salaries and expenses:* Appropriates $3,500,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $3,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Title II—Department of Defense

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Amendment No. 401—*Salaries and expenses:* Appropriates $11,300,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $11,000,000 as proposed by the House. While the House recedes as to the amount, which is $100,000 below the budget estimates, the Senate agrees to the position of the House as stated in House Report No. 1797, 81st Congress providing no funds for the President's Committee on Religion and Welfare in the Armed Forces.

Title III—Department of the Army

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY

Amendment No. 402—*Contingencies of the Army:* Appropriates $51,878,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $51,978,000 as proposed by the House.

GENERAL STAFF CORPS

Amendment No. 403—*Field Exercises:* Appropriates $5,350,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $5,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 404—*Pay of the Army:* Appropriates $1,447,660,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,448,660,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 405—*Travel of the Army:* Appropriates $76,500,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $75,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 406—*Finance Service:* Appropriates $29,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $28,410,000 as proposed by the House.

QUARTERMASTER CORPS

Amendment No. 407—*Welfare of enlisted men:* Appropriates $8,362,500 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $8,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 408—*Subsistence of the Army:* Strikes out the phrase "without unduly increasing future United States market prices" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 409—*Subsistence of the Army:* Strikes out the word "highly" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 410—*Regular supplies of the Army:* Appropriates $107,247,258 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $100,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 411—*Clothing and equipage:* Appropriates $93,853,365 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $90,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 412—*Incidental expenses of the Army:* Appropriates $101,998,313 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $95,000,000 as proposed by the House.

TRANSPORTATION CORPS

Amendment No. 413—*Transportation Service, Army:* Appropriates $289,960,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $290,000,000 as proposed by the House.

SIGNAL CORPS

Amendment No. 414—*Signal service of the Army:* Appropriates $158,248,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $157,500,000 as proposed by the House.

MEDICAL DEPARTMENT

Amendment No. 415—*Medical and hospital department:* Appropriates $54,883,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $54,913,000 as proposed by the House.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Amendment No. 416—*Engineer service, Army:* Appropriates $304,187,500 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $300,176,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 417—*Engineer service, Army:* Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 418—*Military construction, Army:* Reported in disagreement.

ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT

Amendment No. 419—*Ordnance service and supplies, Army:* Appropriates $647,327,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $621,559,000 as proposed by the House.

CHEMICAL CORPS

Amendment No. 420—*Chemical service, Army:* Appropriates $37,300,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $36,000,000 as proposed by the House.

ARMY TRAINING

Amendment No. 421—*Army training:* Appropriates $7,830,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $7,930,000 as proposed by the House.

UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

Amendment No. 422—*Maintenance and operation:* Appropriates $5,120,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $5,200,000 as proposed by the House.

CIVILIAN COMPONENTS

Amendment No. 423—*Army National Guard:* Appropriates $210,500,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $212,400,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 424—*Organized Reserves:* Appropriates, $114,525,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $115,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 425—*Army Reserve Officers' Training Corps:* Appropriates $24,900,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $25,000,000 as proposed by the House.

DEPARTMENTAL SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 426—*Office of Secretary of the Army:* Appropriates $3,368,271 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $3,265,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 427—*Office of Chief of Staff:* Appropriates $6,576,239 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $6,354,700 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 428—*Adjutant General's Office:* Appropriates $9,777,200 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $9,477,400 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 429—*Office of the Inspector General:* Appropriates $203,880 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $197,600 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 430—*Office of the Judge Advocate General:* Appropriates $595,375 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $577,100 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 431—*Office of the Chief of Finance:* Appropriates $1,483,202 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,437,800 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 432—*Office of the Quartermaster General:* Appropriates $6,981,504 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $6,767,400 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 433—*Office of the Chief of Transportation:* Appropriates $2,940,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $2,850,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 434—*Office of the Chief Signal Officer:* Appropriates $2,455,821 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $2,379,600 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 435—*Office of Chief of Special Services:* Appropriates $58,636 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $56,800 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 436—*Office of the Provost Marshal General:* Appropriates $116,038 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $112,500 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 437—*Office of the Surgeon General:* Appropriates $2,475,873 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $2,400,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 438—*Office of Chief of Engineers:* Appropriates $3,751,026 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $3,636,200 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 439—*Office of Chief of Ordnance:* Appropriates $4,137,696 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $3,776,400 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 440—*Office of Chief, Chemical Corps:* Appropriates $817,707 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $792,700 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 441—*Office of Chief of Chaplains:* Appropriates $131,100 as proposed by the House, instead of $128,478 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 442—*Contingent expenses, Department of the Army:* Appropriates $9,970,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $9,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Title IV—Department of the Navy

Amendment No. 443—*Navy Personnel, General expenses:* Appropriates $60,533,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $60,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 444—*Military Personnel, Marine Corps:* Appropriates $200,923,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $200,301,700 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 445—*Marine Corps Troops and Facilities:* Appropriates $82,354,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $80,699,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 446—*Aircraft and facilities:* Appropriates $532,226,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $536,226,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 447—*Ships and facilities:* Appropriates $411,782,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $415,282,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 448—*Ordnance and facilities:* Appropriates $181,665,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $177,088,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 449—*Medical Care:* Appropriates $37,862,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $38,212,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 450—*Civil Engineering:* Appropriates $34,778,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $35,178,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 451—*Public Works:* Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 452—*Research:* Appropriates $43,083,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $43,383,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 453—*Service-wide supply and finance:* Appropriates $209,292,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $200,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 454—*Service-wide operations:* Appropriates $99,281,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $94,261,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 455—*Island Governments:* Appropriates $1,500,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $1,785,000 as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE V—DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

Amendment No. 456—*Acquisition and construction of real property:* Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 457—*Maintenance and operation:* Appropriates $1,027,662,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,010,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 458—*Air National Guard:* Adds words "or State-owned" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 459—*Air National Guard:* Strikes out words "State or" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 460—*Air National Guard:* Strikes out word "thereof" and adds words "of a State" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 461—*Salaries and expenses, administration:* Appropriates $58,545,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $55,620,000 as proposed by the House.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 462: Strikes out Section 626 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 463: Corrects section number.

Amendment No. 464: Corrects section number.

Amendment No. 465: Corrects section number.

Amendment No. 466: Corrects section number.

Amendment No. 467: Reported in disagreement.

GEORGE H. MAHON,
HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
ROBERT L. F. SIKES,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CHAPTER X–A.—GENERAL REDUCTIONS IN APPROPRIATIONS AND CONTRACT AUTHORIZATIONS

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to Chapter X–A of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 468, and agree to the same.

LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
E. H. HEDRICK,
OTTO E. PASSMAN,
C. C. MCGRATH,
CLARENCE CANNON,
KARL STEFAN,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
ELMER THOMAS,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
PAT MCCARRAN,
STYLES BRIDGES (except amendment 508),
CHAN GURNEY,
HOMER FERGUSON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to Chapter X–A of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendment No. 468: Strikes out provision, proposed by the House to reduce appropriations by $600,000,000, in view of action on amendment No. 508.

LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
E. H. HEDRICK,
OTTO E. PASSMAN,
C. C. MCGRATH,
CLARENCE CANNON,
KARL STEFAN
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CHAPTER X–B.—FOREIGN AID

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to Chapter X–B of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 479.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 470, 484, 487, and 489, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 469:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 469, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

CHAPTER X–A—FOREIGN AID

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 471, 472, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, 478, 480, 481, 482, 483, 485, 486, and 488.

J. Vaughan Gary,
John J. Rooney,
Joe B. Bates,
Louis C. Rabaut,
W. F. Norrell,
Clarence Cannon,
Karl Stefan,
R. B. Wigglesworth,
John Taber,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Kenneth McKellar,
Elmer Thomas,
Richard B. Russell,
Pat McCarran,
Joseph C. O'Mahoney,
Styles Bridges,
Chan Gurney,
Homer Ferguson,
Kenneth S. Wherry,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to Chapter X–B of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Foreign Aid

Amendment No. 469—*Foreign Aid:* Corrects title of chapter.

Amendment No. 470—*Funds Appropriated to the President:* Inserts title.

Amendments Nos. 471, 472, 473, 474, 475, 476, and 477—*Economic Cooperation:* Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 478—*Assistance to the Republic of Korea:* Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 479—*International Children's Welfare Work:* Deletes provision of the Senate appropriating $12,500,000.

Amendments Nos. 480, 481, 482, and 483—*International Development:* Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 484—*Mutual Defense Assistance:* Appropriates $1,678,023,729 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 485 and 486—*Government and Relief in Occupied Areas:* Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 487—*Department of State:* Inserts title.

Amendment No. 488—*Government in Occupied Areas of Germany:* Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 489—*Aid to Palestine Refugees:* Appropriates $27,450,000 as proposed by the Senate.

J. Vaughan Gary,
John J. Rooney,
Joe B. Bates,
Louis C. Rabaut,
W. F. Norrell,
Clarence Cannon,
Karl Stefan,
R. B. Wigglesworth,
John Taber,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CHAPTER XI.—GENERAL PROVISIONS

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to Chapter XI of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 491, 492, 494, and 509.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 490, 495, 496, 497, 498, 499, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, and 510, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 493:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 493, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: *Nothing in this subsection shall be so construed as to interfere with the initiation, operation, and administration of agricultural price support programs and no funds (other than funds for administrative expenses) available for price support, surplus removal, and available under Section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935, as amended (7 U. S. C. 612 (c)), with respect to agricultural commodities shall be subject to apportionment pursuant to this section.*

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 508:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 508, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert:

Sec. 1114. Appropriations, reappropriations, contract authorizations and reauthorizations made by this Act for departments and agencies in the executive branch of the government shall, without impairing national

defense, be reduced in the amount of not less than $550,000,000 through the apportionment procedure provided for in Section 1111 of this Act.

And the Senate agree to the same.

LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
E. H. HEDRICK,
OTTO E. PASSMAN,
C. C. MCGRATH,
CLARENCE CANNON,
KARL STEFAN,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
ELMER THOMAS,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
PAT MCCARRAN,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
STYLES BRIDGES (except amendment 508),
CHAN GURNEY,
HOMER FERGUSON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to Chapter XI of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

SECTION 1111

Amendment No. 490: Adds clarifying language as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 491 and 492: Reinstate language of the House relating to reserves to be established in apportionment of funds.

Amendment No. 493: Provides that funds available for price support programs and available under section 32 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act shall not be subject to apportionment.

Amendment No. 494: Strikes out a proposal of the Senate to exempt appropriations for transportation of mail from apportionment.

Amendments Nos. 495 and 496: Add clarifying language as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 497: Exempts funds under Titles I, IV, and X of the Social Security Act from apportionment.

Amendments Nos. 498 and 499: Exempt funds of the House, Senate, and Architect of the Capitol from apportionment.

Amendments Nos. 500, 501, 502, and 503: Add clarifying language as proposed by the Senate.

SECTION 1112

Amendments Nos. 504, 505, 506, and 507: Limit the annual leave provision to civilian employees, extend the limiting date to June 30, 1951, includes the District of Columbia government within the provision and exempts personnel inducted into military service, all as proposed by the Senate.

SECTION 1114

Amendment No. 508: Provides for reduction of $550,000,000 in appropriations and authorizations carried in the bill.

SECTION 1115

Amendment No. 509: Strikes out a provision proposed by the Senate to limit the price paid for typewriters in view of the fact a similar provision had been included in Chapter VIII of the bill.

SECTION 1116

Amendment No. 510: Prohibits, as proposed by the Senate, payment of retired military personnel who engaged in selling supplies to the Government.

LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
E. H. HEDRICK,
OTTO E. PASSMAN,
C. C. MCGRATH,
CLARENCE CANNON,
KARL STEFAN,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

○

defense legislation, and the matter of safety may be worked out, as was indicated by one of the previous speakers by moving some of the military planes out of Bolling Field and the Naval Air Station, and when we realize also that when it comes to defending the Capital, it will not be the long-range bombers that will be used for defense, but the defense fighters and intercepter planes, and when we realize the fact that the defense fighters and intercepter planes can go to and from a continental type of air field without difficulty, you realize why it is well to settle that question by the adoption of this amendment.

At this hour when Members are constantly coming into the well of the House and saying they are going to defer nonessential and nondefense items, we can, by adopting my amendment, meet the arguments that have been advanced in that respect.

We can save a vast amount of money because the amount of land necessary to purchase the width of the runways and the length of the runways is vastly different between the international type and the continental type of airfield.

I yield to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON] briefly.

Mr. FALLON. The gentleman answered the question I was going to ask him as to the difference of cost between the two types of construction.

Mr. SASSCER. It would make a vast difference.

Mr. FALLON. I had one further observation, if the gentleman will permit, with regard to the time element of traveling between the Friendship Airport and the city of Washington. I think the gentleman from Texas had in mind the old road rather than the new road, for when the new highway is constructed it will greatly faciiltate travel.

Mr. SASSCER. And in that same connection I call attention to the afternoon traffic going across the bridges into Virginia. If to accommodate my friend from Virginia you locate the airport beyond the metropolitan area think of the difficulty to be encountered in bucking the traffic across the bridges into Washington.

I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Do I understand the gentleman to tell us that the amendment would restrict the type and class of airport that the CAA could construct to take care of the additional traffic into the metropolitan Washington area?

Mr. SASSCER. That is in substance correct. It would authorize the building of a continental type airport rather than international airport.

Mr. HARRIS. Would the gentleman explain the difference between the continental type and the international type?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland may proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SASSCER. I can cover the subject in one minute without taking three. As I understand, the continental type airport is the type of field adequate for traffic between various cities within the continential limits of the United States. The international type of airport such as the one in Baltimore with is long runways is geared to international traffic.

I think there is probably little justification for the international type airport here. I can readily see in a flight from New York or Pittsburgh to Washington a person might not want to lose the five or ten-minute differential between an airport in this area and the one at Friendship; but a person coming from London, Paris, Singapore, or some great distance would find that the added ten minutes would make relatively no difference.

Mr. HARRIS. Could the gentleman tell the committee what the length of the runways in the airport at Friendship is?

Mr. SASSCER. Yes; it think they are a little under 10,000 feet.

Mr. HARRIS. About 9,000 feet, I understand.

Mr. SASSCER. Yes.

Mr. HARRIS. And the runways here at Washington and in New York are something like seven thousand feet.

Mr. SASSCER. I think that is correct.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not true that the international airport takes care of the same size and type of traffic that flies in from San Francisco, or continental flights in here coming from London and other places overseas?

Mr. SASSCER. As I understand, the national airport is sort of betwixt and between, that it is probably more adequate for intercity flying, but a little less than good for continental flying.

Mr. HARRIS. But it is a fact that flights from across the water come into the Washington National Airport almost daily. Is not that right?

Mr. SASSCER. That is right.

Mr. HARRIS. It would be necessary for a municipal airport which might be constructed within the area of Friendship Airport to take care of traffic that might come in from overseas as well as traffic that might come from San Francisco.

Mr. SASSCER. I think that is about the limitation. This field is either necessary or not necessary. If it is restricted to international traffic then there is no justification for building a duplication of the international field at Friendship which can be reached in a few minutes longer. Personally I see no justification, with the National Airport adequate for continental flying, for building it. They can move out some of this military air traffic.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, if we are really trying to solve the problem as far as air transportation is concerned as it relates to the District of Columbia area, I certainly feel the House would be making a great mistake to put a limiting amendment like this into the legislation.

What the gentleman from Maryland has said might be true today but certainly not true tomorrow or 2 years from now, or 3 years hence, or 5 years hence.

Our purpose is to undertake to give some degree of security to aviation in this area as it grows in the future. We all know that it is going to grow rapidly. In my opinion there would be certain conflicts that would occur and probably prove very costly. For example, a company such as American Airlines or TWA which operates both continental and international flights might want to have the headquarters division at a given city in order that it might more economically carry on its operation. It is possible that this kind of amendment would compel them to have a part of their maintenance building, equipment, and crews in one airport area and a part in another, and perhaps to maintain two sets of each. I think it is unworkable and in the long run would not enable Congress to meet this problem but will make it more complex. We do have one international airport at Baltimore. Who here can say that we may not in 3 or 5 years from now need two airports to take care of international transportation? No one at the present time is in position to say that 10 years hence we may not need in this area two airports to accommodate international transportation.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HESELTON. Is it not true also that this country does not now have in operation jet-transport planes, while Great Britain and Canada are making fast progress in that field? Would it not be rather unwise for us to put a limitation on the development of that kind of an airport when in all probability we will need long runways to accommodate jet transports?

Mr. BECKWORTH. Certainly, if you want to solve the problem the way to solve it is not to limit the bill as the amendment would do.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not a fact that in the development of various types of aircraft there is required longer runways? For instance, the B–36's and the C–97's require approximately 8,000- or 9,000-foot runways. Who knows but what it might become necessary to use these transport facilities, both at Friendship and any other airport developed around here? With the restrictive language you may very likely prohibit the construction of something that will be very badly needed.

Mr. BECKWORTH. It would be contrary to the very ill we seek to cure. One of the things that has been emphasized about the National Airport is that it has some 600 acres only, yet is not subject to being enlarged. Why do you want to enlarge it? In order to accommodate additional traffic and perhaps larger and faster planes. In order to have long runways to meet this problem it is con-

templated perhaps 4,000 acres of land where the site is to be located will be sought, certainly if not sought immediately, to have the kind of option that will assure that much acreage if needed. This sort of amendment would, in a sense, be contrary to the idea of seeking adequate land for the necessary enlargements from time to time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. This new airport, I believe the gentleman said a while ago, is to be self-sustaining?

Mr. BECKWORTH. It is hoped it will be, but no one can guarantee that.

Mr. GROSS. What are we going to do with the present facilities at the National Airport?

Mr. BECKWORTH. It is contemplated they will be in full use all along.

Mr. GROSS. With a $14,000,000 airport located close by?

Mr. BECKWORTH. It is certainly contemplated it will be needed and needed badly. It is needed now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if it would not be more advisable for the House today to vote on authorization of funds to provide bomb shelters here in the District of Columbia rather than to authorize funds for a commercial airport which may not be completed for some years?

Here is the reason I emphasize that: We are about to perpetrate a devastating job on civilian defense here in the District of Columbia if we approve tomorrow or next day the recommendations of the House Appropriations Committee in a bill reported out today carrying $17,000,000,000 supplemental funds, all but $1,000,000,000 of which are for national defense.

There is an item in that bill under the caption "Office of Civilian Defense for the District of Columbia." The District of Columbia Commissioners, with the backing of W. Stuart Symington, Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, charged with preparing national plans for civilian defense, asked for the meager sum of $290,000. This request was cut to $30,000—$30,000 for the Office of Civilian Defense for the fiscal year 1951. This is the Nation's Capital. Oh, I wonder if it is realized how damaging such action, if approved by the House, will be in the various States in the Union, the 48 States now looking to our National Government for advice and counsel in this matter of civilian defense against atomic bombs and poison gas attack?

Think of it—$30,000 for our Nation's Capital. It is most unfortunate, and I hope that the House tomorrow or the next day, acting on this bill, will see to it that the full amount is restored. It is most necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SASSCER].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair [Mr. MURDOCK], Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 456) to authorize the construction, protection, operation, and maintenance of a public airport in or in the vicinity of the District of Columbia, pursuant to House Resolution 821, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for further study and investigation.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further consideration of this bill be postponed until tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

CHOCTAW NATION OF INDIANS IN OKLAHOMA

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 6209) to authorize the commutation of the annual appropriation for fulfilling various treaties with the Choctaw Nation of Indians in Oklahoma, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Page 3, after line 13, insert:

"SEC. 5. The approval of the commutation as provided in section 2 and the deposit to the credit of the Choctaw Nation of the amount specified in section 1 shall constitute a full and complete discharge of all rights, claims, and demands of any nature whatsoever, whether tangible or intangible and whether or not cognizable in law or in equity, against the United States arising out of any of the annuity provisions of the treaties referred to in section 1."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNITED STATES MILITARY RESERVATION AT FORT SCHUYLER, N. Y.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 210) to authorize the conveyance of a portion of the United States Military Reservation at Fort Schuyler, N. Y., to the State of New York for use as a maritime school, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 8, after "direction", insert "together with such easements for highway or other purposes, over that portion of such reservation which is not herein authorized to be conveyed to the State of New York, as may be necessary for the proper use and enjoyment of the portion so conveyed and as may be determined by agreement between the Secretary of the Navy and the appropriate officials of the State of New York."

Page 2, line 13, strike out "or" and insert "and."

Page 2, line 16, strike out all after "education" down to and including "park" in line 18.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand this has unanimous approval.

Mr. KILDAY. Yes; in accordance with the direction of the committee of which a quorum was present.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the general appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 2991)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

CHAPTER I. DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to chapter I of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 1.

JOE B. BATES,
SIDNEY R. YATES,
FOSTER FURCOLO,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
LOWELL STOCKMAN,
EARL WILSON,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

LISTER HILL,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
HOMER FERGUSON,
K. S. WHERRY,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to Chapter I of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, submit the following report in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Amendment No. 1—Federal contribution: Appropriates $9,800,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $11,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are in unanimous agreement that this reduction shall not establish a precedent for future annual appropriations, but is recommended for the fiscal year 1951 because of the emergency situation now facing the nation.

JOE B. BATES,
SIDNEY R. YATES,
FOSTER FURCOLO,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
LOWELL STOCKMAN,
EARL WILSON,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CHAPTER II. LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to chapter II of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 52.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 19, 21, 22, 24, 25, 27, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 36, 37, 38, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 50, and 53, and agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 11, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 23, 26, 28, 35, 39, 46, 47, 48, 49, and 51.

CHRISTOPHER C. MCGRATH,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
GEORGE ANDREWS,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
G. CANFIELD,
ERRETT P. SCRIVNER,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
DENNIS CHAVEZ,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
STYLES BRIDGES,
GUY CORDON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to Chapter II of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

Senate

Amendments Nos. 2–34: Provide appropriations for the Senate, which were not included in the bill as passed by the House. Of such amendments, those numbered 11, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 23, 26, and 28 would have been subject to points of order if considered originally in the House, and therefore are reported in disagreement. The conference report recommends that the House recede and concur with the remainder of such amendments.

Amendment No. 35—Inquiries and investigations: Reported in disagreement.

Amendments Nos. 36–48: Provide for or pertain to appropriations for the Senate, which were not included in the bill as passed by the House. Of such amendments, those numbered 39, 46, 47, and 48 would have been subject to points of order if considered originally in the House, and therefore are reported in disagreement. The conference report recommends that the House recede and concur with the remainder of such amendments.

Joint Committee on Nonessential Federal Expenditures

Amendment No. 49, providing funds for the Joint Committee on Nonessential Federal Expenditures, would have been subject to a point of order if considered originally in the House, and therefore is reported in disagreement.

Architect of the Capitol

Amendment No. 50—Subway Transportation, Capitol and Senate Office Building: Appropriates $2,600 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 51—Senate Office Building: Reported in disagreement, inasmuch as it would have been subject to a point of order if considered originally in the House.

Library of Congress

Amendment No. 52—Editing and Publishing the Index-Digest of Publications of the Temporary National Economic Committee: Strikes out the Senate proposal.

Amendment No. 53—Library buildings, salaries and expenses: Appropriates $693,680 proposed by the Senate, instead of $695,200 proposed by the House.

CHRISTOPHER C. MCGRATH,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
GEORGE ANDREWS,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
G. CANFIELD,
ERRETT P. SCRIVNER,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CHAPTER III. DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE AND THE JUDICIARY

The Committee of Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to chapter III of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 55, 60, 62, 63, 66, 73, 77, 79, 98, 102, 104, 105, 108, 110, 114, and 118.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 56, 58, 64, 67, 69, 70, 71, 74, 75, 76, 78, 80, 81, 82, 83, 85, 87, 88, 90, 91, 96, 99, 100, 101, 103, 109, 111, 112, 113, 115, and 116, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$77,800,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 57: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$6,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 59: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$54,449,297"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 61: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,900,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 65: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$508,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 84: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,350,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 86: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 86, and agree

to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$98,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 89: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 89, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$16,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 93: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 93, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 95: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 95, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$5,150,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 97: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 97, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$11,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 106: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 106, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$24,897,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 117: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 117, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$995,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 68, 72, 92, 94, and 107.

JOHN J. ROONEY,
DANIEL J. FLOOD,
PRINCE H. PRESTON,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
KARL STEFAN,
CLIFF CLEVENGER,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

PAT MCCARRAN,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
STYLES BRIDGES,
HOMER FERGUSON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to Chapter III of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Amendment No. 54—Salaries and Expenses: Appropriates $77,800,000, instead of $77,300,000 as proposed by the House and $78,300,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 55—Representation Allowances: Appropriates $675,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $900,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 56—Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund: Provides no appropriation or language, as proposed by the Senate, instead of appropriating $2,233,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 57—Buildings Fund: Appropriates $6,500,000, instead of $8,000,000 as proposed by the House and $5,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 58—Emergencies in the Diplomatic and Consular Service: Appropriates $9,900,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $10,600,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 59—Contributions to International Organizations: Appropriates $54,449,297, instead of $55,178,297 as proposed by the House and $53,753,067 as proposed by the Senate. The reduction in the House figure applies to "International Civil Aviation Organization".

Amendment No. 60—Missions to International Organizations: Appropriates $1,600,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $1,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 61—International Contingencies: Appropriates $2,900,000, instead of $3,000,000 as proposed by the House and $2,800,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 62 and 63—International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico: Authorizes the purchase of 4 automobiles for replacement only as proposed by the House, instead of the purchase of 8 automobiles of which 6 were to be for replacement only as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 64—International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, Construction: Appropriates $3,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $5,035,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 65—American Sections, International Commissions: Appropriates $508,000, instead of $500,000 as proposed by the House and $600,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 66—American Sections, International Commissions: Eliminates the Senate proposal to make $92,000 available for the examination and survey of the Red River of the North and its tributaries.

Amendment No. 67—International Information and Educational Activities: Appropriates $32,700,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $34,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 68—International Information and Educational Activities: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 69—International Information and Educational Activities: Authorizes the transfer of not to exceed $2,875,000 to other appropriations of the Department of State as proposed by the Senate, instead of $3,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 70—Philippine Rehabilitation: Appropriates $10,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $13,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 71—The Institute of Inter-American Affairs: Appropriates $5,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $5,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 72—The Institute of Inter-American Affairs: Reported in disagreement.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Legal activities and general administration

Amendment No. 73—Salaries and Expenses, General Administration: Appropriates $2,175,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $2,125,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 74—Salaries and Expenses, General Legal Activities: Appropriates $7,475,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $7,300,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 75—Salaries and Expenses, Antitrust Division: Appropriates $3,750,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $3,850,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 76—Salaries and Expenses, United States Attorneys and Marshals: Appropriates $12,847,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $12,600,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 77—Fees and Expenses of Witnesses: Appropriates $1,000,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $1,250,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 78—Salaries and Expenses, Claims of Persons of Japanese Ancestry: Appropriates $1,300,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $4,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 79—Salaries and Expenses, Claims of Persons of Japanese Ancestry: Makes available not to exceed $250,000 for administrative expenses as proposed by the House, instead of $300,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Federal prison system

Amendment No. 80—Buildings and Facilities: Appropriates $800,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $900,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 81—Buildings and Facilities: Provides $170,000 cash for replacement of a power plant at the U. S. Penitentiary, Atlanta, Georgia, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $270,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 82—Buildings and Facilities: Corrects total to conform with action on amendment No. 81 as proposed by the Senate.

Office of alien property

Amendment No. 83—Salaries and Expenses: Makes available $4,150,000 for the general administrative expenses as proposed by the Senate, instead of $4,240,000 as proposed by the House.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Office of the Secretary

Amendment No. 84—Salaries and Expenses: Appropriates $1,350,000, instead of $1,300,000 as proposed by the House and $1,400,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Bureau of the Census

Amendment No. 85—Seventeenth decennial census: Appropriates $28,500,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $29,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Civil Aeronautics Administration

Amendment No. 86—Salaries and Expenses: Appropriates $98,500,000, instead of $97,000,000 as proposed by the House and $99,775,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 87—Establishment of airnavigation facilities: Appropriates $27,500,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $32,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 88—Establishment of airnavigation facilities: Provides $22,000,000 of the amount contained in Amendment No. 87 for liquidation of prior contract authorizations as proposed by the Senate, instead of $26,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 89—Establishment of airnavigation facilities: Provides contract authority in an amount not to exceed $16,000,000, instead of $13,461,500 as proposed by the House and $20,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 90—Federal-aid airport program. Federal Airport Act: Appropriates $37,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $45,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 91—Federal-aid airport program. Federal Airport Act: Provides $34,000,000 of the amount contained in Amendment No. 90 for liquidation of prior contract authority as proposed by the Senate, instead of $42,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 92—Air navigation development: Reported in disagreement.

Civil Aeronautics Board

Amendment No. 93—Salaries and Expenses: Appropriates $3,500,000, instead of $3,400,000 as proposed by the House and $4,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 94—Salaries and Expenses: Reported in disagreement.

Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce

Amendment No. 95—Departmental Salaries and Expenses: Appropriates $5,150,000, instead of $5,000,000 as proposed by the House and $5,300,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 96—Field Office Service: Appropriates $2,155,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $2,050,000 as proposed by the House.

Patent Office

Amendment No. 97—Salaries and Expenses: Appropriates $11,500,000, instead of $11,300,000 as proposed by the House, and $11,530,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Bureau of Public Roads

Amendment No. 98—General Administrative Expenses: Restores the House language which provides that not to exceed $3,000,000 to be derived from the administrative funds shall be available for continuing the construction of a laboratory for testing and research work.

Amendment No. 99—Federal-aid postwar highways: Appropriates $385,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $405,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 100—Federal-aid postwar highways: Corrects the amount to conform with action on Amendment No. 99 as proposed by the Senate.

National Bureau of Standards

Amendment No. 101: Provides a limitation of $700,000 for improvements to buildings, grounds and other plant facilities as proposed by the Senate, instead of $540,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 102—Operation and Administration: Appropriates $1,270,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $1,430,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 103—Radio Propagation and Standards: Appropriates $3,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $3,100,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 104—Construction of Laboratories: Appropriates $500,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $268,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 105—Construction of Laboratories: Authorizes contract authority in an amount not to exceed $5,675,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $3,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Weather Bureau

Amendment No. 106—Salaries and Expenses: Appropriates $24,897,000, instead of $24,447,000 as proposed by the House and $24,927,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 107—Salaries and Expenses: Reported in disagreement.

THE JUDICIARY

Customs court

Amendment No. 108—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $417,465 as proposed by the House, instead of $411,465 as proposed by the Senate.

Court of Claims

Amendment No. 109—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $575,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $587,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 110—Repairs and improvements: Appropriates $10,700 as proposed by the House, instead of $140,700 as proposed by the Senate.

Other courts and services

Amendment No. 111—Salaries of clerks of courts: Appropriates $4,470,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $4,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 112—Salaries of criers: Appropriates $520,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $540,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 113—Miscellaneous expenses: Appropriates $675,00 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $725,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 114—Travel expenses: Appropriates $725,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $650,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 115—Administrative Office of the United States Courts: Appropriates $520,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $530,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 116—Repairs and improvements, District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia: Appropriates $7,100 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $15,600 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 117—Expenses of referees: Appropriates $995,000 to be derived from the referees' expense fund, instead of $960,000 as proposed by the House, and $1,035,400 as proposed by the Senate.

GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS

Department of State

Amendment No. 118—The Institute of Inter-American Affairs: Provides not to exceed $600,000 for administrative expenses of the funds available to the corporation, as proposed by the House, instead of $767,500 as proposed by the Senate.

JOHN J. ROONEY,
DANIEL J. FLOOD,
PRINCE H. PRESTON,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
KARL STEFAN,
CLIFF CLEVENGER,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CHAPTER IV. TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to chapter IV of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 134.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 120, 122, 123, 125, 127, 130, 131, 132, and 133, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 119: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 119, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,185,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 121: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 121, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 124: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 124, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$36,600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 126: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 126, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,850,000" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 128: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 128, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,150,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 129: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 129, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$17,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

J. VAUGHAN GARY,
A. M. FERNANDEZ,
OTTO E. PASSMAN,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
G. CANFIELD,
FREDERIC R. COUDERT,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

BURNET R. MAYBANK,
CARL HAYDEN,
H. M. KILGORE,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
GUY CORDON,
STYLES BRIDGES,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to chapter IV of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Office of Administrative Services

Amendment No. 119—Salaries: Appropriates $1,185,000, instead of $1,160,000 as proposed by the House and $1,207,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 120—Miscellaneous expenses: Appropriates $303,500 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $300,000 as proposed by the House.

Bureau of Accounts

Amendment No. 121—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $2,100,000, instead of $1,875,000 as proposed by the House and $2,209,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 122—Recoinage of silver coins: Strikes out House language as proposed by the Senate.

Bureau of the Public Debt

Amendment No. 123—Distinctive paper for United States currency and securities: Appropriates $1,845,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,745,000 as proposed by the House.

Bureau of Customs

Amendment No. 124—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $36,600,000, instead of $36,500,000 as proposed by the House and $36,806,360 as proposed by the Senate.

Bureau of Internal Revenue

Amendment No. 125—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $245,547,500 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $245,600,000 as proposed by the House.

Bureau of Narcotics

Amendment No. 126—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $1,850,000, instead of $1,750,000 as proposed by the House and $1,908,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Bureau of Engraving and Printing

Amendment No. 127—Salaries and Expenses: Appropriates $16,835,000 as proposed

by the Senate, instead of $15,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Secret Service Division

Amendment No. 128—Salaries and Expenses: Appropriates $2,150,000, instead of $2,100,000 as proposed by the House and $2,250,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Coast Guard

Amendment No. 129—Acquisition, Construction and Improvements: Appropriates $17,000,000, instead of $15,000,000 as proposed by the House and $18,964,000 as proposed by the Senate.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Amendment Nos. 130, 131, and 132—Deficiency in Postal Revenues: Delete the House Limitation of $401,500,000 as the maximum amount which can be drawn from the Federal Treasury for this purpose and inserts language allowing the use of an indefinite amount, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 133—Transportation of Mails: Inserts language to allow the use of this appropriation for payment of current and prior fiscal year settlements with foreign countries, as proposed by the Senate.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Amendment No. 134—Administrative Expenses: Authorizes not to exceed $26,000,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $26,700,000 as proposed by the Senate.

J. VAUGHAN GARY,
A. M. FERNANDEZ,
OTTO E. PASSMAN,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
G. CANFIELD,
FREDERIC R. COUDERT,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CHAPTER V. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to chapter V of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 137, 141, and 152.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 139, 144, 145, 146, 149, 154, and 155, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 135: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 135, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "forty-five passenger motor vehicles, of which seventeen shall be for replacement only"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 136: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 136, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$5,466,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 138: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 138, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,971,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 140: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 140, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$9,800,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 143: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 143, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "and including $200,000 for transfer to the Department of Agriculture for research into utilization of plant material and vegetable sources of cortisone"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 147: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 147, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,090,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 150: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 150, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 153: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 153, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$523,100"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 156: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 156, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$8,582,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 142, 148, and 151.

JOHN E. FOGARTY,
E. H. HEDRICK,
CHRISTOPHER C. MCGRATH,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
ERRETT P. SCRIVNER,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House

DENNIS CHAVEZ,
PAT MCCARRAN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
CHAN GURNEY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to chapter V of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

Food and Drug Administration

Amendments Nos. 135 and 136—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate $5,466,700, instead of $5,666,700 as proposed by the Senate and $5,066,700 as proposed by the House, including the purchase of not to exceed 45 passenger motor vehicles, instead of not to exceed 65 proposed by the Senate and not to exceed 17 proposed by the House.

Office of Education

Amendment No. 137—Promotion and further development of vocational education: Appropriates $19,977,760 as proposed by the House, instead of $23,435,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 138—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $1,971,500, instead of $2,023,420 as proposed by the Senate and $1,900,000 as proposed by the House.

Public Health Service

Amendment No. 139—Venereal diseases: Appropriates $14,500,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $14,900,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 140—Tuberculosis: Appropriates $9,800,000 instead of $9,600,000 as proposed by the Senate, and $10,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 141—Salaries and expenses, hospital construction services: Appropriates $1,357,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $2,107,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 142—National Institutes of Health, operating expenses: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 143—Restores the House language providing for transfer of funds to the Department of Agriculture for research into utilization of plant material and vegetable sources of cortisone, modified to make the transfer in the specific amount of $200,000.

Amendment No. 144 — National Cancer Institute: Appropriates $20,686,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $20,086,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 145—Mental health activities: Appropriates $10,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $9,944,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 146—National Heart Institute: Appropriates $14,750,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $14,150,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 147.—Dental health activities: Appropriates $2,090,000, instead of $2,140,000 as proposed by the Senate and $2,040,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 148—Construction of research facilities: Reported in disagreement.

Saint Elizabeth's Hospital

Amendment No. 149—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $2,005,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,948,000 as proposed by the House.

Social Security Administration

Amendment No. 150—Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Federal Credit Unions: Appropriates $250,000, instead of $300,000 as proposed by the Senate and $200,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 151—Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 152—Salaries and expenses, Children's Bureau: Appropriates $1,500,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $1,510,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Office of the Administrator

Amendment No. 153—Salaries, Office of the General Counsel: Appropriates $523,100, instead of $535,100 as proposed by the Senate and $511,100 as proposed by the House.

General provisions

Amendment No. 154: Inserts a separate section proposed by the Senate, making certain appropriations of the Federal Security Agency in the bill available for travel expenses and for expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the function or activity for which any such appropriation is made.

Amendment No. 155: Corrects a section number.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Amendment No. 156—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $8,582,500, instead of

$8,615,000 as proposed by the Senate and $8,550,000 as proposed by the House.

JOHN E. FOGARTY,
E. H. HEDRICK,
CHRISTOPHER C. MCGRATH,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
ERRETT P. SCRIVNER,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CHAPTER VI. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to chapter VI of the bill (H. R. 7786) "making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 159, 163, 170, 171, 174, 176, 185, 202, 203, 214, and 229.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 158, 160, 161, 162, 164, 165, 167, 168, 169, 199, 205, 206, 207, 210, 211, 213, 216, 218, 219, 226, 227, 228, 233, 235, 236, and 237, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 172: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 172, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,294,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 173: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 173, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,325,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 177: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 177, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,617,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 178: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 178, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$7,960,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 179: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 179, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,437,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 180: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 180, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,012,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 181: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 181, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$452,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 182: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 182, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,723,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 183: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 183, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,130,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 184: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 184, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,157,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 186: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 186, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,450,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 187: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 187, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,354,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 188: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 188, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 190: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 190, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$560,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 191: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 191, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,650,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 193: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 193, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,490,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 194: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 194, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$537,050"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 195: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 195, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,837,475"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 196: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 196, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,115,475"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 197: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 197, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$27,100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 204: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 204, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 208: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 208, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$10,315,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 212: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 212, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,565,175"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 217: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 217, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,118,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 220: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 220, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$8,550,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 221: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 221, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$32,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 222: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 222, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$65,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 225: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 225, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$28,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 230: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 230, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,161,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 231: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 231, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,562,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 157, 166, 175, 189, 192, 198, 200, 201, 209, 215, 223, 224, 232, 234, and 238.

JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
WILLIAM G. STIGLER,
EDWARD H. KRUSE, JR.
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL
CLARENCE CANNON,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
WALT HORAN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
CARL HAYDEN,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
PAT MCCARRAN,
ELMER THOMAS,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
CHAN GURNEY,
HOMER FERGUSON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to Chapter VI of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending

June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Research and Marketing Act

Amendment No. 157: Reported in disagreement.

Bureau of Agricultural Economics

Amendments Nos. 158 and 159—Economic investigations: Strike out House language to permit economic research on farm housing as proposed by the Senate and appropriate $2,600,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $2,720,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 160 and 161—Crop and livestock estimates: Strike out House language authorizing collection of data on farm construction as proposed by the Senate and appropriate $2,904,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $2,725,000 as proposed by the House.

Office of the Administrator, Agricultural Research Administration

Amendment No. 162: Corrects language as proposed by the Senate.

Working capital fund, agricultural research center

Amendment No. 163: Restores language establishing a working capital fund as proposed by the House.

Research on agricultural problems of Alaska

Amendment No. 164: Appropriates $280,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $260,000 as proposed by the House.

Office of Experiment Stations

Amendment No. 165—Payments to States and Territories: Inserts language proposed by the Senate in connection with the transfer of Research and Marketing Act funds.

Amendment No. 166—Payments to States and Territories: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 167—Payments to States and Territories: Authorizes $37,500 for research in Alaska as proposed by the Senate, instead of $27,500 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 168—Payments to States and Territories: Appropriates $12,416,208 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $7,406,208 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 169 and 170—Salaries and expenses: Correct date reference as proposed by the Senate and appropriate $237,500 as proposed by the House, instead of $252,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics

Amendment No. 171: Appropriates $1,500,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $1,763,200 as proposed by the Senate.

Bureau of Animal Industry

Amendment No. 172—Animal husbandry: Appropriates $2,294,000, instead of $2,319,000 as proposed by the Senate and $2,250,000 as proposed by the House. The amount appropriated includes $19,000 proposed by the Senate to enable the Department to continue operation of the Morgan Horse Farm until the State Legislature can consider a proposal for State of Vermont to take it over. It is agreed unanimously by the conferees of both Houses that this activity must be disposed of by the end of the fiscal year 1951.

Amendment No. 173—Diseases of animals: Appropriates $1,325,000, instead of $1,350,000 as proposed by the Senate and $1,300,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 174—Animal disease control and eradication: Appropriates $7,950,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $7,952,500 as proposed by the Senate. Although Senate increase is eliminated, the conferees of both Houses agree that the Seattle stockyards should be given the same inspection service accorded similar stockyards throughout the country, within the funds approved.

Amendment No. 175—Animal disease control and eradication: Reported in disagreement.

Bureau of Dairy Industry

Amendments Nos. 176 and 177: Eliminate language proposed by the Senate authorizing construction of housing at Beltsville and appropriate $1,617,500, instead of $1,735,000 as proposed by the Senate and $1,600,000 as proposed by the House.

Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry

Amendment No. 178: Appropriates $7,960,000, instead of $8,500,000 as proposed by the Senate and $7,750,000 as proposed by the House. This amount provides partial restoration of House cut below 1950 level of operation. Funds for research on cortisone are provided in Chapter V of the bill.

Bureau of Plant Industry

Amendment No. 179—Field crops: Appropriates $3,437,500, instead of $3,475,000 as proposed by the Senate and $3,400,000 as proposed by the House. This amount includes $30,000 for research on new types of cotton.

Amendment No. 180—Fruit, vegetable, and specialty crops: Appropriates $3,012,500, instead of $3,075,000 as proposed by the Senate and $2,950,000 as proposed by the House. Funds for research into new sources of cortisone are included in Chapter V of the bill.

Amendment No. 181—Forest diseases: Appropriates $452,500, instead of $455,000 as proposed by the Senate and $450,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 182—Soils, fertilizers, and irrigation: Appropriates $2,723,750, instead of $2,767,500 as proposed by the Senate and $2,680,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 183—Agricultural engineering: Appropriates $1,130,000, instead of $1,140,000 as proposed by the Senate and $1,120,000 as proposed by the House.

Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine

Amendments Nos. 184 and 185.—Insect investigations: Appropriate $4,157,500, instead of $4,165,000 as proposed by the Senate and $4,100,000 as proposed by the House and restore House language authorizing the transfer of funds to the Public Health Service for studies on effects of insecticidal and fungicidal residue on human health.

Amendment No. 186—Insect and plant-disease control: Appropriates $4,450,000, instead of $4,651,000 as proposed by the Senate and $4,185,900 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 187—Foreign plant quarantines; Appropriates $2,354,700, instead of $2,384,400 as proposed by the Senate and $2,325,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 188—Control of emergency outbreaks of insects and plant diseases: Appropriates $2,100,000, instead of $2,350,000 as proposed by the Senate and $850,000 as proposed by the House. The additional contingency funds, which are provided to eliminate future deficiencies, are to be released only after both committees have approved final plans for their use.

Amendment No. 189—Control of emergency outbreaks of insects and plant diseases: Reported in disagreement.

Control of forest pests

Amendment No. 190—Gypsy and browntail moths: Appropriates $560,000, instead of $590,000 as proposed by the Senate and $539,500 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 191—Forest Pest Control Act: Appropriates $1,650,000, instead of $1,900,000 as proposed by the Senate and $900,000 as proposed by the House. The additional contingency funds of $750,000 are included to eliminate as far as possible future deficiencies.

Amendment No. 192—Forest Pest Control Act: Reported in disagreement.

Amendments Nos. 193, 194, 195, and 196—White pine blister rust: Appropriate $3,490,000, instead of $3,700,000 as proposed by the Senate and $3,280,000 as proposed by the House and adjust amounts to be transferred to the three agencies which carry out this program.

Forest Service

Amendment No. 197—National forest protection and management: Appropriates $27,100,000, instead of $29,320,500 as proposed by the Senate and $26,890,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 198—Cooperative range improvements: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 199—Forest and range management investigations: Appropriates $3,030,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $2,995,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 200—Forest and range management investigations: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 201—Forest products: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 202—Forest resources investigations: Appropriates $880,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $1,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 203—Forest development roads and trails: Appropriates $10,348,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $12,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 204—Acquisition of land for national forests, Weeks Act: Appropriates $300,000, instead of $401,000 as proposed by the Senate and $100,000 as proposed by the House. The conferees of both Houses agree that none of these funds shall be used to purchase lands unless they are located entirely within national forest boundaries.

Amendments Nos. 205, 206, and 207—Farm and other private forestry cooperation: Approve corrections proposed by the Senate in sublimitation accounts.

Flood Control

Amendment No. 208: Appropriates $10,315,000, instead of $9,880,000 as proposed by the Senate and $10,750,000 as proposed by the House. Within the funds available, special attention shall be given to the areas where work has been delayed.

Amendment No. 209: Reported in disagreement.

Soil Conservation Service

Amendment No. 210. Omits surplus heading.

Amendment No. 211—Soil conservation operations: Appropriates $52,400,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $52,900,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 212—Land utilization and retirement of submarginal land: Appropriates $1,565,175, instead of $1,665,175 as proposed by the Senate and $1,490,000 as proposed by the House. The amount approved includes Senate increase for the San Simon Valley project.

Amendment No. 213—Water conservation and utilization projects: Appropriates $500,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $400,000 as proposed by the House.

Production and Marketing Administration

Amendment No. 214—Conservation and use of agricultural land resources: Appropriates $282,500,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $283,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 215—Conservation and use of agricultural land resources: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 216—Sugar Act: Appropriates $63,750,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $60,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 217—Market News Service: Appropriates $2,118,500, instead of $2,187,000 as proposed by the Senate and $2,050,000 as proposed by the House. The amount ap-

proved includes Senate increase for market news service on naval stores.

Amendment No. 218—Marketing regulatory acts: Appropriates $3,495,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $3,550,000 as proposed by the House.

Federal crop insurance

Amendment No. 219: Appropriates $7,204,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $6,854,000 as proposed by the House.

Rural Electrification Administration

Amendment No. 220—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $8,550,000, instead of $8,750,000 as proposed by the Senate and $8,150,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 221—Loan authorization: Authorizes rural telephone loans in the amount of $32,500,000, instead of $40,000,000 as proposed by the Senate and $25,000,000 as proposed by the House. The conferees agree that the fees for engineering and legal services on the larger loans should be reduced. They also feel that standardization of plans should be developed to make possible further savings to the consumers. In addition, the Rural Electrification Administration is expected to exercise its power generation authority only in line with its announced policy and the law.

Farmers' Home Administration

Amendment No. 222—Loan authorization: Authorizes $65,000,000 for farm tenancy and housing loans, instead of $71,350,000 as proposed by the Senate and $56,350,000 as proposed by the House. In addition, the Farmers' Home Administration will have a carry-over of approximately $7,000,000 from 1950 for farm housing loans, which will make a total of $72,000,000 available for 1951.

Amendment No. 223—Loan authorization: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 224—Loan authorization: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 225—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $28,500,000, instead of $29,000,000 as proposed by the Senate and $27,700,000 as proposed by the House.

Extension Service

Amendments Nos. 226, 227, and 228—Payments to States and Territories: Appropriate $27,103,498 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $27,000,000 as proposed by the House and adjust language to increase payments to Alaska and Puerto Rico.

Amendment No. 229—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $900,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $915,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Office of the Secretary

Amendment No. 230: Appropriates $2,161,300, instead of $2,179,300 as proposed by the Senate and $2,143,300 as proposed by the House.

Office of the Solicitor

Amendment No. 231: Appropriates $2,562,500, instead of $2,675,000 as proposed by the Senate and $2,450,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 232: Reported in disagreement.

Office of Information

Amendment No. 233: Approves language as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 234: Reported in disagreement.

Travel limitation

Amendment No. 235: Eliminates language proposed by the House limiting funds for travel expenses, in view of Senate substitute in Amendment No. 238.

Commodity Credit Corporation

Amendment No. 236—Administrative expenses: Authorizes $16,350,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $16,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 237—Restoration of capital impairment: Approves $66,698,457 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $170,515,131 as proposed by the House.

General provisions

Amendment No. 238: Reported in disagreement.

JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
WILLIAM G. STIGLER,
EDWARD H. KRUSE, Jr.,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
WALT HORAN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CHAPTER VII. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to chapter VII of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 239, 240, 242, 245, 248, 250, 253, 256, 257, 258, 259, 266, 272, 280, 286, 287, 291, 292, 299, 308, and 309.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 241, 243, 244, 246, 247, 249, 255, 260, 261, 264, 267, 269, 274, 276, 282, 290, 293, 294, 297, 298, 301, 303, 304, 305, and 307, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 251: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 251, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$700,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 252: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 252, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and proposed by said amendment, insert "*Provided,* That of appropriations herein made for the Bureau of Land Managament expenditures in connection with the revested Oregon and California Railroad and reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands shall be reimbursed from the 25 per centum referred to in section c, title II, of the Act approved August 28, 1937, of the special fund designated the 'Oregon and California Land Grant Fund' and section 4 of the Act approved May 24, 1939, of the special fund designated the 'Coos Bay Wagon Road Grant Fund'"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 262: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 262, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$23,272,651"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 263: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 263, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 265: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 265, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 268: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 268, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken by said amendment, insert ": *Provided,* That in addition to the amount appropriated herein, tribal funds may be advanced to Indian tribes during the current fiscal year for such purposes as may be designated by the governing body of the particular tribe involved and approved by the Secretary. Any tribal funds advanced under this authority shall be reported to the Congress in the annual Budget for the fiscal year 1952"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 270: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 270, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$5,875,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 271: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 271, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$5,116,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 273: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 273, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$295,828,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 281: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 281, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$7,200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 283: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 283, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and proposed by said amendment, insert "not to exceed $100,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), including such services at rates for individuals not to exceed $100 per day, when authorized by the Secretary"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 296: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 296, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$7,400,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 310: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 310, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$30,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 254, 275, 277, 278, 279, 284, 285, 288, 289, 295, 300, 302, and 306.

MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
HENRY M. JACKSON,
ALBERT GORE,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
BEN F. JENSEN,
IVOR D. FENTON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CARL HAYDEN,
ELMER THOMAS,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
KENNETH S. WHERRY,
CHAN GURNEY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes

of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to Chapter VII of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Office of the Secretary

Amendment No. 239—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $2,315,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $2,100,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 240—Standardization of geographic names: Provides no appropriation, as proposed by the House, instead of making an appropriation of $14,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 241—Enforcement of Connally Hot Oil Act: Appropriates $180,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $200,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 242—Southeastern power marketing area, operation and maintenance: Appropriates $150,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $100,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 243 and 244—Southwestern Power Administration, construction: Appropriate $8,620,000 and provide contractual authority of $1,730,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of appropriating $10,350,000 and providing $6,000,000 contractual authority as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 245—Southwestern Power Administration, operation and maintenance: Appropriates $760,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $660,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The Southwestern Power Administration is expected to exercise its power generation and transmission authority only in line with its announced policy and the law.

Bonneville Power Administration

Amendments Nos. 246 and 247—Construction: Appropriate $39,500,000 and provide contractual authority of $20,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of appropriating $41,500,000 and providing contractual authority of $21,750,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 248—Operation and maintenance: Appropriates $5,000,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $4,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Bureau of Land Management

Amendment No. 249—Management of lands and resources: Appropriates $7,127,810 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $6,756,800, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 250—Management of lands and resources: Eliminates the Senate proposal to include express authorization to expend funds for weed control on the revested Oregon and California Railroad and Coos Bay Road lands, since such express authority is not needed.

Amendment No. 251—Construction: Appropriates $700,000, instead of $600,000 as proposed by the House and $800,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 252—Administrative provisions: Provides for reimbursement of all expenditures in connection with the revested Oregon and California Railroad and Coos Bay Road lands from the special funds maintained by 25% of the receipts from such lands. Such reimbursement for current expenses is to be made entirely from 25% of current year receipts. If 25% of current receipts is inadequate also to reimburse for the $700,000 appropriation for capital expenditures such current year deficiency can be made up from later receipts. This modifies the reimbursement proposal of both Houses.

Amendment No. 253—Range improvements: Eliminates the Senate proposal to insert a limitation of $350,000 on expenditure of receipts.

Amendment No. 255—Payments to states (proceeds of sales): Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 255—Payments to states (proceeds of sales): Provides a limitation of $20,000 on such payments as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 256—Payment to Oklahoma: Eliminates the Senate proposal to insert a limitation of $4,000 on such payment.

Amendment No. 257—Leasing of grazing lands: Eliminates the Senate proposal to insert a limitation of $6,000 on expenditure of receipts.

Amendment No. 258—Payments to states (Grazing fees): Eliminates the Senate proposal to insert a limitation of $300 on such payments.

Bureau of Indian Affairs

Amendment No. 259—Health, education and welfare services: Eliminates the Senate proposal to authorize expenditure for research among mixed Indians and non-Indian groups.

Amendment No. 260—Health, education and welfare services: Appropriates $40,252,328 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $37,929,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 261—Resources management: Appropriates $10,814,576 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $10,542,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 262—Construction: Appropriates $23,272,651, instead of $22,422,000 as proposed by the House and $23,635,151 as proposed by the Senate. This action eliminates the sum of $500,000 which was added by the Senate for the construction of roads and trails, but restores the sum of $137,500 for land acquisition which was deleted by the Senate. The restoration of $137,500 for land acquisition is made with the understanding that it is not to be expended for the acquisition of privately owned land to be held in trust so as to extend the boundaries of Indian reservations.

Amendment No. 263—Construction: Provides contractual authority of $3,500,000, instead of $2,500,000 as proposed by the House and $5,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 264—Restriction on land acquisition: Adopts the proposal of the Senate to limit the use of appropriations for the acquisition of land or water rights for Indians in specified states.

Amendment No. 265—General administrative expenes: Appropriates $3,600,000, instead of $3,500,000 as proposed by the House, and $3,644,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 266—Administrative provisions: Authorizes the purchase of 227 automobiles as proposed by the House, instead of 250 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 267—Tribal funds: Appropriates $2,437,965 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $2,430,965 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 268—Tribal funds: Authorizes the advancement of tribal funds to Indian tribes during the current fiscal year upon the designation by the governing body of the tribe and approval by the Secretary, and requires that such advances shall be reported to the Congress in the annual budget for the fiscal year 1952, thus reinstating with modification the language proposed by the House but deleted by the Senate.

Amendment No. 269—Tribal funds: Inserts a limitation upon the use of tribal funds for the acquisition of land or water rights in specified states, as proposed by the Senate.

Bureau of Reclamation

Amendment No. 270—General investigations: Appropriates $5,875,000, instead of $5,150,000 as proposed by the House and $6,500,000 as proposed by the Senate. This action provides $50,000 for investigation of the La Prele unit, Wyoming.

Amendment No. 271—General investigations: Provides that of the appropriation of $5,875,000 for general investigations the amount to be derived from the reclamation fund is $5,116,000, instead of $4,400,000 as proposed by the House and $5,791,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 272—Construction and rehabilitation: Eliminates the proposal of the Senate to authorize emergency reconstruction of the La Prele unit, Wyoming, and initiation of construction on the Kennewick Division of the Yakima project, Washington.

Amendment No. 273—Construction and rehabilitation: Appropriates $295,828,000, instead of $297,467,000 as proposed by the House, and $294,713,000 as proposed by the Senate. This action ratifies the allocation of funds for construction and rehabilitation as set forth on pages 142 and 143 (and for the Missouri Basin project, on pages 147, 148, 149, and 150) of Senate report No. 1941, accompanying H. R. 7786, including ratification of the Senate action in providing $750,000 to initiate the work on the Folsom power facilities, Central Valley project, and including ratification of providing $504,000 (increase in appropriation of $228,000 together with $276,000 to be available through reprograming under House allowance) for construction of the Brighton-Brush transmission line and substations, Colorado-Big Thompson project, but with the following exceptions to such ratification:

(a) In addition to $343,000 allowed by the Senate for the Fort Peck project, Montana, $750,000 is also allowed to complete construction of the Havre—Shelby transmission line and substations. This is in lieu of the $1,400,000 allowed by the House and of the entire disallowance of funds for this line as proposed by the Senate.

(b) The additional sum of $365,000 is provided for the Missouri Basin project to construct the Canyon Ferry-Great Falls transmission line and substations.

Amendment No. 274—Construction and rehabilitation: Provides that of the appropriation of $295,828,000, the sum to be derived from the reclamation fund shall be $25,135,700 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $22,897,700 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 275—Construction and rehabilitation (contract authority): Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 276—Construction and rehabilitation: Ratifies the action of the Senate in deleting the proposal of the House to earmark $1,000,000 for the construction of specified transmission lines in South Dakota.

Amendment No. 277—Construction and rehabilitation (language authorizing South Dakota transmission lines): Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 278—Construction and rehabilitation (restriction on construction of Glendo unit): Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 279—Construction and rehabilitation (restriction on construction of Moorhead Dam): Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 280—Construction and rehabilitation: Eliminates the proposal of the Senate to rescind the unused portion of the 1950 appropriation for construction of the Havre-Shelby transmission line and substations, Fort Peck project, Montana.

Amendment No. 281—General administrative expenses: Appropriates $7,200,000, instead of $7,000,000 as proposed by the House and $7,400,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 282—General administrative expenses: Inserts a provision limiting expenditures for information work to not more than $150,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 283—Administrative provisions: Provides that not to exceed $100,000 shall be available for services authorized under section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946, including such services at rates for individuals not to exceed $100 per day, when authorized by the Secretary. This modifies the proposals of both Houses in this connection.

Amendment No. 284—Administrative provisions (administration of interstate compacts): Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 285—Administrative provisions (payments to school districts): Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 286—Administrative provisions: Eliminates the proposal of the Senate to insert a provision limiting reimbursability of certain expenditures.

Amendment No. 287—Administrative provisions: Authorizes expenditures for studies of recreational uses of reservoir areas pursuant to law, as proposed by the House, instead of authorizing expenditures for such studies on a non-reimbursable basis and with an express limit on expenditures for any one reservoir area, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 288—Administrative provisions (Reimbursability of certain expenditures): Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 289—Transfer of Ephrata Air Force Base: Reported in disagreement.

The Bureau of Reclamation was permitted to insert in the Senate Hearings, Part I, beginning at page 576, a statement of the Bureau's interpretation of some of the provisions of H. R. 7786 as passed by the House. Such interpretation should be considered as that sought to be established by the Bureau of Reclamation, and not necessarily as the intent of Congress. When interpretation is necessary, the Comptroller General should resolve questions in the light of all relevant factors.

Geological Survey

Amendment No. 290—Surveys, investigations and research: Appropriates $19,382,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $19,129,000 as proposed by the House.

Bureau of Mines

Amendments Nos. 291 and 292—Conservation and development of mineral resources: Appropriate $17,758,000 as proposed by the House instead of $17,813,403 as proposed by the Senate; and eliminate the provision proposed by the Senate to authorize the reacquisition of certain properties in Montana.

Amendment No. 293—Construction: Appropriates $1,268,100 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,372,600 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 294—Administrative provisions: Authorizes the purchase of 150 automobiles as proposed by the Senate, instead of 145 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 295—Administrative provisions (Transfer of land in Minnesota): Reported in disagreement.

National Park Service

Amendment No. 296—Maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities: Appropriates $7,400,000, instead of $7,250,000 as proposed by the House, and $7,448,100 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 297—Construction: Appropriates $19,667,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $20,542,000 as proposed by the House.

This action on amendments Numbered 296 and 297 will necessitate some flexibility to permit adjustment of items originally scheduled under maintenance and rehabilitation and construction.

Amendments Nos. 298 and 299—Construction: Provide that of the construction appropriation the sum for liquidation of prior obligations shall be $7,935,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $8,935,000 as proposed by the House; and eliminate the proposal of the Senate to provide $100,000 in contract authorization.

Amendment No. 300—Construction (Provision regarding Independence National Historical Park): Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 301—General administrative expenses: Appropriates $1,314,500 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,264,500 as proposed by the House.

Fish and Wildlife Service

Amendment No. 302—Management of resources (Payment for information): Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 303—Management of resources: Appropriates $7,082,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $7,157,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 304—Investigations of resources: Appropriates $4,125,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $3,900,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 305—Construction: Appropriates $2,423,450 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $2,401,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 306—Migratory bird conservation fund: Reported in disagreement.

Territories and island possessions

Amendment No. 307—Administration of territories and possessions: Appropriates $3,392,180 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $3,329,500 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 308—Construction of roads, Alaska: Appropriates $20,400,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $18,883,212 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 309—Claims, Alaska Road Commission: Provides no appropriation as proposed by the House, instead of appropriating $12,893 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 310—Construction, Alaska Railroad: Appropriates $30,000,000, instead of $31,000,000 as proposed by the House and $28,700,000 as proposed by the Senate.

MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
HENRY M. JACKSON,
ALBERT GORE,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
BEN F. JENSEN,
IVOR D. FENTON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CHAPTER VIII. INDEPENDENT OFFICES

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to chapter VIII of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 316, 330, 331, 340, 341, 343, 346, 350, 357, 359, 362, and 371.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 311, 313, 314, 320, 321, 323, 324, 326, 327, 328, 329, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 347, 360, 364, 365, 366, 368, and 372, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 312: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 312, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$187,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 315: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 315, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken by said amendment insert ": *Provided further*, That no part of the foregoing appropriation or contract authorization shall be used in connection with the payment of a fixed fee to any contractor or firm of contractors engaged under a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract or contracts at any installation of the Commission, where that fee for community management is at a rate in excess of $90,000 per annum, or for the operation of a transportation system where that fee is at a rate in excess of $45,000 per annum"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 317: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 317, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$15,511,913"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 318: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 318, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$35,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 322: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 322, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,891,695"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 325: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 325, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 339: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 339, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$78,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 344: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 344, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$9,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 348: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 348, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$190,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 349: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 349, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$42,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 351: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 351, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$11,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 352: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 352, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$38,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 355: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 355, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by

said amendment insert "$6,230,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 356: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 356, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,700,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 358: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 358, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,179,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 367: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 367, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$881,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 369: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 369, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the per centum proposed insert "5.5"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 370: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 370, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the per centum proposed insert "9"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 319, 337, 338, 342, 345, 353, 354, 361, 363, and 373.

ALBERT THOMAS,
ALBERT GORE,
GEORGE ANDREWS,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
FRANCIS CASE
(except as to amendment 363),
JOHN PHILLIPS
(except as to amendment 363),
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
ELMER THOMAS,
HOMER FERGUSON,
GUY CORDON,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to Chapter VIII of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Bureau of the Budget

Amendment No. 311—Salaries and Expenses: Appropriates $3,412,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $3,386,000 as proposed by the House.

Philippine Alien Property Custodian

Amendment No. 312—Administrative Expenses: Appropriates $187,750, instead of $160,000 as proposed by the House and $215,500, as proposed by the Senate.

AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION

Amendment No. 313—Salaries and Expenses: Appropriates $670,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $695,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 314—Construction of Memorials and Cemeteries: Appropriates $8,500,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $8,680,000 as proposed by the House.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Amendment No. 315—Payment of Fees to Contractors: Restores provision in the House bill, amended to clarify intent. In connection with this provision the conferees wish it understood that they are aware that these contracts contain a cancellation clause and that they are expecting the Commission to take immediate advantage of that clause.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

Amendments Nos. 316 and 317—Salaries and Expenses: Authorize the expenditure of $50,000 for performing the duties imposed upon the Commission by the Act of July 19, 1940 (Hatch Act), as proposed by the House, instead of $80,000 as proposed by the Senate; and appropriate $15,511,913, instead of $15,261,913 as proposed by the House and $15,761,913 as proposed by the Senate.

COMMISSION ON RENOVATION OF THE EXECUTIVE MANSION

Amendment No. 318—Salaries and Expenses: Appropriates $35,000, instead of $20,000 as proposed by the House and $50,000 as proposed by the Senate. Re-appropriation of unobligated balances totaling $30,000 provides a total of $65,000 for this purpose.

DISPLACED PERSONS COMMISSION

Amendment No. 319—Salaries and Expenses: Reported in disagreement.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Amendments Nos. 320 and 321—Salaries and Expenses: Authorize the expenditure of $256,500 for travel expenses as proposed by the Senate, instead of $247,500 as proposed by the House; and appropriates $4,013,300 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $3,938,300 as proposed by the House.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Amendments Nos. 322 and 323—Salaries and Expenses: Appropriates $3,891,695, instead of $3,866,695 as proposed by the House and $3,916,695 as proposed by the Senate; and strikes out the words "to the Bureau of Trade Practice Conferences" as proposed by the Senate.

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

Amendments Nos. 324 and 325—Salaries: Appropriate $32,689,500, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $34,500,000 as proposed by the House; and authorizes the expenditure of $300 for newspapers and periodicals, instead of $600 as proposed by the Senate.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 326—Sites and Planning, Public Buildings Outside the District of Columbia: Appropriates $22,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $28,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 327, 328, and 329—Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act: Appropriate $605,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $633,608,240 as proposed by the House; strikes out the provision of the House to the effect that not to exceed $25,000,000 may be expended in accordance with the purposes of the act of July 23, 1946 through purchase contracts negotiated with operators as proposed by the Senate; and provides a contract authorization of $125,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $100,000,000 as proposed by the House. In connection with this activity the conferees wish to go on record as being in accord with the so-called "buy American policy" which was enacted in 1933. The conferees are of the opinion that this policy should continue in full force, and that every assistance should be extended by the government to the development of our domestic sources of raw materials. We point out that domestic development means double protection—a stock pile immediately acquired and the source of supply proved.

Amendments Nos. 330 and 331—Alaska Public Works: Strike out the proposal of the Senate authorizing a contract authorization in the amount of $4,000,000; and restores the provision of the House requiring that a certificate from the Secretary of Defense that the installation of such facility will be of value in connection with national defense.

Amendments Nos. 332 and 333—Advance Planning of Non-Federal Public Works: Appropriate $20,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $28,000,000 as proposed by the House; and provides a contract authorization in the sum of $27,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $32,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 334—Grants for Plan Preparation, Water Pollution Control: Appropriates $750,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $900,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 335—Administrative Expenses, Water Pollution Control: Appropriates $52,285 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $60,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 336—Virgin Islands Public Works: Appropriates $1,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,300,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 337 and 338—Public Works Advance Planning: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 339—Operating Expenses: Appropriates $78,500,000, instead of $76,500,000 as proposed by the House and $82,725,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 340—Purchase and Distribution of Typewriters: Restores the two paragraphs contained in the House Bill relating to the acquisition and distribution of typewriters.

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

Office of the Administrator

Amendments Nos. 341 and 342—Salaries and Expenses: Appropriate $4,200,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $4,900,000 as proposed by the Senate; and reports in disagreement the proposal of the Senate relating to expenses of inspections of projects financed through loans to educational institutions authorized by Title 4 of the Housing Act of 1950.

Public Housing Administration

Amendment No. 343—Annual Contributions: Appropriates $7,500,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $9,250,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 344—Administrative Expenses: Appropriates $9,000,000, instead of $8,750,000 as proposed by the House and $11,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Amendment No. 345—General Expenses: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 346—Railroad Safety: Appropriates $1,000,000, as proposed by the House, instead of $1,016,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 347—Locomotive Inspection: Appropriates $718,600, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $700,000 as proposed by the House.

MOTOR CARRIER CLAIMS COMMISSION

Amendment No. 348—Salaries and Expenses: Appropriates $190,000, instead of $175,000 as proposed by the House and $227,800 as proposed by the Senate.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

Amendments Nos. 349 and 350—Salaries and Expenses: Appropriate $42,500,000, instead of $40,890,630 as proposed by the House and $44,225,630 as proposed by the Senate; and restores the provision of the House providing that no part of the appropriation shall be available for the operation of a field office

outside the continental or territorial limits of the United States.

Amendment No. 351—Construction and Equipment: Provides a contract authorization of $11,000,000, instead of $10,000,000 as proposed by the House and $12,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY

Amendments Nos. 352 and 353—Maintenance and Operation of Properties: Appropriate $38,000, instead of $35,000 as proposed by the House and $39,600 as proposed by the Senate; and reports in disagreement the provision of the Senate waiving the provisions of Section 507 of the Housing Act of 1950.

PHILIPPINE WAR DAMAGE COMMISSION

Amendment No. 354—Eligibility of Persons Who Collaborated With the Enemy: Reported in disagreement. Any recommendation submitted by the committee in connection with this amendment should in no way be considered justification for continuation of this activity beyond April 30, 1951, the statutory termination date for this part of the program.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Amendment No. 355—Salaries and Expenses: Appropriates $6,230,000, instead of $6,130,000 as proposed by the House and $6,330,000 as proposed by the Senate.

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Amendment No. 356—Salaries and Expenses: Appropriates $2,700,000, instead of $2,606,490 as proposed by the House and $2,770,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 357—Paleontological Investigations: Strikes out the provision of the Senate proposing an appropriation of $20,000.

Amendment No. 358—Salaries and Expenses, National Gallery of Art: Appropriates $1,179,000, instead of $1,158,000 as proposed by the House and $1,200,000 as proposed by the Senate.

TARIFF COMMISSION

Amendment No. 359—Salaries and Expenses: Appropriates $1,290,700 as proposed by the House, instead of $1,340,700 as proposed by the Senate.

THE TAX COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Amendment No. 360—Salaries and Expenses: Appropriates $326,900, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $820,000 as proposed by the House.

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

Amendment No. 361—Ship Construction: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 362—Operating-Differential Subsidies: Appropriates $26,450,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $30,108,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 363—Limitation on Number of Ships Receiving Operating-Differential Subsidy: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 364—Maritime Training: Strikes out the provision of the House appropriating $3,342,660, and inserts the proposal of the Senate appropriating $4,348,520 including pay of cadet-midshipmen and other trainees as proposed by the Senate. For several years there has been disagreement in the two Houses as to the justice and desirability of providing the $65 monthly allowance for cadet-midshipmen. It has been pointed out that similar payments are made to cadets at the Military Academy and midshipmen at the Naval Academy. It also has been pointed out that the obligation to serve on the part of the two latter groups is greater than it is in the case of cadets attending the Maritime Academy. It is recommended that the subcommittees of the Committees on Appropriations of the two Houses having the subject in charge, or certain members thereof, conduct a study of the problem with a view to submitting a recommendation thereon by the beginning of the next regular session of the Congress.

Amendment No. 365—State Marine Schools: Strikes out the proposal of the House containing an appropriation of $668,000 together with an unobligated balance of not to exceed $25,000, and inserts the proposal of the Senate appropriating $1,102,050, including pay of cadet-midshipmen at $65 per month.

Amendment No. 366—Vessel Operating Functions: Corrects statute reference as proposed by the Senate.

VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 367—Administration, Medical, Hospital and Domiciliary Services: Appropriates $881,750,000, instead of $875,847,795 as proposed by the House and $887,621,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 368—Limitation on Educational and Training Institutions: Strikes out the proposal of the House regarding the eligibility of educational institutions for the training of veterans, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 369 and 370—Payment for Technical and Clerical Services for the Preparation of Plans and Specifications: Authorize the use of not to exceed 5.5 per cent of appropriation and contract authorizations, instead of 4 per cent as proposed by the House and 6.7 per cent as proposed by the Senate, in connection with projects supervised by the Veterans Administration; and authorizes the use of not to exceed 9 per cent where such projects are under the supervision of other government agencies, instead of 7 per cent as proposed by the House and 10 per cent as proposed by the Senate.

WAR CLAIMS COMMISSION

Amendment No. 371—Administrative expenses: Appropriates $600,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $700,000 as proposed by the Senate.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 372—Section 110: Excepts certain corporations from the general provisions of Title I, Chapter VIII, as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE II. CORPORATIONS

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

Amendment No. 373—Public Housing Administration: Reported in disagreement.

ALBERT THOMAS,
ALBERT GORE,
GEORGE ANDREWS,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
FRANCIS CASE
(except as to amendment 363),
JOHN PHILLIPS
(except as to amendment 363),
JOHN TABER
(except as to amendment 363),
Managers on the Part of the House.

CHAPTER IX. CIVIL FUNCTIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to chapter IX of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 384 and 395.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 382, 385, 386, 389, 391, 392, 394, 396, and 397, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 379: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 379, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,525,00"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 380: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 380, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following "(for replacements only) in the current fiscal year of three hundred and fifty passenger motor vehicles and one motorboat (to be acquired from surplus stock where practicable) and the purchase (not to exceed one, to be acquired from surplus stock where practicable), maintenance, repair, and operation of aircraft"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 381: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 381, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following ": *Provided further*, That the various appropriations for rivers and harbors and flood control shall be available for payments to school districts as authorized by law"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 383: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 383, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$198,811,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 387: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 387, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "383,408,250"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 390: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 390, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$66,422,400"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 393: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 393, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$432,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 388 and 398.

CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN H. KERR,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
ALBERT GORE,
E. H. HEDRICK,
W. F. NORRELL,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
KARL STEFAN,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
ELMER THOMAS,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
JOHN C. STENNIS,
CHAN GURNEY,
GUY CORDON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to Chapter IX of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

CIVIL FUNCTIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Quartermaster Corps

Amendment No. 374—Cemeterial Expenses: Appropriates $5,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $5,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 375—Entombment of an Unknown American Serviceman, World War II: Deletes provision of the House providing funds incident to the selection and burial of an unknown American serviceman of World War II, as proposed by the Senate.

SIGNAL CORPS

Amendment No. 376—Alaska Communication System: Appropriates $2,877,920 for construction in Alaska as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 377—Alaska Communication System: Deletes provision of the House limiting to $28,000 construction costs per housing unit and substitutes provision establishing an average cost of $24,000 per unit, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 378—Alaska Communication System: Enlarges provision of the House pertaining to inclusion of equipment in housing units, as proposed by the Senate.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Amendment No. 379—Administrative Expense Limitation: Authorizes a limitation of $1,525,000, instead of $1,450,000 as proposed by the House and $1,600,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 380—Administrative Provisions: Provides for the purchase of 350 passenger motor vehicles, one motor boat and one airplane, instead of only 350 passenger motor vehicles as proposed by the House and 500 passenger motor vehicles, two motor boats and one airplane as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 381—Administrative Provisions: Provides for payments to school districts.

Amendment No. 382—Rivers and Harbors: Provides authority for investigations and for plans and specifications for authorized projects, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 383—Rivers and harbors: Appropriates $198,811,500 instead of $185,878,000 as proposed by the House and $221,244,500 as proposed by the Senate. The amount agreed upon is 10 percent below the amount approved by the Senate. The Senate had approved $1,800,000 for planning and $2,585,000 for examinations and surveys, which amounts are included in the lump sum appropriation for rivers and harbors. Since the appropriation has been reduced 10 percent below the Senate figure, the amounts for planning and examinations and surveys are likewise reduced by the amount of 10 percent below the amounts approved by the Senate.

Amendment No. 384—Old River, Cleveland, Ohio: Deletes provision of the Senate providing $75,000 for dredging.

Amendment No. 385—Alteration of bridges over navigable waters: Appropriates $900,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 386—Flood control: Corrects language.

Amendment No. 387—Flood control: Appropriates $383,408,250, instead of $341,055,000 as proposed by the House and $436,933,000 as proposed by the Senate. The amount agreed upon is 12 percent below the amount approved by the Senate. The Senate had approved $3,565,000 for planning and $6,500,000 for preliminary examinations, surveys, and contingencies which amounts are included in the lump sum appropriation for flood control. Since the appropriation has been reduced 12 percent below the Senate figure the amounts for planning, preliminary examinations, surveys, and contingencies are likewise reduced by the amount of 12 percent below the amounts approved by the Senate.

With respect to amendments Nos. 383, 387, 390, and 393, the conferees are agreed that obligation and expenditure of funds shall be made under the criteria set forth in the letter of the President and the Corps of Engineers, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, July 21, 1950.

The honorable the SECRETARY OF THE ARMY.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In my message of July 19 to the Congress, I announced that I was directing the executive agencies "* * * to conduct a detailed review of Government programs, for the purpose of modifying them wherever practicable to lessen the demand upon services, commodities, raw materials, manpower, and facilities which are in competition with those needed for national defense. The Government, as well as the public, must exercise great restraint in the use of those goods and services which are needed for our increased defense efforts."

In order to adjust the programs of the Federal Government, I am writing to you and the heads of the other agencies whose programs involve substantial use of materials and other resources needed for the defense effort. Please reexamine your programs, giving particular attention, to the extent applicable, to the following:

(1) All civil public works, both direct Federal programs and grant-in-aid programs, should be screened with the objective, as far as practical, of deferring, curtailing, or slowing down those projects which do not directly contribute to defense or to civilian requirements essential in the changed international situation set forth in my message.

(2) Consistent with the restrictive policy already in force for housing credit, other credit programs should be tightened. The only exceptions should be those which directly contribute to meeting our defense and international responsibilities.

(3) Procurement of supplies and equipment should be held to minimum amounts, especially purchases of motor vehicles, typewriters, and other equipment using critical materials. Inventories should be reduced to the lowest practical levels, and excess supplies and equipment should be made available immediately to the General Services Administration.

In addition, I shall expect that in the reexamination of the programs of your agency you will give first priority to those activities which contribute directly to national defense, including requests of other agencies for assistance.

I am asking the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to work closely with you in this review and to report to me on the steps which you have taken in revising your program to meet these objectives.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY TRUMAN.

TENTATIVE CRITERIA FOR REVIEW OF CIVIL WORKS PROGRAM OF CORPS OF ENGINEERS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PRESIDENT'S LETTER OF JULY 21, 1950

The civil-works program of the Corps of Engineers will be reviewed to insure that no new projects are initiated unless they make an important contribution to the war effort and that only those projects now under construction which meet one or more of the following specific criteria will be continued during the period of partial mobilization.

SPECIFIC CRITERIA

1. The project includes the development of power.

2. The project provides industrial or municipal water supply in critical areas.

3. The project is a dam and reservoir project where closure is under way or has been effected and should be completed to a point of useful operation.

4. The project is an important harbor or waterway.

5. The project protects important industries or major food-producing areas.

6. The project can be completed in the 1951 working season, and where termination costs would constitute an appreciable economic loss, the work in place would be damaged if not protected, and if relatively small amounts of additional work will make the project fully effective.

7. The project involves almost entirely the movement of earth such as channel improvements or levees and does not compete in the use of critical materials.

8. Maintenance of completed projects, advance planning of selected authorized projects, and the survey program should be continued.

With respect to those projects that meet the above criteria for continuation of construction, each individual feature of the project will be examined to determine whether it can be deferred without detriment to the major purpose of the project or to the work in place.

The conferees are further agreed that no construction or planning of any new project appropriated for in this chapter shall be started unless certified by the President as necessary to the war effort and amounts allowed for construction herein shall be available for reallocation to any project appropriated for in this chapter as the Corps of Engineers find necessary to meet the exigencies of the war effort and to maintain economical construction schedules.

Amendment No. 388—Mandan, North Dakota, and James River: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 389—Flood Control General (Emergency Fund): Appropriates $2,700,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $3,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 390—Flood Control, Mississippi River and Tributaries: Appropriates $66,422,400 instead of $65,000,000 as proposed by the House and $66,778,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 391—Emergency Fund for Flood Control on Tributaries of the Mississippi River: Appropriates $450,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 392—Flood Control, Sacramento River, California: Appropriates $2,524,500 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $2,700,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 393—Flood Control, Roseville, Ohio: Appropriates $432,000, instead of $540,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 394—Miscellaneous Civil Works: Appropriates $16,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $12,000 as proposed by the House.

UNITED STATES SOLDIERS' HOME

Amendment No. 395—Maintenance and Operation: Appropriates $2,395,000 from the Soldiers' Home Trust Fund as proposed by the House, instead of $2,363,240 as proposed by the Senate.

PANAMA CANAL

Amendment No. 396—Maintenance and Operation: Appropriates $13,251,700 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $14,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 397—Civil Government: Appropriates $3,849,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $3,925,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 398—General Provisions: Reported in disagreement.

CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN H. KERR,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
ALBERT GORE,
E. H. HEDRICK,
W. F. NORRELL,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
KARL STEFAN,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CHAPTER X. DEFENSE

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to chapter X of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 408, 409, 441, and 455.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 452, 453, 454, 457, 458, 459, 460, 461, 462, 463, 464, 465, and 466, and agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 399, 417, 418, 451, 456, and 467.

GEORGE MAHON,
HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
ROBERT L. F. SIKES,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

ELMER THOMAS,
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
M. E. TYDINGS,
CHAN GURNEY,
STYLES BRIDGES,
HOMER FERGUSON,
KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to Chapter X of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I—INDEPENDENT OFFICES

National Security Resources Board

Amendment No. 399—Salaries and expenses: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 400—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $3,500,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $3,000,000 as proposed by the House.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Office of the Secretary of Defense

Amendment No. 401—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $11,300,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $11,000,000 as proposed by the House. While the House recedes as to the amount, which is $100,000 below the budget estimates, the Senate agrees to the position of the House as stated in House Report No. 1797, 81st Congress providing no funds for the President's Committee on Religion and Welfare in the Armed Forces.

TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Office of the Secretary of the Army

Amendment No. 402—Contingencies of the Army: Appropriates $51,878,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $51,978,000 as proposed by the House.

General Staff Corps

Amendment No. 403—Field Exercises: Appropriates $5,350,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $5,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 404—Pay of the Army: Appropriates $1,447,660,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,448,660,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 405—Travel of the Army: Appropriates $76,500,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $75,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 406—Finance Service: Appropriates $29,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $28,410,000 as proposed by the House.

QUARTERMASTER CORPS

Amendment No. 407—Welfare of enlisted men: Appropriates $8,362,500 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $8,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 408—Subsistence of the Army: Strikes out the phrase "without unduly increasing future United States market prices" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 409—Subsistence of the Army: Strikes out the word "highly" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 410—Regular supplies of the Army: Appropriates $107,247,258 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $100,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 411—Clothing and equipage: Appropriates $93,853,365 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $90,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 412—Incidental expenses of the Army: Appropriates $101,998,313 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $95,000,000 as proposed by the House.

TRANSPORTATION CORPS

Amendment No. 413—Transportation Service, Army: Appropriates $289,960,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $290,000,000 as proposed by the House.

SIGNAL CORPS

Amendment No. 414—Signal service of the Army: Appropriates $158,248,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $157,500,000 as proposed by the House.

MEDICAL DEPARTMENT

Amendment No. 415—Medical and hospital department: Appropriates $54,883,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $54,913,000, as proposed by the House.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Amendment No. 416—Engineer service, Army: Appropriates $304,187,500 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $300,176,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 417—Engineer Service, Army: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 418—Military construction, Army: Reported in disagreement.

ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT

Amendment No. 419—Ordnance service and supplies, Army: Appropriates $647,327,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $621,559,000 as proposed by the House.

Chemical Corps

Amendment No. 420—Chemical service, Army: Appropriates $37,300,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $36,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Army training

Amendment No. 421—Army training. Appropriates $7,830,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $7,930,000 as proposed by the House.

United States Military Academy

Amendment No. 422—Maintenance and operation: Appropriates $5,120,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $5,200,000 as proposed by the House.

Civilian components

Amendment No. 423—Army National Guard: Appropriates $210,500,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $212,400,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 424—Organized Reserves: Appropriates $114,525,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $115,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 425—Army Reserve Officers' Training Corps: Appropriates $24,900,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $25,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Department salaries and expenses

Amendment No. 426—Office of Secretary of the Army: Appropriates $3,368,271 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $3,265,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 427—Office of Chief of Staff: Appropriates $6,576,239 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $6,354,700 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 428—Adjutant General's Office: Appropriates $9,777,200 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $9,477,400 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 429—Office of the Inspector General: Appropriates $203,880 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $197,600 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 430—Office of the Judge Advocate General: Appropriates $595,375 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $577,100 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 431—Office of the Chief of Finance: Appropriates $1,483,202 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,437,800 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 432—Office of the Quartermaster General: Appropriates $6,981,504 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $6,767,400 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 433—Office of the Chief of Transportation: Appropriates $2,940,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $2,850,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 434—Office of the Chief Signal Officer: Appropriates $2,455,821 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $2,379,600 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 435—Office of Chief of Special Services: Appropriates $58,636 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $56,800 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 436—Office of the Provost Marshal General: Appropriates $116,038 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $112,500 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 437—Office of the Surgeon General: Appropriates $2,475,873 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $2,400,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 438—Office of Chief of Engineers: Appropriates $3,751,026 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $3,636,200 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 439—Office of Chief of Ordnance: Appropriates $4,137,696 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $3,776,400 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 440—Office of Chief, Chemical Corps: Appropriates $817,707 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $792,700 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 441—Office of Chief of Chaplains: Appropriates $131,100 as proposed by the House, instead of $128,478 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 442—Contingent expenses, Department of the Army: Appropriates $9,970,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $9,000,000 as proposed by the House.

TITLE IV—DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Amendment No. 443—Navy Personnel, General expenses: Appropriates $60,533,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $60,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 444—Military Personnel, Marine Corps: Appropriates $200,923,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $200,301,700 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 445—Marine Corps Troops and Facilities: Appropriates $82,354,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $80,699,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 446—Aircraft and facilities: Appropriates $532,226,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $536,226,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 447—Ships and facilities: Appropriates $411,782,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $415,282,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 448—Ordnance and facilities: Appropriates $181,665,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $177,088,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 449—Medical Care: Appropriates $37,862,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $38,212,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 450—Civil Engineering: Appropriates $34,778,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $35,178,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 451—Public Works: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 452—Research: Appropriates $43,083,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $43,383,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 453—Service-wide supply and finance: Appropriates $209,292,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $200,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 454—Service-wide operations: Appropriates $99,281,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $94,261,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 455—Island Governments: Appropriates $1,500,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $1,785,000 as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE V—DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

Amendment No. 456—Acquisition and construction of real property: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 457—Maintenance and operation: Appropriates $1,027,662,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,010,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 458—Air National Guard: Adds words "or State-owned" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 459—Air National Guard: Strikes out words "State or" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 460—Air National Guard: Strikes out word "thereof" and adds words "of a State" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 461—Salaries and expenses, administration: Appropriates $58,545,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $55,620,000 as proposed by the House.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 462: Strikes out Section 626 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 463: Corrects section number.

Amendment No. 464: Corrects section number.

Amendment No. 465: Corrects section number.

Amendment No. 466: Corrects section number.

Amendment No. 467: Reported in disagreement.

GEORGE H. MAHON,
HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
ROBERT L. F. SIKES,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CHAPTER X–A. GENERAL REDUCTIONS IN APPROPRIATIONS AND CONTRACT AUTHORIZATIONS

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to chapter X–A of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 468, and agree to the same.

LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
E. H. HEDRICK,
OTTO E. PASSMAN,
C. C. MCGRATH,
CLARENCE CANNON,
KARL STEFAN,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
ELMER THOMAS,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
PAT MCCARRAN,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
STYLES BRIDGES
(except amendment 508),
CHAN GURNEY,
HOMER FERGUSON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to Chapter X–A of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendment No. 468: Strikes out provision, proposed by the House to reduce appropriations by $600,000,000, in view of action on amendment No. 508.

LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
E. H. HEDRICK,
OTTO E. PASSMAN,
C. C. MCGRATH,
CLARENCE CANNON,
KARL STEFAN,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CHAPTER X–B. FOREIGN AID

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to chapter X–B of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 479.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 470, 484, 487, and 489, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 469: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 469, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "CHAPTER X–A—FOREIGN AID"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 471, 472, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, 478, 480, 481, 482, 483, 485, 486, and 488.

J. VAUGHAN GARY,
JOHN J. ROONEY,
JOE B. BATES,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
KARL STEFAN,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
ELMER THOMAS,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
PAT MCCARRAN,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
STYLES BRIDGES,
CHAN GURNEY,
HOMER FERGUSON,
KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to Chapter X—B of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

FOREIGN AID

Amendment No. 469, Foreign Aid: Corrects title of chapter.

Amendment No. 470, Funds Appropriated to the President: Inserts title.

Amendments Nos. 471, 472, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, Economic Cooperation: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 478, Assistance to the Republic of Korea: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 479, International Children's Welfare Work: Deletes provision of the Senate appropriating $12,500,000.

Amendments Nos. 480, 481, 482, 483, International Development: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 484, Mutual Defense Assistance: Appropriates $1,678,023,729 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 485 and 486, Government and Relief in Occupied Areas: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 487, Department of State: Inserts title.

Amendment No. 488, Government in Occupied Areas of Germany: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 489, Aid to Palestine Refugees: Appropriates $27,450,000 as proposed by the Senate.

J. VAUGHAN GARY,
JOHN J. ROONEY,
JOE B. BATES,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
KARL STEFAN,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
JOHN TABER,
Manager on the Part of the House.

CHAPTER XI. GENERAL PROVISIONS

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to chapter XI of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 491, 492, 494 and 509.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 490, 495, 496, 497, 498, 499, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507 and 510, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 493: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 493, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "Nothing in this subsection shall be so construed as to interfere with the initiation, operation, and administration of agricultural price support programs and no funds (other than funds for administrative expenses) available for price support, surplus removal, and available under section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935, as amended (7 U. S. C. 612 (c)), with respect to agricultural commodities shall be subject to apportionment pursuant to this section."; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 508: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 508, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "SEC. 1114. Appropriations, reappropriations, contract authorizations and reauthorizations made by this Act for departments and agencies in the executive branch of the government shall, without impairing national defense, be reduced in the amount of not less than $550,000,000 through the apportionment procedure provided for in Section 1111 of this Act."; and the Senate agree to the same.

LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
E. H. HEDRICK,
OTTO E. PASSMAN,
C. C. MCGRATH,
CLARENCE CANNON,
KARL STEFAN,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
ELMER THOMAS,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
PAT MCCARRAN,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
STYLES BRIDGES
(except amendment 508),
CHAN GURNEY,
HOMER FERGUSON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to Chapter XI of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

SECTION 1111

Amendment No. 490: Adds clarifying language as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 491 and 492: Reinstates language of the House relating to reserves to be established in apportionment of funds.

Amendment No. 493: Provides that funds available for price support programs and available under section 32 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act shall not be subject to apportionment.

Amendment No. 494: Strikes out a proposal of the Senate to exempt appropriations for transportation of mail from apportionment.

Amendments Nos. 495 and 496: Add clarifying language as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 497: Exempts funds under Titles I, IV, and X of the Social Security Act from apportionment.

Amendments Nos. 498 and 499: Exempt funds of the House, Senate, and Architect of the Capitol from apportionment.

Amendments Nos. 500, 501, 502, and 503: Add clarifying language as proposed by the Senate.

SECTION 1112

Amendments Nos. 504, 505, 506, and 507: Limit the annual leave provision to civilian employees, extend the limiting date to June 30, 1951, includes the District of Columbia government within the provision and exempts personnel inducted into military service, all as proposed by the Senate.

SECTION 1114

Amendment No. 508: Provides for reduction of $550,000,000 in appropriations and authorizations carried in the bill.

SECTION 1115

Amendment No. 509: Strikes out a provision proposed by the Senate to limit the price paid for typewriters in view of the fact a similar provision had been included in Chapter VIII of the bill.

SECTION 1116

Amendment No. 510: Prohibits, as proposed by the Senate, payment of retired military personnel who engaged in selling supplies to the Government.

LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
E. H. HEDRICK,
OTTO E. PASSMAN,
C. C. MCGRATH,
CLARENCE CANNON,
KARL STEFAN,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized for 10 minutes.

(Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks on two subjects.)

[Mr. HOLIFIELD addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Washington is recognized for 20 minutes.

(Mr. MITCHELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

[Mr. MITCHELL addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MITCHELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes on Tuesday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

(Mr. LANE asked and was given permisison to revise and extend his remarks.)

KICK RED RUSSIA OUT OF UN

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, are we going to let Communist Russia wreck the UN, and with it any hopes for collective action to halt aggression anywhere and at any time? That is exactly what the conspirators at the Kremlin have been trying to do ever since the UN organization was established. Better to kick them out and keep them out until they demonstrate by their actions that they have abandoned forever their mad dreams of world conquest.

When we alone possessed the A-bomb, we came forward with a plan for inspection and control, to be administered by the UN, which would protect all nations from this terrible weapon. Why did Russia refuse? Because the fanatics of the Politburo were looking forward to the day when they would also have this weapon in superior quality, which they would then use to blackmail or crush all other nations into submission.

Why have the Russians taken so many walks?

Why have they used the paralyzing power of the veto more than 40 times?

All the evidence is in, and from it we draw certain, inescapable conclusions.

Russia is a totalitarian state, with a total disregard of the rights of other states.

It is now clear that her purpose in joining the UN was not to cooperate but to sabotage.

The Russians will not play ball in this league, unless they are permitted to win every game.

It is only on rare occasions, such as the time the Russians were absent and the United States took concerted action to condemn and oppose the invasion of South Korea that the UN has been able to make any progress.

All other steps to halt Russian expansionism have been undertaken on the initiative of the United States and with the cooperation of some other nations. These effective measures could not have been put into operation through the instrumentality of the United Nations because the Russians would have vetoed such action.

I say, therefore, that the UN itself is in danger as long as the present regime in Russia is permitted to represent that country in the United Nations.

It is the bull in the china shop of diplomacy, and this metaphor is open to several interpretations.

Foremost is the fact that the UN will degenerate into a sounding board of echoes, incapable of service to the cause of peace until it cleans its house of the wrecker known as red Russia.

After exercising every forbearance, after giving the Soviet Union every opportunity to mend its ways, we find it openly contemptuous of all those civilized standards of behavior among na-

tions that are honestly trying to stop aggression.

Why are we sacrificing our young men in Korea?

Why are we diverting so much money and effort to defense in a way that will call for sacrifices from all of us?

Everyone knows that the answer is the clear and present danger from red Russian imperialism.

Why, then, are our leaders so timid in calling this menace by its true name?

Why do they honor with debate, in the Security Council, that nation whose avowed purpose is to destroy us?

Diplomacy has its cherished fictions, but none more tragic than this hope, this illusion, that somehow communism will reform or collapse.

I would like to see the Communists repent sincerely or be cast out by the Russian people, but to anticipate either is beyond the most wishful of thinking.

We are faced with an ugly and perilous fact that must be dealt with courageously.

Russia has walked out of the UN before as a threat to the UN.

This time it must be ejected on the UN's terms.

The motley crew of Communist sympathizers, fellow travelers, confused idealists, and the faint of heart generally will wring their hands claiming that this will ruin the UN.

I say that such action will save it from ruin.

Without Red Russia we shall have the majority of nations in this world working together to build, not destroy, an international organization genuinely dedicated to peace. There is no place in such a body for any nation that engages in the cynical and deadly practice of undermining the security and the sovereignty of any other nation. Aggression is not limited to direct attack. Russia is employing the devious tactics of arming and encouraging satellites to attack a neighbor or by the expedient of boring from within. Stripped of their deceits, the world recognizes these evasive maneuvers for what they really are, definite acts of aggression.

I am not advocating a preventive war against Communist Russia.

But I share the rising tide of resentment felt by most people who have observed the deliberate and arrogant sabotage of the UN by a succession of delegates from Moscow, even as the Politburo, with an ill-concealed hand, is stirring up trouble all over the globe.

The UN must be saved from slow strangulation. Free it from the grip of Stalin's agents who would destroy it by every throttling pressure from veto to filibuster, to a twisting of every fact, and deliberate suffocation by lies and propaganda.

The time has come for us to seize the initiative and put an end to such lawlessness.

I believe that this Congress should pass a resolution of censure against the leaders of the Soviet Union.

And I further propose that our delegates to the United Nations be instructed to take action leading to the disqualification of the Soviet Union as a member of the UN because the Soviet Government has forfeited its right to participate in the deliberations of the world assembly by its persistent sabotage of that organization.

The masters of Red Russia are the aggressors against all the people of this earth, including their own.

They must be banished from the United Nations before they ruin it.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, in each to include extraneous material.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks which were made by the Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico, Dr. A. FERNÓS-ISERN, on July 4, be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD, notwithstanding the fact that the Public Printer estimates the cost to be $246.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the cost and without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix of today's RECORD.]

Mr. ZABLOCKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD for the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] a speech that he made.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix of today's RECORD.]

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the legislative business on September 1, I may be permitted to address the House for 1 hour on the eleventh anniversary of the invasion of Poland.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to further revise my remarks made on August 22, 1950, in the Appendix of the RECORD on page A6313 beginning with the word "people" in the last line of paragraph 6 in column 1, by adding: "I think potatoes and some other highly perishable vegetables should not have the benefit of any support prices."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include appropriate material.

Mr. FULTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter to the New York Times.

Mr. HESELTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole and include extraneous matter.

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include a newspaper article.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1192. An act for the relief of certain Basque aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2324. An act for the relief of Maria Balsam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2648. An act for the relief of Carlo Fava; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2922. An act for the relief of Chieko Murata; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3018. An act for the relief of W. F. Steiner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3037. An act for the relief of Nicholas Yialouris (also known as Nicholas Gialouris or Nicolaos Gialouris or Nick Yialouris); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3121. An act for the relief of Mario Juan Blas Besso-Pianetto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3136. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer to the town of Mills, Wyo., a sewage system located in such town; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 3250. An act for the relief of Marne Post No. 28, American Legion, New Martinsville, W. Va.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3254. An act to provide for designation of the United States Veterans' Administration Hospital at Buffalo, N. Y., as the Buffalo Veterans' Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

S. 3321. An act for the relief of Zena (Zenobia) Symeonides; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3434. An act for the relief of Mikiko Anzai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3546. An act to extend the Act of June 6, 1933 (48 Stat. 113), as amended, to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

S. 3672. An act to amend section 3 (c) of the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to make the exclusion from such act of temporary employees of the Senate and House of Representatives inapplicable to such employees with one or more years of service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 3768. An act to authorize payments by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on the purchase of automobiles or other conveyances by certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

S. 3807. An act to authorize the President to appoint Col. Henry A. Byroade as Director of the Bureau of German Affairs, Department of State, without affecting his military status and perquisites; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 3910. An act relating to the assignment of surplus clerks in the Postal Transportation Service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 3917. An act for the relief of Basilio Gorgone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3965. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Lamm Lumber Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

81ST CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. CON. RES. 272

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

AUGUST 25, 1950

Mr. CANNON submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was considered and agreed to

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Clerk of the House of Representatives in the enrollment of H. R. 7786, the General Appropriation Bill, 1951, is authorized and directed to correct chapter and section numbers.

81ST CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. CON. RES. 272

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Authorizing correction of chapter and section numbers in the enrollment of H. R. 7786.

By Mr. CANNON

AUGUST 25, 1950
Considered and agreed to

member patrons on some basis related to their sales to or purchases from the corporation during the taxable year, if (A) the allocation or distribution is conditional (i) upon profits or margins being earned by the corporation from all its operations or a class of its operations during its fiscal year, or (ii) upon income attributable to the resale of the producer's product along with products or a class or classes of products of some other producers less any deductions determination of which is within the discretion of the corporation, or (B) the amount of the allocation or distribution can be determined only with reference to the amount of the profits, margins, or income earned, or (C) the amount of the allocation or distribution can be determined only after declaration or payment of dividends on any class of stock of the corporation or only after the fixing of sums to be transferred to capital, reserves, or surplus.

"'(6) Member of cooperative corporation: For the purposes of this chapter, a person shall be considered a member of a cooperative corporation only if such person is entitled to exercise voting rights and meets such requirements for membership as are prescribed by the cooperative.'

"(c) Information returns required of cooperatives: The Internal Revenue Code is amended by inserting between section 148 and 149 a new section as follows:

"'SEC. 148A. Information by cooperatives.

"'(a) Payments of patronage dividends, refunds, or rebates: Every association organized and operated as a cooperative shall, when required by the Commissioner, render a correct return, duly verified under oath, of its payments of patronage dividends, rebates, or refunds, stating the name and address of each member in the association, and the amount of payments paid to each member and patron.

"'(b) Accumulated earnings and profits: When requested by the Commissioner, every association organized and operated as a cooperative shall forward to him a correct statement of accumulated earnings and profits, including patronage dividends, rebates, or refunds allocated to, but not paid in cash to, members and patrons, and the names and addresses of members and patrons who would be entitled to the same if divided or distributed, and the amounts that would be payable to each.'

"(d) Taxable years to which applicable: The amendments and repeals made by this section shall be applicable only with respect to taxable years beginning after June 30, 1950."

ORDER FOR CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON APPROPRIATION BILL ON MONDAY

Mr. MORSE obtained the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. May I ask the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], when he intends to bring up the conference report on the omnibus appropriation bill?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, it is a privileged matter. If there is no objection, I see no reason why we cannot bring it up right away.

Mr. WHERRY. I would appreciate it if it were brought up on Monday. There are several Senators whom I should like to see on the floor when the report is brought up for consideration.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Georgia if he is willing to agree that we take up the conference report on the appropriation bill on Monday. I think consideration of it will require only a few moments. I have been assured by the leaders that it will take only a short time. If it takes any considerable amount of time, we can defer action on it.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, it is a privileged matter.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. GEORGE. Why can we not act upon it now?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, it would be perfectly agreeable to the junior Senator from Nebraska to have the Senate act upon it now; but, several Senators are not now on the Senate floor who should be here when discussion is had of the report. I am not sure that they can be brought back to the floor so late in a Friday session. While I am in total agreement with the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee that consideration of the report will not take much time, I believe we should defer action until Monday, unless the Senator should wish to ask for a quorum call and get the absent Senators back to the Chamber.

Mr. GEORGE. No, Mr. President, I would not ask for a quorum call this late in the afternoon.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. As the Senator knows, there are 11 chapters to the bill. There were subcommittees which dealt with each chapter, and the chairmen of those subcommittees ought to be present. I think they should be notified before we proceed to consider the report. In my judgment it will be impossible to notify all of them so they can be here this afternoon.

Mr. GEORGE. I am merely apprehensive that we may get into a long discussion of the budget on Monday.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope not.

Mr. GEORGE. But, of course, the conference report is a privileged matter, and I shall yield to the Senator from Tennessee to bring it up.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is very kind of the Senator. I appreciate it very much.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate meets on Monday the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to consideration of the conference report on the omnibus appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

INVESTIGATION OF FEDERAL JUDICIARY

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am submitting a concurrent resolution providing that there be a thorough investigation of the entire Federal judiciary. If the facts in the Bridges case are as they have been stated to me, Judges William Orr and William Healy should be impeached and thrown out of office. If, on the other hand, the facts are otherwise, those judges should be retained. During the last 18 years there have been appointed too many judges who have simply been politicians, some of them utterly devoid of the attributes of a good, fair, honest judge. Some of them were members of subversive organizations before they were appointed. Others have simply been political hacks with enough influence to be appointed and confirmed. Certainly all of us are familiar with one case, argued upon this floor, which stinks to high heaven. Also, we should find out whether judges who are not even citizens of the United States have been appointed. If there are any judges who, while our boys are dying on the field of battle, to protect the skins of all our people, are sympathizers with Russian communism, the quicker this committee, to be composed of representatives of the House and Senate, finds that out and the quicker steps are taken to impeach and get rid of all judges of that sort, the better.

I hope, Mr. President, that we may have prompt action on this concurrent resolution, and that sufficient money be given to the committee so that a fair, honest, impartial, and thorough investigation can be made immediately, because I believe that the people of the United States are entitled to have on the bench good, fair, honest, capable judges who believe in the American system of government.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 103), submitted by Mr. LANGER, was received and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That a joint committee of six be appointed, three by the chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate and three by the chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the House, to make a thorough investigation of the entire Federal judiciary with a view to ascertaining whether any of the Federal judges are Communists, sympathizers of Russian communism, believers in Marxism system of government, members of subversive organizations, whether they are real Americans and citizens of the United States, and still fit, because of age or otherwise, to properly conduct their duties as Federal judges of the United States Government, with full authority to recommend impeachment.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I now call attention to an article entitled 'Court Rules 2 to 1—Bridges Free—Prosecutor Says 'God Help America'—Will Quit." The article appears on the front page of today's issue of the Washington Post. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRIDGES FREE—PROSECUTOR SAYS "GOD HELP AMERICA"—WILL QUIT

SAN FRANCISCO, August 24.—CIO Longshore Leader Harry Bridges today was ordered freed in $25,000 bail pending his appeal on a perjury conviction, and in Washington the Government's special prosecutor who had handled the Bridges' case, F. Joseph Donohue, announced he would resign Friday.

He would not amplify his remarks except to say:

"God help America."

The $25,000 bail was the amount Australia-born Bridges had furnished while awaiting decision on his appeal from a Federal Court conviction and sentence of 5 years' imprisonment on August 5.

He was convicted in April of perjury and conspiracy to defraud at the time he obtained his United States citizenship in 1945. A jury found he lied when he swore he was not a member of the Communist Party.

Bridges will be freed after papers in the case are signed at 10 a. m. Friday.

In a 2 to 1 ruling the Court of Appeals held that the Government's effort to jail Bridges was "novel and startling."

Voting for Bridges' release on bail were Judges William E. Orr and William Healy. Judge Clifton Mathews dissented.

"It is our purpose neither to minimize, on the one hand, nor to exaggerate, on the other, the possible implications of Bridges' utterances as disclosed in the Government showing," the majority opinion said.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a marked portion of page 19 of the hearings before the Committee on the Judiciary, on September 21, 1949, on the nomination of Judge Minton.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

From 1900 to 1909 there were seven Republicans and two Democrats on the Supreme Court. From 1910 to 1916 there were six Republicans and three Democrats. From 1917 to 1921 there were five Republicans and four Democrats. From 1922 to 1932 there were six Republicans and three Democrats. From 1933 to 1937 there were five Republicans and four Democrats. In 1938 there were four Republicans and five Democrats. In 1939 and 1940 there were three Republicans and six Democrats. From 1941 to 1946 there were two Republicans and seven Democrats, and for the last 3 years there has been one Republican and eight Democrats. That just shows that we are losing the equitable balance by continually receiving what somebody has termed "appointment of government by cronies."

Senator FERGUSON. The last three appointments were all Democrats.

Senator JENNER. And the picture is much worse than that. That is referring only to the Supreme Court. When you get into the breakdown of actual judges, Mr. Truman has carried on the Roosevelt tradition of appointing political partisans to the bench, and of the 192 Federal judges appointed since 1933, up to date, 184 of the 192 have been Democrats, and only 8 Republicans.

PROTECTION OF INTERNAL SECURITY OF THE UNITED STATES—PERMISSION TO SUBMIT MINORITY VIEWS DURING RECESS

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me for a moment?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for permission for myself and some of my colleagues to file with the clerk of the Senate minority views on the so-called McCarran bill, Senate bill 4037, to protect the internal security of the United States, and for other purposes. It is the so-called anti-Communist bill, which now is on the Senate Calendar.

The reason for making this request is in order that the minority views may be submitted and printed. The delay in submitting them arises from the fact that we were unable to obtain the majority report on the bill until so late that we shall not be able to complete the minority views until tomorrow.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the minority views may be filed tomorrow, during the recess of the Senate, if the Senate is not in session at that time, in order that the minority views may be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, consent is granted.

THE RAILROAD STRIKE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make a few remarks in reference to the pending railway case.

As the Senate knows, the press ticker has informed us this afternoon that the President of the United States has issued an order seizing the railroads of the country at 5 p. m. next Sunday and placing their operation, or token operation, under the Army.

I think the action of the President is a great mistake and an unfortunate precedent to establish in this national emergency. I do not think it should have occurred until all other possible procedures for settlement of the case had been completely exhausted. I most respectfuly say that I do not think all possible procedures had been exhausted.

I happen to be one who believes that labor disputes should be kept away from the White House if there is any possible way of doing so. I think labor disputes in this country should be settled by procedures and machinery outside of the White House except in those rare instances when no other course is available. However, judging from the past experience we have had I recognize that there are rare emergency occasions when it becomes necessary for the President of the United States to take jurisdiction of the case. Nevertheless, when that is done, I think it is very important that before the President takes any so-called enforcement action in respect to the dispute—and seizure is that kind of action—the White House should hand down a decision in accordance with what it thinks a fair settlement of the dispute should be. I think the American people are entitled to know that. I think the American people are entitled to know the facts about any labor dispute which results in action as drastic and significant as is the action taken today by the President of the United States in the railway case.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I think it is very important that labor and industry recognize that whenever a case goes to the White House it is to be expected that the White House will finally render on that case a decision in behalf of the American people. Under such circumstances it is to be expected that the White House will make clear to both sides to the dispute that their failure to settle the case by the peaceful procedures which are available to them is not going to stop their Government at the executive level from calling upon them, as the last step in the case, to abide by a fair decision in respect to the issues.

That has not been done in this case, Mr. President, and that is why I think the order of seizure is a very bad precedent.

Let us consider some of the steps in this case. I shall not pass judgment on the merits of the respective positions of the parties on the various issues, because I have not studied the record. Nevertheless, all of us are familiar with some of the steps of procedure which have been followed in this case. We know that the dispute is of many months' standing—in fact, some 17 months. We know that it involves wages and conditions of employment. We know that an emergency board's report was handed down on those issues; and we know that the brotherhoods—for their own reasons, and I am not going to pass judgment on the propriety of their reasons—refused to accept the recommendations of the Emergency Board. They had a right, under the law, to refuse to accept those recommendations; and that refusal on their part came prior to the Korean war.

Under the Railway Labor Act they were entitled to 30 days for further negotiations, after their refusal to accept the recommendations of the Emergency Board. The history of the Railway Labor Act, its spirit and intent—yes, its very language—leaves no room for doubt that it was planned under that act that if during the so-called cooling-off period of 30 days following the issuance of an Emergency Board's report the parties could not negotiate a settlement between them, either side would then be free to resort to economic action by way either of a strike or a lock-out.

In this case, the brotherhoods made perfectly clear that they would not accept those recommendations. Again I am not going to render a judgment here this afternoon on the wisdom of their decision. I only wish to point out that they had the right to reach that conclusion if they wanted to. They would have had a right to strike under the Railway Labor Act. Then a new condition developed which did not exist during the 17 months of negotiations on this case. It was a condition which was not in the picture when the Emergency Board held its hearings and made its recommendations. That new condition was the outbreak of the Korean war. In my judgment, Mr. President, that changed things materially. It placed new obligations, I think, on both parties to the dispute. Those obligations are great moral obligations, great patriotic obligations. I think as the result of the outbreak of the Korean war both sides owed a duty to the American people to reach a settlement by way of the peaceful procedures of mediation and conciliation. They did not do it. A strike was threatened, and then the brotherhoods—and I want to be very careful to understate this situation, but by way of that understatement, nevertheless, to report it accurately—I think it is an understatement to say that at that point the brotherhoods sent to the President of the United States a telegram which made very clear that if the case were not settled on a basis which they considered to be fair, and if the President of the United States did not order the railroads seized by the Government, they would call a strike. I think, by way of interpretation of their message to the White House it is fair to say that they had the right to

ROSETTE SELINA ROMANO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7095) for the relief of Rosette Selina Romano, a minor.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Rosette Selina Romano, native and citizen of Italy, shall be considered to be the native-born daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Antonio Romano, United States citizens.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "native-born daughter" and insert "alien natural-born child."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOSEPH UMBERTO MONTALBAN-TROY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8136) for the relief of Joseph Umberto Montalban-Troy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws, Joseph Umberto Montalban-Troy, of Boise, Idaho, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of his actual entry into the United States, upon the payment by him of the visa fee of $10 and the head tax of $8.

SEC. 2. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the non-preference category of the first available Canadian immigration quota.

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the said Joseph Umberto Montalban-Troy may be naturalized as a citizen of the United States by taking the oath of allegiance, in the manner prescribed in the naturalization laws, before any court having jurisdiction of the naturalization of aliens.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "visa fee of $10 and the head tax of $8" and insert "required visa fee and head tax."

Page 2, line 2, strike out "Canadian."

Page 2, line 3, after the word "quota" insert "for Italy."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. OLGA KOWALIK AND CZESLAWA KOWALIK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9144) for the relief of Mrs. Olga Kowalik and Czeslawa Kowalik.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any provision of the immigration laws prescribing annual quotas, the aliens Mrs. Olga Kowalik and Czeslawa Kowalik shall be granted admission to the United States for permanent residence if otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. Upon the admission of such aliens to the United States for permanent residence, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to make appropriate deduction of two numbers from the quota for Poland.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That, notwithstanding the residence requirements of paragraph (1) of subsection 2 (c) of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended (50 U. S. C. App. 1951), Mrs. Olga Kowalik and her daughter, Czeslawa Kowalik, residing at a Polish refugee camp located at Tengerum Arusha, Tanganyika, East Africa, shall be deemed to be eligible displaced persons as defined in section 2 (c) of the said act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHRISTINA SHALFEIEFF

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9434) for the relief of Christina Shalfeieff.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Christina Shalfeieff shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of her last entry into the United States, upon payment of the required head tax and visa fee. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. That completes the call of the Private Calendar.

GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1951

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of August 24, 1950.)

Mr. TABER (interrupting the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, may I ask the chairman of our committee if it would not be possible to agree to dispense with the further reading of the statement at this time. It has been printed in the RECORD and is available to all Members. It is almost impossible for the Members to hear as the Clerk reads, and I do not see that it serves any useful purpose to have it read now.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I heartily concur in the suggestion of the gentleman from New York, and in view of the fact that the conference report has been printed in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for this morning, and that the reading of it at this time would merely consume time unnecessarily, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does this bill contain any funds for the arming of the North Atlantic Pact nations?

Mr. CANNON. There is $1,200,000,000.

Mr. TABER. That is $1,600,000,000.

Mr. CANNON. Four hundred million dollars of it is for the liquidation of contracts. The principal amount for that purpose is carried in the deficiency bill which will follow the conference report.

Mr. RICH. But you do have in this bill $1,600,000,000 for the arming of these North Atlantic Pact nations?

Mr. CANNON. It is $1,200,000,000. Four hundred million dollars is for the liquidation of contracts.

Mr. RICH. Several days ago we made a request on the floor of the House that any bill which came back here for our own support should not contain any money for the arming of these North Atlantic Pact nations. I just want you to know it makes no difference what is in the bill—I am against it, because I believe in principle that that is the wrong thing. If we are going to get peace in this world, you cannot do it by arming everybody. I just want you to know that.

Mr. CANNON. I am certain this conference report meets with the warm approval of my friend from Pennsylvania, because it effects unprecedented retrenchments.

Mr. RICH. No, it cannot meet with my approval, because neither the committee nor anybody should bring a bill here which is to arm ourselves and for the support of the departments of Government, and contain gifts which go to arm any foreign country. I am against it to the *n*th degree and I want you to know it.

Mr. CANNON. When we have friends and depend upon them to help us, it is imperative that we see that they have in their hands the implements with which to make that help effective.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have some information on this civil functions section of the bill. The appropriation, as I understand it, was increased from $185,878,000 to $221,244,500, is that correct?

Mr. CANNON. The budget estimate for that chapter was $834,867,500. It passed the House with a drastic reduction to the sum of $630,820,000. The Senate raised it to $763,464,620. But in conference we again reduced it to $687,043,270, which is $147,000,000 less than the budget and $56,000,000 less than the Senate figures.

Mr. RANKIN. What page is that on?

Mr. CANNON. I am reading from a tabulation which I will include with my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. RANKIN. I am looking at the bill. It seems to me these bills ought to be so written that the Members of Congress could examine them and find out what is in them.

Mr. CANNON. It is written as they have always been written.

Mr. RANKIN. No; it is not, anything of the kind.

Mr. CANNON. It is written precisely as such bills have always been written. Furthermore it is accompanied by a report and a statement by the House managers. I trust the gentleman will find time to peruse the bill and the report and we will have additional tabulations in the RECORD for further analysis.

Mr. RANKIN. You have this amendment No. 383 under civil functions, which, as I understand it, gives the administration the right to use this money on any projects which have been approved by the Congress, is that right?

Mr. CANNON. That is correct.

Mr. RANKIN. That includes the Tennessee-Tombigbee, and also the Demopolis Dam, does it not?

Mr. CANNON. The President must certify that all projects are essential to national defense before he can spend money on them.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker we present here the most complete and comprehensive résumé of annual Federal expenditures ever presented at one time since the adoption of the budgetary system.

The estimate submitted to the Congress by the President for the entire operation of the Government for the fiscal year 1951 aggregated $38,452,358,148. We submit a conference report today providing $36,153,490,425. In other words, the conference report which we submit today, notwithstanding the fact that we are unexpectedly at war, is $2,288,867,723 below the budget estimates, an unprecedented reduction in a war budget.

Summarizing the whole fiscal situation, Mr. Speaker, we provide in this general appropriation bill for expenditures of $36,153,490,425; we carry in the deficiency appropriation bill, reported yesterday, and which we hope to take up in the House today, $16,771,184,479. These two bills with the permanent appropriations of $6,557,462,804 which, under the statutes are automatic, including such items as interest on the national debt, aggregate $59,482,037,708. In brief, we are spending for the fiscal year for all purposes, as projected at this date, a total budget of $59,482,037,708, or in round figures, $60,000,000,000.

At this point I shall insert in the RECORD comparative tables indicating House and Senate action and agreements in conference in relation to the budget estimates:

Comparison of conference agreement with budget estimates

	Budget estimate	Conference agreement	Difference
Appropriations	$35,581,208,648	$33,934,345,425	−$1,646,863,223
Contract authority	2,261,149,500	2,170,145,000	−91,004,500
Borrowing authority	610,000,000	599,000,000	−11,000,000
Total	38,452,358,148	36,703,490,425	−1,748,867,723
General reduction		−550,000,000	−550,000,000
Net total	38,452,358,148	36,153,490,425	−2,298,867,723

Appropriations, 1951

	Budget estimate	Passed by House	Passed by Senate	Conference	Conference as compared with budget	Conference as compared with House	Conference as compared with Senate
Chapter I. District	$12,000,000	$10,800,000	$12,000,000	$10,800,000	−$1,200,000		−$1,200,000
Chapter II. Legislative	87,820,747	56,322,450	69,308,211	69,180,211	−18,640,536	+$12,857,761	−128,000
Chapter III. State, Justice	1,185,612,897	1,110,870,462	1,066,260,732	1,065,627,962	−119,984,935	−45,242,500	−632,770
Chapter IV. Treasury, Post Office	2,813,379,100	2,754,105,000	2,760,305,360	2,757,846,000	−55,533,100	+3,741,000	−2,459,360
Chapter V. Labor, Federal Security	2,463,008,500	2,271,099,614	2,276,842,274	2,272,428,614	−190,579,886	+1,329,000	−4,413,660
Chapter VI. Agriculture	810,626,946	764,032,701	780,336,504	773,208,924	−37,418,022	+9,176,223	−7,127,580
Chapter VII. Interior	674,971,505	622,134,130	617,061,433	620,396,325	−54,575,180	−1,737,805	+3,334,892
Chapter VIII. Independent offices	8,466,982,724	8,021,827,007	8,018,289,977	7,996,140,947	−470,841,777	−25,686,060	−22,149,030
Chapter IX. Civil functions	834,867,500	630,820,000	763,464,620	687,043,270	−147,824,230	+56,222,870	−76,421,750
Chapter X. Defense	13,376,865,000	12,910,702,300	13,294,581,821	13,294,299,443	−82,565,557	+383,597,143	−282,378
Chapter XI. Foreign aid	4,855,073,729		4,599,873,729	4,387,373,729	−467,700,000	4,387,373,729	−212,500,000
Total	35,581,208,648	29,152,713,664	34,258,324,661	33,934,345,425	−1,646,863,223	+4,781,631,761	−323,979,236

Bill as passed House, $29,152,713,664; estimates not considered by House, +$5,248,427,480; total, $34,401,141,144, conference total, $33,922,445,425, difference, −$478,695,719.

Contract authorizations

	Budget estimate	Passed by House	Passed by Senate	Conference	Conference as compared with budget	Conference as compared with House	Conference as compared with Senate
Chapter I. District							
Chapter II. Legislative							
Chapter III. State, Justice	$91,036,500	$58,786,500	$69,650,000	$62,325,000	−$28,711,500	+$3,538,500	−$7,325,000
Chapter IV. Treasury, Post Office							
Chapter V. Labor, Federal Security	161,211,000	154,288,000	154,288,000	154,288,000	−6,923,000		
Chapter VI. Agriculture							
Chapter VII. Interior	44,750,000	38,250,000	37,870,000	36,230,000	−8,520,000	−2,020,000	−1,640,000
Chapter VIII. Independent Offices	578,367,000	510,517,000	537,017,000	531,517,000	−46,850,000	+21,000,000	−5,500,000
Chpater IX. Civil functions							
Chapter X. Defense	1,385,785,000	1,385,785,000	1,385,785,000	1,385,785,000			
Chapter XI. Foreign aid							
Total	2,261,149,500	2,147,626,000	2,184,610,000	2,170,145,000	−91,004,500	+22,518,500	−14,465,000

Bill as passed the House, $2,147,626,500; estimates not considered by the House, $300,000,000; total, $2,447,626,500; conference amount, $2,170,145,000; difference, $277,481,500.

Borrowing authority

	Budget estimate	Passed by House	Passed by Senate	Conference	Conference as compared with budget	Conference as compared with House	Conference as compared with Senate
Chapter VI. Agriculture	$610,000,000	$520,350,000	$550,350,000	$536,500,000	−$73,500,000	+$16,150,000	−$14,036,000
Chapter X-B. Foreign aid			100,000,000	62,500,000	+62,500,000	+62,500,000	−37,500,000
Total	610,000,000	520,350,000	650,350,000	599,000,000	−11,000,000	+78,650,000	−51,536,000

Due to the fact that we are now engaged in a war which is taxing our resources, and which necessarily disorganizes routine and requires complete readjustment of all budgetary processes, it is impossible to draw didactic comparisons with former years or budgets.

It is to be noted, however, that in one respect this is one of the most extraordinary conference reports ever submitted to the House in the fiscal history of the Nation, in that it reflects the most complete agreement between the two Houses ever reported on the annual supply bills since the adoption of the budgetary system.

This voluminous bill, consisting of nearly 500 pages, embracing expenditures for every branch of the Federal Government, comprising thousands of items, provides for the operation of the Government in both peace and war. The House and the Senate conferees have reached complete agreement upon every item with the exception of one small provision. No record of such complete agreement between House and Senate managers and between the two Houses is to be found in the previous annals of the committee or the Congress.

Of course, we bring back to the House in technical disagreement those items which under the rules cannot be included in a conference report but must be submitted for a separate vote, but on all of them there was complete accord by the several committees of conference.

Mr. RANKIN. What is the one item in disagreement?

Mr. CANNON. The $130,000 which the other body inserted in the bill for the Bird Dog Committee which both Houses agreed should be liquidated at the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and which they now attempt to continue regardless of the agreement. It is all the more unjustifiable and untenable because it attempts to support a joint committee with expenditures from the contingent fund of one House—characterized by their own majority leader as an absurd proposal.

With that single exception there is complete agreement of the managers on the part of the two Houses on every item in the omnibus bill.

Incidentally less time was spent in actual conference between the two Houses on this bill than has been spent in conference on the annual supply bills within the recollection of the committee staff.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. On page 212 of the bill there is provided $350,000,000 for rural electrification. That is right, is it not?

Mr. CANNON. That is correct.

Mr. RANKIN. And also $40,000,000 for the rural telephone program.

Mr. CANNON. Thirty-two million five hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. RANKIN. Thirty-two million five hundred thousand dollars?

Mr. CANNON. Yes. The House figure on that, as the gentleman will note on page 212, amendment No. 221, if he has the bill with the Senate amendments before him, was $25,000,000. The Senate increased the figure to $40,000,000. In conference we agreed upon $32,500,000.

Mr. RANKIN. There is no restriction in this bill on these rural power associations' building steam plants where necessary, is there?

Mr. CANNON. None whatever. On the contrary, we included in the bill, both in the chapter on Agricultural appropriations and the chapter on Interior appropriations, explicit provision nullifying any effort on the part of reports to the other body to establish restrictions.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further at that point?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. There was some question that generating plants could be established only when it could show that the co-ops could not obtain power at a reasonable cost elsewhere. The other body attempted to put that language in. That has been stricken; is that right?

Mr. CANNON. If the gentleman read the statement of the managers on amendment No. 221, he will find a complete exposition of that subject. The language to which the gentleman referred was included in the committee report to the other body, but in conference we adopted language which so clarifies the situation that there is no possibility of any interpretation which could be construed as limitation.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. This language, then, will let the Administrator decide that question of reasonable rates.

Mr. CANNON. That is correct.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. That also applies to the construction of transmission lines, does it not?

Mr. CANNON. That is true.

Mr. RANKIN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, there are two features of this conference report which may be especially noted. In the consideration of estimates of appropriations for the support of the defense program, for the prosecution of the war, both committees, meeting separately and meeting in conference, resolved every doubt in favor of liberality and adequacy on war expenditures and preparations for national defense.

On the other hand, just as insistently, if not more so, the committee attempted to resolve every doubt on nondefense items against the proposed expenditure. And I am but relating the circumstances when I say that every nickel of the $2,300,000,000 which we saved through reduction of appropriations is stained with blood and sweat, because we had to fight to hold it from the clutch of voracious interests which sought to spend it, and more, on nondefense projects, which could make no possible contribution to the winnings of the war or the avoidance of future wars.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has consumed 10 minutes.

Mr. CANNON. I will take five additional minutes, Mr. Speaker.

The country is in the gravest danger. That is the unanimous opinion of the military authorities. We are today in danger not merely of war, but of extermination. We carry the largest debt men ever dreamed of and we face the heaviest expenditure ever required of a nation. In addition to that our national revenues are declining. For the fiscal year ending June 30 last, the Federal Government collected in revenues $1,500,000,000 plus, less than collected the previous year.

At the same time the sale of Government bonds is declining. For the last month more bonds were cashed than were sold. So in time of great national danger, with declining revenues, with mounting expenditures, increasing difficulty in floating Government loans, there are interests in the country which insist on spending money for unnecessary nondefense purposes. They fought bitterly to the last ditch for expenditures which even if we had no debt and if we were not at war would be unwarranted. With the debt which we are carrying and with the war which we are now waging, and with the possibility of other and more terrible wars in the future, we barely saved $2,000,000,000. It is to be hoped that the Nation will realize that we cannot have business as usual or politics as usual—that all must sacrifice and lessen the pressure on Congress for projects which can be eliminated or deferred.

Mr. Speaker, may I add that it is fortunate that we were proceeding this year under the one-package appropriation bill. Had we not had the omnibus appropriation bill this year—had we been reporting out every week or two separate supply bills, most of them would have become law months ago and the programs they implemented would have been in effect long before the war opened. But with all appropriations in one bill, we were in position to readjust plans and expenditures to meet the changed conditions thrust upon us by the war. As it is, every expenditure has been reconsidered and readjusted. All plans and programs have been brought down to date. The funds which under the old system would have already been spent and committed to peacetime purposes and conditions are now available for the needs of the day and the hour. The omnibus appropriation bill is one of the few fortuitous features of this unhappy war.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time and now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, we have before us the conference report on the general appropriation bill. I am not going to do much more than to describe some of the major items that are involved and to perhaps answer any questions that may be raised with reference to them.

There is complete agreement on most items with reference to amount. There are three or four items in disagreement that will probably require some little

discussion, although I do not think that it should take too long.

As far as the regular departments are concerned, the only items where I was particularly disappointed in the result were the Agricultural chapter and the Department of the Interior chapter where too often the high figure of either House or Senate has been taken. This resulted in those chapters being away above the highest figures in almost every case. But in most of the other chapters we did reasonably well.

In connection with the items at the end of the bill, which were put in by the Senate, it was necessary to yield to the Senate on most of the items relating to the military because of the war situation. In connection with the items relating to foreign relief, the conference reports back an agreement upon $2,250,000,000 for ECA. That is a very liberal figure, but, everything considered, I think we should be glad we were able to get a $200,000,000 reduction from the Senate figure.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman might state that there was an effort to reduce that more than we did.

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

Mr. STEFAN. We reserved some of it.

Mr. TABER. That is correct. Of course, there is a situation there that is very distressing. In yesterday's Times-Herald there was an article which I think would be profitable for the House to read. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may insert the article at this point in my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. The article reads as follows:

MARSHALL PLAN PRESS AGENTS GIVEN FREE VISITS TO EUROPE

(By Philip Wardin)

Young Americans can join the Navy and see the world through a porthole but if they prefer luxury they can become Marshall plan press agents at a good salary and see the world first class, with expenses paid by the taxpayers.

A survey reveals that the Economic Cooperation Administration information office has been giving several of its employees free visits to Europe and the Middle East this summer.

Robert Mullen, director of ECA information, left yesterday on a tour of Europe. He originally mapped a $7,500 round-the-world trip, but later postponed part of it—a visit to the Orient—until fall.

Mullen has sent an heiress to the J. P. Morgan banking fortune to London for a convention of clubwomen—to get new propaganda material on the Marshall plan to influence American clubwomen.

He sent an inexperienced youth, hired as a "picture expert" tripping to Paris and London to see the sights and get new pictures for propaganda purposes here.

Despite the fact that ECA now has 73 American press employees in Paris alone and 56 more in the various 16 Marshall plan missions in Europe plus 222 Europeans on these staffs, ECA sent a former woman reporter to Paris last week to get "human interest" stories for a clubwoman propaganda pamphlet.

Although the ECA press information office in Paris has a chief who gets about $20,000 a year in salary and expense money, and has a large number of highly paid former reporters on his staff, the ECA here sent a man from Washington to show a group of editors about Europe.

Several others from the Washington Office have gone to Europe this summer on similar assignments.

Mullen now has 48 persons on his Washington staff drawing salaries totaling $280,000 a year. Among these are the Morgan heiress, an ex-bullfighter, the daughter of a famous symphony conductor, and a score of graduates from the defunct war agencies of World War II.

He recently separated a noted Negro World War II Air Force pilot who achieved some success as an author from his Washington staff and dispatched him to Formosa at $15,000 a year to direct Marshall plan press information there.

The American press agents for ECA will draw $673,000 in salaries this year.

Now, it is perfectly apparent that they can get along with much less money. They saved $115,000,000 more out of last year's appropriation than they told us they would when they were before us on this side.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, that newspaper article is a very good argument for the argument we have been making on the floor of this House time and time again that we, who are endeavoring to spread the truth about America throughout the world, should have one information service rather than having to scatter our shots in three or four different directions. We have three or four different information services from the United States, and unless we concentrate and coordinate this effort to tell the truth about our aims, you are going to have a situation like this happen right along and America will become the laughing stock of the world.

Mr. TABER. That is correct. On top of that extra balance that they had left, the expenditures for the fiscal year period down to a couple of days ago when I saw the Treasury statement, were running $115,000,000 as against $360,000,000 for the corresponding period a year ago. That indicates that a cutaway beyond the figure that I have named, and that has been made, would be justifiable. It indicates that there is considerable velvet in there.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. Would the gentleman care to express his opinion as to the reduction in the amount of moneys to be accorded to the Franco government of Spain.

Mr. TABER. Well, that will come up for discussion separately when that amendment in disagreement is reached, and I would rather not spend my time on it now, because I do not have enough time to justify doing it in both places.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Will there be an explanation also of the cut in the point 4 funds?

Mr. TABER. Yes. The item was cut $11,900,000, and that is in the conference report.

There are two or three other things that need explanation. In the first place, they could not possibly spend anywhere near the $15,000,000 in addition to the $8,000,000 that they have under the South America operation, and in the second place, the outfit operating in South America is bringing America into disrepute instead of creating good will in South America, and it was felt that a reduction of that kind would be helpful and would perhaps create a spirit of trying to do better instead of having a great lot of throw-away money without getting any results. The situation in South America has been very bad for a long time, and this other set-up is not even organized and in shape so that they can move in an intelligent way at all. I think that is about all I care to say on that.

The item for the children's fund was cut out. It was not authorized by law. Furthermore, that fund had $24,000,000 remaining from last year. There seemed to be pretty general unanimity among the House conferees on that point.

There are a good many other items involved here. I believe I should spend a minute on the items with reference to chapter IX. That relates to rivers, harbors, and flood control. The rivers and harbors items were reduced $22,000,000, or perhaps a little bit more, below the figure recommended by the other body. On flood control it is approximately $54,000,000 below the Senate figure. In each case that is a little above the House figure, but it was a settlement because the engineers had reported that the President was going to impound all of that amount of $74,000,000 anyway.

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. GOLDEN. Will the gentleman from New York explain under what conditions the new emergency flood control projects which were put in by amendment in the other body can get approval so that they may proceed with the work?

Mr. TABER. They must have a certification from the President of the United States that it is necessary for the war effort. That is the rule. I would not expect any project unless it were really necessary and would contribute in some way to the war effort, to be approved. That is our understanding.

Mr. GOLDEN. If a flood control project which protects railroad yards over which as much as 18 million tons of coal are shipped per year, and if it is shown that coal is used constantly in the defense program, do you think that sort of program might be approved?

Mr. TABER. Of course I would not be able to tell what the President would do, but that would be an element which I would consider very important to think about.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FORAND). Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and eighty-nine Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 254]

Bailey	Hall,	Pfeifer,
Barden	Edwin Arthur	Joseph L.
Barrett, Wyo.	Hall,	Pfeiffer,
Beall	Leonard W.	William L.
Biemiller	Halleck	Plumley
Blackney	Hand	Poulson
Boggs, La.	Hare	Powell
Bolling	Hébert	Quinn
Brehm	Hinshaw	Regan
Bulwinkle	Jacobs	Rivers
Burdick	Johnson	Sabath
Chatham	Kearney	Sadowski
Cole, N. Y.	Keefe	Scott,
Crawford	Klein	Hugh D., Jr.
Dawson	Kunkel	Smith, Kans.
Dingell	Latham	Smith, Ohio
Dondero	Lichtenwalter	Sutton
Eaton	McMillen, Ill.	Towe
Engel, Mich.	Martin, Iowa	Wadsworth
Fellows	Mason	Werdel
Furcolo	Miles	Williams
Gillette	Miller, Calif.	Wilson, Tex.
Gilmer	Morrison	Winstead
Gore	Murray, Wis.	Withrow
Gregory	Norton	
Hagen	O'Neill	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 359 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1951

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MARCANTONIO moves to recommit the conference report on H. R. 7786 to the committee of conference with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to incorporate in the conference report the following provision: At the end of chapter XI, titled "General Provisions," add the following:

"None of the funds appropriated in this act shall be paid to any person, firm, partnership, or corporation which refuses equality in employment to any person because of race, color, or creed."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against the motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, the motion is not in order for two reasons: In the first place, the proposed instructions to the House managers incorporated in the motion propose action which is not within their province, they direct the managers on the part of the House to change the conference report, an action which can be taken only with the concurrence of the managers on the part of the Senate.

The second point is that the provision which the gentleman from New York seeks to add to the conference report does not appear in either the House bill or the Senate bill. It is therefore not in conference. It is not in difference between the two Houses. For either reason, the motion to recommit is not in order.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Yes, Mr. Speaker. As to the first point that has been raised, only the managers on the part of the House are directed by this motion to do certain things. This motion does not direct the managers on the part of the Senate. Therefore, if this motion were adopted, the House would not be going beyond its power or beyond its province. It would certainly be acting within its jurisdiction in instructing its own conferees.

The second question raised is whether or not this is a matter which can be discussed and taken up at a conference between the two Houses. The contention is made that this language was not contained in either one of the two bills. That is true, Mr. Speaker, but that is not the test to be applied. Assuming that these conferees had incorporated this language in the conference report, would the language then be subject to a point of order? Obviously not, because it would be germane. It would be language which both Houses had the power to incorporate. Therefore, the conference had the power to incorporate this language, and since the conferees had the power to incorporate this language, certainly the House has the power to instruct its own conferees to have this language incorporated.

What is more, Mr. Speaker, we are dealing here with a negative limitation. This is a limitation on funds which is something that the members of the conference can at any time put in a conference report. We have had conference reports here time and time again, particularly on appropriation bills, which contained limitations of various sorts, either a limitation of amount, or of scope, or of duties, and various other types of limitations, none of which had been either in the Senate or in the House bill. The precedents are ample on this point.

If the conferees could do it, why cannot the House ask the conferees to do it?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, would the Speaker permit a brief observation?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I merely wish to make the observation that the conferees do not have the power to include in a bill something which is not in conference. This subject was not in conference.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is ready to rule. Without passing on the first point raised by the gentleman from Missouri, the Chair will rule on the second point made by the gentleman from Missouri. The point of order is that this matter was not incorporated in the bill when it passed the House, nor was it in the bill as it passed the other body. The motion to recommit calls upon the Committee of conference to do something which the House itself does not have the power to do, namely to amend its own bill after its passage. This matter, not being in either the House version or the Senate version of the bill, the Chair holds that the point of order is well taken and sustains the point of order.

The question is on the adoption of the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, most of the items reported in disagreement are merely formal matters on which there is general agreement. They are technicalities reported back in compliance with the rule, and as their individual consideration would consume a great deal of time, without any corresponding advantage, I ask unanimous consent that the following amendments be considered en bloc:

Chapter II: Amendments 11, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 23, 26, 28, 39, 46, 47, 48, 49, and 51;

Chapter III: Amendments 94 and 107;

Chapter V: Amendments 142, 148, and 151;

Chapter VI: Amendments 157, 166, 201, 223, and 224;

Chapter VII: Amendments 254, 278, 279, 285, 295, 300, 302, and 306;

Chapter VIII: Amendments 342 and 353;

Chapter IX: Amendment 398;

Chapter X: Amendments 417, 418, 451, and 456;

Chapter X–B: Amendments 474, 478, 481, 482, 483, 485, 486, and 488.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Reserving the right to object, this is only for the purpose of keeping the RECORD straight; is any one of these amendments the amendment providing for a loan to Franco?

Mr. CANNON. No. That is submitted in a separate amendment.

Mr. YATES. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, do any of these amendments include the amount appropriated under the point 4 program?

Mr. CANNON. No; these amendments are likewise submitted separately.

Mr. KEOGH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I ask whether the amendments enumerated in this list are amendments on which the conferees on the part of the House and on the part of the other body are in unanimous agreement?

Mr. CANNON. The managers on the part of the House and the managers on

the part of the Senate are all in complete and unanimous agreement on the amendments included in the request.

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, do any of the amendments read affect the Economic Cooperation Administration funds that have been added to this bill that were not considered in the House?

Mr. CANNON. No; they do not.

Mr. RICH. Have you agreed to the fact that you are going to give this $100,000,000 to Spain?

Mr. CANNON. That will come up in a separate amendment.

Mr. RICH. And the $1,678,000,000 for arming these foreign countries? When you talk about peace and you are preparing for war——.

Mr. CANNON. No such provision is included in the amendments enumerated.

Mr. RICH. That comes up later?

Mr. CANNON. Either in the conference report or later.

Mr. RICH. Is the House going to agree to that?

Mr. CANNON. That will be for the House to determine.

Mr. RICH. We hope not.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The amendments are as follows:

Page 4, line 1, insert:

"For clerical assistance to the Vice President, at rates of compensation to be fixed by him in multiples of $5 per month, $50,370."

Page 4, line 11, insert:

"SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

"For professional and clerical assistance to the Select Committee on Small Business, $88,645, authorized by Senate Resolution 272, agreed to May 26, 1950, at rates of compensation to be fixed hereafter in accordance with the provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, with respect to standing committees."

Page 4, line 18, insert:

"CONFERENCE COMMITTEES"

Page 4, line 19, insert:

"For clerical assistance to the Conference of the Majority, at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman of said committee, $30,280."

Page 4, line 22, insert:

"For clerical assistance to the Conference of the Minority at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman of said committee, $30,280."

Page 5, line 5, insert:

"OFFICE OF SERGEANT AT ARMS AND DOORKEEPER

"For office of Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, including three in lieu of two assistant chief telephone operators at $2,400 each and 33 in lieu of 26 telephone operators at $1,800 each, $1,028,205."

Page 5, line 15, insert:

"Legislative reorganization: For salaries and expenses, legislative reorganization, including the objects specified in Public Law 663, Seventy-ninth Congress, $100,000."

Page 6, line 1, insert:

"Joint Committee on Atomic Energy: For salaries and expenses of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, including the objects specified in Public Law 20, Eightieth Congress, $160,135."

Page 6, line 11, insert:

"Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce: To enable the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to engage by contract the services of private firms or corporations for making a survey of certificated interstate, overseas, and foreign air-carrier operations, with a view to drafting legislation requiring the separation of mail compensation from any Federal subsidy payments, $200,000."

Page 8, line 13, insert:

"Senate restaurants: For repairs, improvements, equipment, and supplies for Senate kitchens and restaurants, Capitol Building and Senate Office Building, including personal and other services, to be expended under the supervision of the Committee on Rules and Administration, United States Senate, $42,500."

Page 9, line 11, insert:

"The Sergeant at Arms is authorized and directed to secure suitable office space in post office or other Federal buildings in the State of each Senator for the use of such Senator and in the city to be designated by him: *Provided,* That in the event suitable space is not available in such buildings and a Senator leases or rents office space elsewhere, the Sergeant at Arms is authorized to approve for payment, from the contingent fund of the Senate, vouchers covering bona fide statements of rentals due in an amount not exceeding $900 per annum for each Senator."

Page 9, after line 21, insert:

"Commencing with the fiscal year 1949 the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to protect the funds of his office by purchasing insurance in an amount necessary to protect said funds against loss. Premiums on such insurance shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration."

Page 10, line 4, insert:

"Salaries or wages paid out of the foregoing items under 'Contingent expenses of the Senate' shall be computed at basic rates as authorized by law, plus increased and additional compensation as provided by the 'Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945,' as amended, and the 'Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1950.' "

Page 19, line 8, insert:

"JOINT COMMITTEE ON NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

"For an amount to enable the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures to carry out the duties imposed upon it by section 601 of the Revenue Act of 1941 (55 Stat. 726), to remain available during the existence of the committee, $20,000, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate."

Page 22, line 12, insert:

"Senate Office Building: For maintenance, miscellaneous items and supplies, including furniture, furnishings, and equipment, and for labor and material incident thereto, and repairs thereof; for purchase of waterproof wearing apparel and for personal and other services, including four female attendants in charge of ladies' retiring rooms at $1,500 each and one at $1,560, for the care and operation of the Senate Office Building; to be expended under the control and supervision of the Architect of the Capitol; in all, $643,900."

Page 94, line 14, after "annum" insert "and such employees may be appointed without regard to the Classification Act of 1949."

Page 80, line 5, after "$3,400,000" insert "*Provided,* That the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force are authorized to transfer to the Civil Aeronautics Board without charge, subject to the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, aircraft (for replacement only), aircraft engines, parts, and accessories surplus to the needs of such Departments."

Page 150, line 2, after "including" insert "grants of adrenocorticotripic hormone (ACTH), cortisone, and other chemical substances, and for."

Page 152, line 16, after "$1,375,000" insert "*Provided,* That the Surgeon General is authorized to convey by quitclaim deed upon such terms and conditions as he may prescribe not to exceed 25,000 square feet of land presently included in the site of the National Institutes of Health to the Bethesda Fire Department, a body corporate of the State of Maryland, for the purpose of erecting and maintaining a fire station to provide protection for the facilities of the National Institutes of Health and for the adjacent community: *Provided further,* That such terms and conditions may include an agreement by the Surgeon General to pay to such department on behalf of the United States 33⅓ percent of the cost of the construction of the station but not to exceed $20,000, to be charged to the maximum limits of costs set out in this paragraph."

Page 156, line 19, after "fund" insert "of which not more than $404 shall be available for payment in advance when authorized by the Federal Security Administrator for dues or fees for library membership in organizations whose publications are available to members only or to members at a price lower than to the general public."

Page 168, strike out all after line 3 over to and including line 17, page 157, and insert:

"To enable the Secretary to improve and develop, independently or through cooperation among Federal and State agencies, and others, a sound and efficient system for the distribution and marketing of agricultural products under the provisions of title II of the act of August 14, 1946, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1621–1629), but including the objects for which funds are available for titles II and III of such act of August 14, 1946, $6,000,000: *Provided,* That not less than $650,000 of this amount shall be available for contracts in accordance with the provisions of section 205 of said act: *Provided further,* That the Secretary may make available to any bureau, office, or agency of the Department such amounts from this appropriation as may be necessary to carry out the functions for which it is made (but amounts made available to the Office of the Secretary, Office of the Solicitor, and Office of Information, shall not exceed those which the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives of the Department, shall determine), and any such amounts shall be in addition to amounts transferred or otherwise made available to other appropriation items of the Department: *Provided further,* That no part of this appropriation shall be available for work relating to fish or shellfish or any product thereof, except for the support of equitable transportation rates before Federal agencies concerned with such rates and for development of foreign markets."

Page 175, line 24, strike out "$2,863,708" and insert "Sections 3 and 5, $2,863,708, and sections 9 and 11 of said act as added by the act of August 14, 1946 (7 U. S. C. 427h, 427j), including administration by the Office of Experiment Stations in the United States Department of Agriculture, $5,000,000, no part of which latter amount shall be used for beginning construction of any building costing in excess of $15,000, except that a poultry breeding house may be constructed at Purdue University at a cost to this appropriation of not to exceed $29,000."

Page 196, line 11, after "$1,300,000" insert "of which $30,000 shall be made available for the establishment of a forest utilization service unit in the Southwest."

Page 214, line 6, after "$56,350,000" insert "of which not to exceed $3,500,000 of the amount available for the purposes of title I and section 43 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, may be distributed to States and Territories without regard to farm population and prevalence of tenancy, in addition to the amount otherwise distributed thereto, for loans in rec-

lamation projects and to entrymen on unpatented public land."

Page 215, line 5, after "acts" insert "*Provided further*, That for the purpose of making loans pursuant to the foregoing authority, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public-debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under that act are extended to include such loans to the Secretary: *Provided further*, That repayments to the Secretary of the Treasury on such loans shall be treated as a public-debt transaction."

Page 238, line 19, after "lands" insert "and materials."

Page 248, line 14, after "Dam" insert "*Provided further*, That in order to promote agreement among the States of Nebraska, Wyoming, and Colorado and to avoid any possible alteration of existing vested water rights, no part of this or of any prior appropriation shall be used for construction or for further commitment for construction of the Glendo unit or any feature thereof, until a definite plan report thereon has been completed, reviewed by the States of Nebraska, Wyoming, and Colorado, and approved by Congress."

Page 248, line 12, after "Dam" insert "*Provided further*, That no part of this or prior appropriations shall be used for construction, nor for further commitments to construction of Moorhead Dam and Reservoir, Mont., or any feature thereof until a definite plan report thereon has been completed, reviewed by the States of Wyoming and Montana, and approved by the Congress."

After "(e))" insert "including payments on account of dependents of employees in field offices in project areas engaged in construction and related activities."

Page 263, line 11, insert: "The Veterans' Administration is authorized to transfer to the Department of the Interior, for the use of the Bureau of Mines, without compensation therefor, full jurisdiction, possession, and control of a parcel of forty-three acres, more or less, within the boundaries of the Fort Snelling Government Reservation in Hennepin County, Minnesota."

Page 265, line 6, after "appropriation" insert "*Provided further*, That not to exceed $150,000 of the funds available for the Independence National Historical Park, Pa., shall be available after January 1, 1951, for the management, protection, maintenance, and rehabilitation of Independence Hall, grounds, and structures in that park."

Page 266, line 11, after "695c);" insert "and not to exceed $30,000 for payment, in the discretion of the Secretary, for information or evidence concerning violations of laws administered by the Fish and Wildlife Service."

Page 267, line 22, strike out lines 19 to 23, inclusive, and insert: "For carrying into effect section 4 of the Act of March 16, 1934, as amended (16 U. S. C. 718–718h), amounts equal to the sums received during the current year and each fiscal year thereafter from the proceeds from the sale of stamps, to be warranted monthly and to remain available until expended."

Page 288, line 23, after "amended" insert: "*Provided further*, That necessary expenses of inspections of projects financed through loans to educational institutions authorized by Title IV of the Housing Act of 1950 shall be compensated by such institutions by the payment of fixed fees which in the aggregate in relation to the development costs of such projects will cover the costs of rendering such services, and expenses for such purpose shall be considered nonadministrative, and for the purpose of providing such inspections, the Administrator may utilize any agency and such agency may accept reimbursement or payment for such services from such institutions or the Administrator, and shall credit such amounts to the appropriations or funds against which such charges have been made."

Page 294, line 23, after "monthly" insert: "*Provided further*, That so long as funds are available from appropriations for the foregoing purposes, the provisions of section 507 of the Housing Act of 1950 (Public Law 475, 81st Cong.) shall not be effective."

Page 371, strike out lines 9 to 12, inclusive, and insert:

"SEC. 102. No part of any appropriation contained in this chapter shall be used directly or indirectly, except for temporary employment in case of emergency, for the payment of any civilian for services rendered by him on the Canal Zone while occupying a skilled, technical, clerical, administrative, executive, or supervisory position unless such person is a citizen of the United States of America or of the Republic of Panama: *Provided, however*, (1) That notwithstanding the provision in the act approved August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1409) limiting employment in the above-mentioned positions to citizens of the United States from and after the date of approval of said act, citizens of Panama may be employed in such positions; (2) that at no time shall the number of Panamanian citizens employed in the above-mentioned positions exceed the number of citizens of the United States so employed, if United States citizens are available in continental United States or on the Canal Zone; (3) that nothing in this chapter shall prohibit the continued employment of any person who shall have rendered 15 or more years of faithful and honorable service on the Canal Zone; (4) that in the selection of personnel for skilled, technical, administrative, clerical, supervisory, or executive positions, the controlling factors in filling these positions shall be efficiency, experience, training, and education; (5) that all citizens of Panama and the United States rendering skilled, technical, clerical, administrative, executive, or supervisory service on the Canal Zone under the terms of this chapter (a) shall normally be employed not more than 40 hours per week, (b) may receive as compensation equal rates of pay based upon rates paid for similar employment in continental United States plus 25 percent; (6) this entire section shall apply only to persons employed in skilled, technical, clerical, administrative, executive, or supervisory positions on the Canal Zone directly or indirectly by any branch of the United States Government or by any corporation or company whose stock is owned wholly or in part by the United States Government: *Provided further*, That the President may suspend from time to time in whole or in part compliance with this section if he should deem such course to be in the public interest."

Page 393, line 20, after "$300,176,000" insert "*Provided*, That the sum of $2,000,000 of the appropriation 'Engineer Service, Army', fiscal year 1947, shall remain available until June 30, 1951, for the payment of obligations incurred under contracts executed thereunder prior to July 1, 1947."

Page 394, line 1, insert:

"MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY

"For construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations, and facilities for the Army, as authorized by the Act of June 17, 1950 (Public Law 564, 81st Cong.), without regard to sections 1136 and 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended, including hire of passenger motor vehicles; $95,318,585, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed $661,400 of the funds appropriated under this head in the Military Functions Appropriations Act, 1949, are hereby made available for construction authorized by the Act of October 27, 1949 (Public Law 414)."

Page 414, after line 11, insert:

"PUBLIC WORKS

"For construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, naval installations, and facilities for the Navy, as authorized by the Act of June 16, 1948 (62 Stat. 459), and the act of June 17, 1950 (Public Law 564, 81st Cong.); major repairs and improvements to the Davisville pier, Naval Base, Newport, R. I.; furniture for public quarters; personnel in the Bureau of Yards and Docks and other personnel services necessary for the purposes of this appropriation; and engineering and architectural services as authorized by section 3 of the act of April 25, 1939 (34 U. S. C. 556); $62,928,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the funds appropriated by the act of June 25, 1948 (62 Stat. 1027), for construction of two new storehouses at Adak, Alaska, may be used for the conversion of existing facilities, if the Secretary of the Navy determines such action would result in a savings to the Government."

Page 419, strike out lines 13 and 18, inclusive, and insert:

"For construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations, and facilities for the Air Force, as authorized by the act of March 30, 1949 (Public Law 30, 81st Cong), the act of October 27, 1949 (Public Law 415, 81st Cong.), the act of May 11, 1949 (Public Law 60, 81st Cong.), and the act of June 17, 1950 (Public Law 564, 81st Cong.), without regard to sections 1136 and 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended, including hire of passenger motor vehicles, to remain available until expended, $164,784,000, of which $25,000,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority granted under this head in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1950, or authorized to be transferred to this head by the National Military Establishment Appropriation Act, 1950."

In the last line of Senate amendment No. 471, after "specified" insert "of which not more than $25,000 shall be available to the Administrator for any further action he may consider advisable to carry out the provisions of section 115 (f) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended."

Page 449, line 9, insert:

"ASSISTANCE TO THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA

"For expenses necessary to provide assistance to the Republic of Korea, as authorized by law, including expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appropriation; payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672); health service programs as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); transportation of privately owned automobiles; hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft; exchange of funds without regard to section 3651 of the Revised Statutes; and loss by exchange; $90,000,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed $1,500,000 shall be available for administrative expenses."

In the last line of Senate amendment No. 477, after "years" insert "*Provided, however*, That no part of this appropriation may be expended for the duplication of any program being carried on by any other agency of the United States Government or any international agency to which the United States is a major contributor, nor for the construction of any project except for demonstration or instructional purposes, nor for any purpose except administrative expenses, and preliminary surveys and technical cooperation programs upon which reports shall be made to the Congress of the United States quarterly."

In the last line of Senate amendment No. 477, after "years" insert *"Provided further,* That the making of any survey or the advancement of any technical cooperation program or the preparation of plans for projects does not constitute any obligation whatsoever on the part of the Government of the United States to make any loan or grant for the execution or construction of any project or for the completion of any program devised under title IV of Public Law 535, approved June 5, 1950."

In the last line of Senate amendment No. 477, after "years" insert *"Provided further,* That it shall be the duty of the Secretary of State to give written notice to each recipient of funds or beneficiary under said title that such assistance shall not be construed as an obligation on the part of the United States to make funds available for the construction or execution of any project and to report such action to Congress."

Page 453, preceding line 16, insert:

"TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE"

Page 453, line 16, insert:

"DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY, CIVIL FUNCTIONS

"GOVERNMENT AND RELIEF IN OCCUPIED AREAS

"For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to meet the responsibilities and obligations of the United States in connection with the government or occupation of certain foreign areas (except Germany), including personnel services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere and, subject to such authorizations and limitations as may be prescribed by the head of the department or agency concerned, tuition, personal allowances (not to exceed $10 per day), travel expenses (not to exceed those authorized for like United States military or civilian personnel), and fees incident to instruction in the United States or elsewhere of such persons as may be required to carry out the provisions of this appropriation; travel expenses and transportation; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates not in excess of $50 per diem for individuals; health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); payment of claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672); translation rights, photographic work, educational exhibits, and dissemination of information, including preview and review expenses incident thereto; expenses incident to the operation of schools in Japan for American children who are dependents of Government personnel; printing and binding; purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft; repair and maintenace of buildings, utilities, facilities, and appurtenances; contingencies for the United States commanders, commissioners, or other administrators of foreign areas, to be expended in their respective discretions (not exceeding amounts authorized or approved by the head of the department or agency concerned); such minimum supplies for the civilian populations of such areas as may be essential to prevent starvation, disease, or unrest, prejudicial to the objectives sought to be accomplished; and such supplies, commodities, and equipment as may be essential to carry out the purposes of this appropriation; $288,000,000, of which not to exceed $18,200,000 shall be available for administrative expenses: *Provided,* That the general provisions of the appropriation act for the fiscal year 1951 for the military functions of the Department of the Army shall apply to expenditures made by that Department from this appropriation: *Provided further,* That expenditures from this appropriation may be made outside continental United States, when necessary to carry out its purposes, without regard to sections 355, 1136, 3648, and 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended, civil service or classification laws, or provisions of law prohibiting payment of any person not a citizen of the United States: *Provided further,* That expenditures from this appropriation may be made, when necessary to carry out its purposes, without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes, as amended, and the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 (41 U. S. C. 151–161): *Provided further,* That expenditures may be made hereunder for the purposes of economic rehabilitation in such occupied areas in such manner as to be consistent with the general objectives of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended: *Provided further,* That funds appropriated hereunder and unexpended at the time of the termination of occupation by the United States, of any area for which such funds are made available, may be expended by the President for the procurement of such commodities and technical services, and commodities procured from funds herein or heretofore appropriated for government and relief in occupied areas and not delievered to such an area prior to the time of the termination of occupation, may be utilized by the President, as may be necessary to assist in the maintenance of the political and economic stability of such areas: *Provided further,* That before any such assistance is made available, an agreement shall be entered into between the United States and the recognized government or authority with respect to such area containing such undertakings by such government or authority as the President may determine to be necessary in order to assure the efficient use of such assistance in furtherance of such purposes: *Provided further,* That such agreement shall, when applicable, include requirements and undertakings corresponding to the requirements and undertakings specified in sections 5, 6, and 7 of the Foreign Aid Act of 1947 (Public Law 389, approved December 17, 1947): *Provided further,* That funds appropriated hereunder may be used, insofar as practicable, and under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the head of the department or agency concerned to pay ocean transportation charges from United States ports, including territorial ports, to ports in Japan and the Ryukyus for the movement of supplies donated to, or purchased by, United States voluntary nonprofit relief agencies registered with and recommended by the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid or of relief packages consigned to individuals residing in such countries: *Provided further,* That under the rules and regulations to be prescribed, the head of the department or agency concerned shall fix and pay a uniform rate per pound for the ocean transportation of all relief packages of food or other general classification of commodities shipped to Japan or the Ryukyus regardless of methods of shipment and higher rates charged by particular agencies of transportation, but this proviso shall not apply to shipments made by individuals to individuals: *Provided further,* That the President may transfer to any other department or agency any function or functions provided for under this appropriation, and there shall be transferred to any such department or agency such unobligated balances of this appropriation and, without reimbursement and without regard to the appropriation from which procured, such property as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall determine to relate primarily to any function or functions so transferred; and any funds so transferred may be expended either under the authority contained herein or under the authority governing the activities of the department or agency concerned."

TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Page 457, line 21, insert:

"GOVERNMENT IN OCCUPIED AREAS OF GERMANY

"For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to meet the responsibilities and obligations of the United States in connection with the government, occupation, and control of occupied areas of Germany, under such regulations as the Secretary of State may prescribe, including personal services in the District of Columbia; one deputy to the United States High Commissioner for Germany at a salary of $17,500; tuition, personal allowances (not to exceed $10 per day), travel expenses (not to exceed those authorized for United States civilian personnel), health and accident insurance, and fees incident to instruction in the United States or elsewhere, of such persons as may be required to carry out the provisions of this appropriation; actual expenses of preparing and transporting to their former homes the remains of persons who may die away from their homes while participating in activities authorized under this appropriation; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates not in excess of $50 per diem for individuals; health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672) and payment of tort claims in the manner authorized in the first paragraph of section 2672, as amended, of title 28 of the United States Code when such claims arise in foreign countries; expenses for translation and reproduction rights; acquisition, maintenance, operation, and distribution of educational, informational, reorientation, and rehabilitation materials and equipment for Germany, including grants; medical and health assistance for the civilian population of Germany; expenses incident to the operation of schools for American children who are dependents of Government personnel; expenses incident to maintaining discipline and order in occupied areas (including trial and punishment by courts established by or under authority of the President); printing and binding, including printing and binding outside continental United States without regard to section 11 of the act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111); purchase, rental, operation, and maintenance of printing and binding machines, equipment, and devices abroad; purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles; transportation to occupied Germany of property donated for the purposes of this appropriation; unforeseen contingencies (not to exceed $100,000) for the United States High Commissioner for Germany, to be accounted for pursuant to the provisions of section 291 of the Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C. 107); and representation allowances (not to exceed $20,000) similar to those authorized by section 901 (3) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (22 U. S. C. 1131); $27,000,000: *Provided,* That provisions of law, including current appropriation acts, applicable to the Department of State shall be available for application to expenditures made from this appropriation: *Provided further,* That when section 601 of the Economy Act of 1932, as amended (31 U. S. C. 686), is employed to carry out the purposes of this appropriation the requisitioned agency may utilize the authority contained in this appropriation: *Provided further,* That expenditures from this appropriation may be made outside the continental United States, when necessary to carry out its purposes, without regard to sections 355 and 3648, Revised Statutes, as amended: *Provided further,* That the Department of State is authorized to utilize for carrying out the purposes of this appropriation, including unforeseen contingencies, without dollar reimbursement from this or any other appropriation (1) currencies deposited in Germany by the Federal Republic of Germany in accordance with section 115 (b) (6) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, and which may be made available by the Economic Cooperation Administration, (2) currencies otherwise deposited in Germany by the Federal Republic of Germany and which become available for use of the Government of the United States, its repre-

sentatives or agencies in Germany, in such quantities and under such terms and conditions as may be determined by the Secretary of State after consultation with the Administrator for Economic Cooperation, and (3) other currencies derived from activities carried on under this appropriation: *Provided further,* That civilian employees of the United States serving in Germany who received appointments in October 1949 to the Foreign Service of the United States for service in Germany shall, for the purposes of section 625 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, be considered to have been in class on September 30, 1949: *Provided further,* That for the purposes of this appropriation appointments may be made to the Foreign Service Reserve without regard to the 4-year limitation contained in section 522 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946: *Provided further,* That in the event the President assigns to the Department of State responsibilities and obligations of the United States in connection with the government, occupation, or control of foreign areas in addition to Germany, the authorities contained in this appropriation may be utilized by the Department of State in connection with such government, occupation, or control of such foreign areas: *Provided further,* That when the Department of the Army, under the authority of the act of March 3, 1911, as amended (10 U. S. C. 1253), furnishes subsistence supplies to personnel of civilian agencies of the United States Government serving in Germany, payment therefor by such personnel shall be made at the same rate as is paid by civilian personnel of the Department of the Army serving in Germany."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered: (Ch. II) 11, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 23, 26, 28, 39, 46, 47, 48, 49, 51; (ch. III) 94, 107; (ch. V) 142, 148, 151; (ch. VI) 157, 166, 201, 223, 224; (ch. VII) 254, 278, 279, 285, 295, 300, 302, 306; (ch. VIII) 342, 353; (ch. IX) 398; (ch. X) 417, 418, 451, 456; (ch. X–B) 474, 478, 481, 482, 483, 485, 486, 488; and concur therein.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. There is no question of reserving the right to object. The gentleman from Missouri has made a motion that is in order.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 35: On page 7, line 11, insert:

"Inquiries and investigations: For expenses of inquiries and investigations ordered by the Senate or conducted pursuant to section 134 (a) of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, including compensation for stenographic assistance of committees at such rates and in accordance with such regulations as may be prescribed by the Committee on Rules and Administration, but not exceeding the rate of 25 cents per hundred words for the original transcript of reported matter; and including $50,000 for the Committee on Appropriations, to be available also for the purposes mentioned in Senate Resolution No. 193, agreed to October 14, 1943, and Public Law 20, Eightieth Congress, $832,000: *Provided,* That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for per diem and subsistence expenses (as defined in the Travel Expense Act of 1949) at rates in excess of $9 per day except that higher rates may be established by the Committee on Rules and Administration in the case of travel beyond the limits of the continental United States: *And provided further,* That hereafter the provisions of section 134 (a) of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, shall be applicable to the Select Committee on Small Business."

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. McGRATH moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 25, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In line 13 of the Senate amendment, strike out "$832,000" and insert the following: "$722,000, and the affairs of the Joint Committee on Foreign Economic Cooperation, provided for in Senate Resolution No. 298, Eighty-first Congress, shall be liquidated not later than August 31, 1950."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 68: Page 54, line 13, after "$34,000,000" insert "of which sum $200,000 shall be used for the purpose of preserving friendships with the peoples of western European countries by means of radio broadcasts, said programs to be created and produced under the supervision and control of the Department of State by experienced private international broadcasting organizations; and."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ROONEY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 68, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert: "of which sum $100,000 may be available for the purpose of preserving friendships with the peoples of western European countries by means of radio broadcasts, said programs to be created and produced under the supervision and control of the Department of State by experienced private international broadcasting organizations; and."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 72: Page 56, line 16, after "expended" insert "and in addition, the Institute is authorized, prior to June 30, 1953, to enter into contracts for the purposes of such act, as amended, in an amount not to exceed $7,000,000."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ROONEY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 72, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: "$1,000,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 92: Page 79, line 9, after "expenses" insert "of which $35,000 may be transferred to the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Civil Aeronautics Administration" for such expenses, including the maintenance and operation of aircraft."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ROONEY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 92, and concur therein within an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert: "$17,500."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 175: Page 179, line 15, strike out all after "$7,950,000" down to and including "entry" in line 23.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 175, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken by said amendment, insert the following: "including $30,000 for the acquisition of land and construction of buildings for inspection of livestock at Canadian border ports of entry."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 189: Page 189, line 22, after "$850,000", insert "of which $1,500,000 shall be apportioned for use pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes for the purposes of said joint resolution only to the extent that the Secretary, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, finds necessary to meet emergency conditions."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 189, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: "$1,250,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 192: Page 190, line 22, after "$900,000", insert "of which $1,000,000 shall be apportioned for use pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes for the purposes of said act only to the extent that the Secretary, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, finds necessary to meet emergency conditions."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 192, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: "$750,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 198: Page 195, line 5, insert:

"Cooperative range improvements: For artificial revegetation, construction, and maintenance of range improvements, control of rodents, and eradication of poisonous and noxious plants on national-forest lands, pursuant to section 12 of the act of April 24, 1950 (Public Law No. 478), $750,000, to remain available until expended."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 198, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$700,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 200: Page 196, line 6, after "$2,995,000", insert "of which $55,000 shall be available for such investigations and experiments at Bartlett Experimental Forest only."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 200, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$41,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 209: Page 200, line 14, after "situated", insert *"Provided further,* That of the funds available herein, not in excess of $7,880,000 may be expended in watersheds heretofore authorized by section 13 of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944, for necessary gully control, floodwater detention, and floodway structures in areas other than those over which the Department of the Army has jurisdiction and responsibility."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 209, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$8,315,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 215: Page 206, line 2, strike out all after "States" down to and including "county" in line 24.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 215, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken by said amendment, insert the following: *"Provided further,* That not to exceed 5 percent of the allocation for the agricultural conservation program for any county may be allotted with the approval of the State committee to the Soil Conservation Service for services of its technicians in formulating and carrying out the agricultural conservation program and the funds so allotted shall not be utilized by the Soil Conservation Service for any purpose other than technical and other assistance in such county."

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, may I have a minute or so to interrogate the gentleman?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. May I ask the gentleman in this connection if he feels the language is absolutely voluntary as regards the various counties and States?

Mr. WHITTEN. There is no question but what it is purely permissive.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I notice that the State PMA committee must agree to any such transfer on the part of the county.

Mr. WHITTEN. That is right. It has to be agreeable to the county and to the State before it is done; in other words, it is permissive. It enables them to do it if they want to.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Has the gentleman conferred with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] and the members of the legislative Committee on Agriculture?

Mr. WHITTEN. I have several times, and they are in complete accord with what we are trying to do.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. They do not think that we are infringing on their legislative rights?

Mr. WHITTEN. None whatever.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Would the language in this amendment in any way prohibit the PMA committees from employing personnel which some might consider to be technicians in the construction or work such as pools, terraces, and so forth, where there are no soil conservation districts?

Mr. WHITTEN. It would not restrict it in any way whatsoever. This is to try to prevent duplication, but in those areas in which soil conservation technicians are not available, it would in no way restrict their activities.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Does the gentleman feel that this additional assistance from the Production and Marketing Administration of soil conservation personnel assigned to soil conservation districts will be kept in those districts where the work has not been substantially completed?

Mr. WHITTEN. Certainly, there is no intention to upset that in the least..

Mr. ALBERT. But you did cut the soil conservation item approximately $500,000?

Mr. WHITTEN. No.

Mr. ALBERT. In this make-up?

Mr. WHITTEN. No. The figure for the soil conservation district is in excess of $1,000,000 higher than it was last year. The Senate did cut it $500,000, and this is additional money over what they had hoped to get at this date. So, since they got a million dollars more than they now have, I do not see that there is any reduction. There might be a reduction in what they hoped to have.

Mr. ALBERT. And the gentleman feels that all these districts which have not completed their jobs will be kept open under this bill?

Mr. WHITTEN. Certainly, that is the intention of this committee.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman explain the difference in the language in this amendment which the gentleman has just offered and the language in the present law?

Mr. WHITTEN. Well, the difference was this: The Senate insisted that this should have approval of the State PMA committee. Personally, I think it is sound to have some consideration by the State and have a State policy rather than have individual handling of it in each county. I think that is the only change.

Mr. JENSEN. In other words, this language is giving the authority back to the farmers, so to speak?

Mr. WHITTEN. That is the way I see it, and it is an effort to correlate the efforts of these two agencies which I think have done a splendid job. We counselled with numerous Members of the legislative committee. This program did not get started until last November, but nevertheless, 250 counties have voluntarily come into it, and it looks like it holds real promise to get maximum dividends from this soil program.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 232: Page 220, line 6, insert the following: "together with such amounts from other appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules in the budget for the current fiscal year for such expenses which several amounts not exceeding a total of $207,000 shall be trans-

ferred to and made a part of this appropriation."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 234: Page 221, line 19, insert the following: "*Provided*, That when and to the extent that in the judgment of the Secretary agricultural exhibits and motion and sound pictures relating to the programs of the various agencies of the Department authorized by Congress can be more advantageously prepared, displayed, or distributed by the Office of Information, as the central agency of the Department therefor, additional funds not exceeding $300,000 for these purposes may be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation, from the funds applicable, and shall be available for the objects specified herein."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 238: Page 229, line 6, insert the following:

"SEC. 411. Of the funds appropriated in this chapter for travel expenses, $791,888 shall be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury on or before August 1, 1950; but such amount shall be credited toward any other reduction in amounts available for such travel expenses resulting from decreases in appropriations made by this act below the budget estimates."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 238, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: "In lieu of the words "on or before August 1, 1950" in said amendment, insert the following: "within 30 days after enactment of this act."

The motion was agreed to.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 275: Page 247, line 4, after "fund" insert "and in addition thereto the Commissioner of Reclamation is hereby authorized to incur obligations and enter into contracts for additional work, materials, and equipment in an amount not exceeding $3,000,000 for power transmission lines and substations in the fiscal year 1951."

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 277: page 247, line 22, after "Dam" insert *"Provided further*, That $3,000,000 of the funds provided in this paragraph plus $3,000,000 contract authority shall be available for construction of transmission lines and substations in South Dakota, to include a transmission loop from Fort Randall through the load centers of Armour, Huron, Aberdeen, Andover, Watertown, Brookings, Sioux Falls, and Gavins Point to Fort Randall, and lines from Fort Randall to Winner and from Rapid City to Midland."

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 284: Page 252, line 8, after "Reclamation;" insert "payment, except as otherwise provided for, of compensation and expense of persons on the rolls of the Bureau of Reclamation appointed as authorized by law to represent the United States in the negotiation and administration of interestate compacts; and, without reimbursement or return under the reclamation laws."

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JACKSON of Washington moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 284, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert: "payment, except as otherwise provided for, of compensation and expense of persons on the rolls of the Bureau of Reclamation appointed as authorized by law to represent the United States in the negotiation and administration of interstate compacts without reimbursement or return under the reclamation laws."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 288: Page 253, line 7, strike out all after "law" down to and including "Investigations." in lines 8 and 9, and insert *"Provided further*, That,' except as otherwise provided by the act of April 19, 1945 (43 U. S. C. 377), or by any other law, no part of any appropriation made herein shall be available pursuant to the said act of April 19, 1945, for expenses other than those incurred on behalf of specific reclamation projects except expenses under the head 'General administrative expenses' and under the head 'General investigations.' "

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JACKSON of Washington moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 288, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and proposed by said amendment, insert *"Provided*, That no part of any appropriation made herein shall be available pursuant to the act of April 19, 1945 (43 U. S. C. 377), for expenses other than those incurred on behalf of specific reclamation projects except $7,200,000 under the head 'General administrative expenses' and $1,193,205 ($197,925 for reconnaissance, $769,080 for basin surveys, and $226,200 for general engineering and research) under the head 'General Investigations.' "

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 289: Page 256, line 11, insert:

"TRANFER OF EPHRATA AIR FORCE BASE

"For the purpose of assisting in the construction, operation, and maintenance, and settlement programs on the Columbia Basin project in the State of Washington, the armed services, General Services Administration, or other Federal agency having ownership or custody thereof or interest therein, is authorized and directed to transfer to the Bureau of Reclamation, without reimbursement or transfer of funds, all of their right, title, and interest to certain buildings, facilities, and equipment at the Ephrata Air Force Base, Ephrata, Wash., including the following buildings in accordance with block and building numbers: Block 800, building No. 68; block 1900, buildings Nos. 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17; block 2000, 4 buildings No. 75. 2 buildings No. 56; block 3000, buildings Nos. 56, 131, 58; block 2900, buildings Nos. 59, 53, 55, 57, 66, 89, 90, 85, 84, 124, 141, 2 buildings No. 60, 2 buildings No. 64, 2 buildings No. 65; block 3300, 11 buildings No. 28; block 3400, 7 buildings No. 28; block 3500, buildings Nos. 43, 46; block 3600, buildings Nos. 34, 35, 36, 38, 2 buildings No. 37; block 3700, buildings Nos. 35, 38, 4 buildings No. 31, 2 buildings No. 32, 2 buildings No. 34, 2 buildings No. 37; block 3800, buildings Nos. 35, 38, 39, 42, 2 buildings No. 37; block 4300, buildings Nos. 19, 20, 21, 22; block 4400, buildings Nos. 113, 114, 2 buildings No. 112; block 4600, buildings No. 134; block 4700, buildings Nos. 94, 95, 96, 99, 109, 100, 35, 108, 104, 110, 6 buildings No. 97; block 4800, buildings Nos. 53, 40, 102, 101, 103, 105, 107, 111, 2 buildings No. 32, 5 buildings No. 106, 3 buildings No. 98, together with one sewage-disposal plant No. 116, 1 water tank No. 115, 1 well, 1 flag pole No. 118, 2 garbage racks No. 155, 2 garbage racks No. 158, 1 wash rack No. 63, 2 grease racks No. 62, and sewer system, water lines, electric-power lines, railroad spur and siding, road improvements, and all other facilities and equipment incident to the foregoing property, and including land and rights-of-way formerly under Reclamation withdrawal to other federally owned land on which said buildings, are situate, which have heretofore or which may hereafter be declared surplus to the needs of the Armed Forces."

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JACKSON of Washington moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 289, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In the last line of the matter proposed by said amendment, before the period, insert *"Provided*, That amounts equal to the value of all property transferred hereunder and used shall be charged, in the same manner as appropriations are charged, as part of the construction or appropriate other costs of the Columbia Basin project, such values to be determined by appraisal approved by the Administrator of General Services of the market value of such property current at the time of transfer hereunder less expenditures on such property by the Bureau of Reclamation prior to such transfer."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 319. On page 291, strike out all of line 11, on page 291, down to and including line 17, on page 292, and insert:

"Displaced Persons Commission: For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended by the Act of June 16, 1950 (Public Law 555), including personal services and rents in the District of Columbia; travel expenses without regard to the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, as amended, and the rates of per diem allowances under the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926, as amended; purchase (not to exceed three), and hire of passenger motor vehicles; printing and binding, including printing and binding outside the continental limits of the United States without regard to section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111); expenses incident to the primary and secondary education of American children who are dependents of Government personnel paid from this appropriation and stationed overseas; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672); health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); employment of aliens; and payment of rent in foreign countries in advance; $9,000,000: *Provided,* That allocations may be made from this appropriation by the Commission upon approval by the Bureau of the Budget to any department, agency, corporation, or independent establishment of the Government for direct expenditure for the purposes of this appropriation, and any such expenditures may be made under the specific authority herein contained or under the authority governing the activities of the department, agency, corporation, or independent establishment to which amounts are allocated: *Provided further,* That the Commission may enter into agreements with international, governmental, and private agencies and may make payment in advance or by reimbursement for expenses incurred by such agencies in rendering assistance to the Commission in carrying out the purposes of this act."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 319, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"Displaced Persons Commission: For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended by the act of June 16, 1950 (Public Law 555), including personal services and rents in the District of Columbia; travel expenses, including travel expenses outside continental United States without regard to the standardized Government travel regulations, as amended, and the rates of per diem allowances under the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926, as amended; purchase (not to exceed three), and hire of passenger motor vehicles; printing and binding, including printing and binding outside the continental limits of the United States without regard to section 11 of the act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111); expenses incident to the primary and secondary education of American children who are dependents of Government personnel paid from this appropriation and stationed overseas; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672); health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); employment of aliens; and payment of rent in foreign countries in advance; $8,000,000: *Provided,* That allocations may be made from this appropriation by the Commission upon approval by the Bureau of the Budget to any department, agency, corporation, or independent establishment of the Government for direct expenditure for the purposes of this appropriation, and any such expenditures may be made under the specific authority contained or under the authority governing the activities of the department, agency, corporation, or independent establishment to which amounts are allocated: *Provided further,* That the Commission may enter into agreements with United States governmental agencies and may make payment in advance or by reimbursement for expenses incurred by such agencies in rendering assistance to the Commission in carrying out the provisions of this act."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 337: On page 304, strike out "the" and insert "not to exceed $4,000,000 of the."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 337, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert "$4,350,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 338: page 304, line 21, after "1951" insert: "The sum of $2,000,000 carried in the said unexpended balances shall be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury immediately upon the approved of this act."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 338, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert "$1,324,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 345: Page 314, line 13, strike out "$9,889,600" and insert "$10,002,600."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 345, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert: "$9,889,600 (and any part of the amount of $100,000 for valuations of pipelines, and $3,831,920 for the work of the Bureau of Motor Carriers, contained in this paragraph, may be transferred as the Commission may determine for carrying out other functions of the Commission)."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 354: Page 320, line 18, after the word "Philippines," insert "or, in the absence of such finding by such court, the Commission after hearing finds upon evidence that such person was guilty of such collaboration or act of disloyalty."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 354, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "or, in any case involving charges of such collaboration or disloyalty which have not been adjudicated by any such court, where the Commission, after hearing and evidence, certifies that it is satisfied that the person so charged is guilty of such collaboration or disloyalty."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 325, line 17, strike out all after "$63,000,000" down to and including "estimates" in line 15, and insert: *Provided,* That no part of this appropriation or contract authorization shall be used (1) to start any new ship construction for which an estimate was not included in the budget for the current fiscal year or (2) to start any new ship construction the currently estimated cost of which exceeds by 10 percent the estimated cost included therefor in such budget unless, in either case, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget specifically approves the start of such ship construction and the Director shall submit forthwith a detailed explanation thereof to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and of the House of Representatives; and, or used herein, the term "budget" includes the detailed justification supporting the budget estimates: *Provided further,* That not to exceed $64,875,000 of the funds and contract authority made available for new ship construction, including reconditioning and betterment, in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1950, shall continue to be available until December 31, 1950."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same.

SAM HOBBS,
PETER W. RODINO, Jr.,
WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH,
Managers on the Part of the House.

PAT MCCARRAN,
ALEXANDER WILEY,
JAMES EASTLAND,
By MCCARRAN,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1838) to amend title 28 of the United States Code relating to fees of United States marshals, submit the following explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon in conference and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

The House passed the Senate bill after amending it by striking out the first section, which proposed to make the fee chargeable by marshals for the sale of property uniform in all judicial districts, and to make applicable to all sales the fees presently authorized for the sale of property under process in admiralty. The Senate recedes.

SAM HOBBS,
PETER W. RODINO, Jr.,
WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH,
Managers on the Part of the House.

AUTHORIZING CORRECTION OF CHAPTERS AND SECTION NUMBERS ON H. R. 7786

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of a House concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 272), which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Clerk of the House in the enrollment of H. R. 7786, the general appropriation bill, 1951, is authorized and directed to correct chapter and section numbers.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FILING OF CONFERENCE REPORTS ON S. 3959 AND H. R. 9038

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the bill S. 3959, and also on H. R. 9038, have until midnight tonight to file conference reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAWSON, from the committee of conference, submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (S. 3959) entitled "An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, and for other purposes":

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 3001)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3959) entitled "An Act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That the parenthetical expression appearing in clause (1) of the final sentence of subsection (a) of section 109 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (Public Law 152, Eighty-first Congress) is amended to read as follows:

"'(including the purchase from or through the Public Printer, for warehouse issue, of standard forms, blankbook work, standard specifications, and other printed material in common use by Federal agencies not available through the Superintendent of Documents).'

"SEC. 2. (a) Clause (2) of the final sentence of subsection (a) of section 109 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as hereinbefore amended, is amended to read as follows: '(2) for paying the purchase price, transportation to first storage point of supplies and services, and the cost of personal services employed directly in the repair, rehabilitation, and conversion of personal property.'

"(b) The third sentence of subsection (b) of section 109 of such Act is amended to read as follows: 'On and after such date, such prices shall be fixed at levels so as to recover so far as practicable the applicable purchase price, the transportation cost to first storage point, inventory losses, the cost of personal services employed directly in the repair, rehabilitation, and conversion of personal property, and the cost of amortization and repair of equipment utilized for lease or rent to executive agencies.'

"(c) The amendments made by this section shall be effective on the date, not earlier than July 1, 1950, on which the Administrator of General Services shall determine that appropriated funds adequate to effectuate the purposes of such amendments have been made available.

"SEC. 3. (a) The final sentence of subsection (b) of section 109 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 is amended to read as follows: 'Where an advance of funds is not made, the General Services Administration shall be reimbursed promptly out of funds of the requisitioning agency in accordance with accounting procedures approved by the Comptroller General: *Provided*, That in any case where payment shall not have been made by the requisitioning agency within forty-five days after the date of billing by the Administrator or the date on which an actual liability for supples or services is incurred by the Administrator, whichever is the later, reimbursement may be obtained by the Administrator by the issuance of transfer and counterwarrants, or other lawful transfer documents, supported by itemized invoices.'

"(b) Section 109 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(g) Whenever any producer or vendor shall tender any article or commoddity for sale to the General Services Administration or to any procurement authority acting under the direction and control of the Administrator pursuant to this Act, the Administrator is authorized in his discretion, with the consent of such producer or vendor, to cause to be conducted, in such manner as the Administrator shall specify, such tests as he shall prescribe to determine whether such article or commodity conforms to prescribed specifications and standards. When the Administrator determines that the making of such tests will serve predominantly the interest of such producer or vendor, he shall charge such producer or vendor a fee which shall be fixed by the Administrator in such amount as will recover the cost of conducting such tests, including all components of such cost, determined in accordance with accepted accounting principles. When the Administrator determines that the making of such tests will not serve predominantly the interest of such producer or vendor, he shall charge such producer or vendor such fee as he shall determine to be reasonable for the furnishing of such testing service. All such fees collected by the Administrator may be deposited in the General Supply Fund to be used for any purpose authorized by subsection 109 (a) of this Act.'

"SEC. 4. Paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 203 (j) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 are amended to read as follows:

"'(1) Under such regulations as he may prescribe, the Administrator is authorized in his discretion to donate for educational purposes or public health purposes, including research, in the States, Territories, and possessions without cost (except for costs of care and handling) such equipment, materials, books, or other supplies under the control of any executive agency as shall have been determined to be surplus property and which shall have been determined under paragraph (2) or paragraph (3) of this subsection to be usable and necessary for educational purposes or public health purposes, including research.

"'(2) Determination whether such surplus property (except surplus property donated in conformity with paragraph (3) of this subsection) is usable and necessary for educational purposes or public health purposes, including research, shall be made by the Federal Security Administrator, who shall allocate such property on the basis of needs and utilization for transfer by the Administrator of General Services to tax-supported medical institutions, hospitals, clinics, health centers, school systems, schools, colleges, and universities, and to other nonprofit medical institutions, hospitals, clinics, health centers, schools, colleges, and universities which have been held exempt from taxation under section 101 (6) of the Internal Revenue Code, or to State departments of education or health for distribution to such tax-supported and nonprofit medical institutions, hospitals, clinics, health centers, school systems, schools, colleges, and universities; except that in any State where another agency is designated by State law for such purpose such transfer shall be made to said agency for such distribution within the State.'"

"SEC. 5. The Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 is amended by—

"(a) redesignating section 210 thereof as section 212, and wherever such section number appears in such act as originally enacted, it is amended to conform to the redesignation prescribed by this subsection;

"(b) inserting in the table of contents appearing in the first section of such Act, immediately after the line in which 'Sec. 209,' appears, the following:

"'Sec. 210. Operation of buildings and related activities.

"'Sec. 211. Motor vehicles identification.'

"(c) inserting, immediately after section 209 thereof, the following new sections:

"'OPERATION OF BUILDINGS AND RELATED ACTIVITIES

"'SEC. 210. (a) Whenever and to the extent that the Administrator has been or hereafter may be authorized by any provision of law other than this subsection to maintain, operate, and protect any building, property, or grounds situated in or outside the District of Columbia, including the construction, repair, preservation, demolition, furnishing, and equipment thereof, he is authorized in the discharge of the duties so conferred upon him—

"'(1) to purchase, repair, and clean uniforms for civilian employees of the General Services Administration who are required by law or regulation to wear uniform clothing;

"'(2) to furnish arms and ammunition for the protection force maintained by the General Services Administration;

"'(3) to pay ground rent for buildings owned by the United States or occupied by Federal agencies, and to pay such rent in advance when required by law or when the Administrator shall determine such action to be in the public interest;

"'(4) to employ and pay personnel employed in connection with the functions of operation, maintenance, and protection of property at such per diem rates as may be approved by the Administrator, not exceeding rates currently paid by private industry for similar services in the place where such services are performed;

"'(5) without regard to the provisions of section 322 of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 412), as amended, to pay rental, and to make repairs, alterations, and improvements under the terms of any lease entered into by, or transferred to, the General Services Administration for the housing of any Federal agency which on June 30, 1950, was specifically exempted by law from the requirements of said section;

"'(6) to obtain payments, through advances or otherwise, for services, space, quarters, maintenance, repair, or other facilities furnished, on a reimbursable basis, to any other Federal agency, or any mixed-ownership corporation (as defined in the Government Corporation Control Act), or the District of Columbia, and to credit such payments to the applicable appropriation of the General Services Administration;

"'(7) to make changes in, maintain, and repair the pneumatic tube system connecting buildings owned by the United States or occupied by Federal agencies in New York City installed under franchise of the city of New York, approved June 29, 1909, and June 11, 1928, and to make payments of any obligations arising thereunder in accordance with the provisions of the Acts approved August 5, 1909 (36 Stat. 120), and May 15, 1928 (45 Stat. 533);

"'(8) to repair, alter, and improve rented premises, without regard to the 25 per centum limitation of section 322 of the Act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 412), as amended, upon a determination by the Administrator that by reason of circumstances set forth in such determination the execution of such work, without reference to such limitation, is advantageous to the Government in terms of economy, efficiency, or national security: *Provided*, That such determination shall show that the total cost (rentals, repairs, alterations, and improvements) to the Government for the expected life of the lease shall be less than the cost of alternative space which needs no such repairs, alterations, or improvements. A copy of every such determination so made shall be furnished to the General Accounting Office;

"'(9) to pay sums in lieu of taxes on real property declared surplus by Government corporations, pursuant to the Surplus Property Act of 1944, where legal title to such property remains in any such Government corporation;

"'(10) to furnish utilities and other services where such utilities and other services are not provided from other sources to persons, firms, or corporations occupying or utilizing plants or portions of plants which constitute (A) a part of the National Industrial Reserve pursuant to the National Industrial Reserve Act of 1948, or (B) surplus real property, and to credit the amounts received therefrom to the applicable appropriation of the General Services Administration;

"'(11) at the direction of the Secretary of Defense, to use proceeds received from insurance against damage to properties of the National Industrial Reserve for repair or restoration of the damaged properties; and

"'(12) to acquire, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, real estate and interests therein.

"'(b) At the request of any Federal agency or any mixed-ownership corporation (as defined in the Government Corporation Control Act) or the District of Columbia, the Administrator is hereby authorized to operate, maintain, and protect any building owned by the United States (or, in the case of any wholly owned or mixed-ownership Government corporation, by such corporation) and occupied by the agency or instrumentality making such request.

"'(c) At the request of any Federal agency or any mixed-ownership corporation (as defined in the Government Corporation Control Act), or the District of Columbia, the Administrator is hereby authorized (1) to acquire land for buildings and projects authorized by the Congress; (2) to make or cause to be made, under contract or otherwise, surveys and test borings and to prepare plans and specifications for such buildings and projects prior to the approval by the Attorney General of the title to the sites thereof; and (3) to contract for, and to supervise, the construction and development and the equipping of such buildings or projects. Any sum available to any such Federal agency or instrumentality for any such building or project may be transferred by such agency to the General Services Administration in advance for such purposes as the Administrator shall determine to be necessary, including the payment of salaries and expenses of personnel engaged in the preparation of plans and specifications or in field supervision, and for general office expenses to be incurred in the rendition of any such service.

"'(d) Whenever the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall determine such action to be in the interest of economy or efficiency, he shall transfer to the Administrator all functions then vested in any other Federal agency with respect to the operation, maintenance, and custody of any office building owned by the United States or any wholly owned Government corporation, or any office building or part thereof occupied by any Federal agency under any lease, except that no transfer shall be made under this subsection—

"'(1) of any post-office building unless the Director shall first determine that such building is not used predominantly for post-office purposes, and functions which are transferred hereunder to the Administrator with respect to any post-office building may be delegated by him only to another officer or employee of the General Services Administration or to the Postmaster General;

"'(2) of any building located in any foreign country;

"'(3) of any building located on the grounds of any fort, camp, post, arsenal, navy yard, naval training station, airfield, proving ground, military supply depot, or school, or of any similar facility of the Department of Defense, unless and to such extent as a permit for its use by another agency or agencies shall have been issued by the Secretary of Defense or his duly authorized representative;

"'(4) of any building which the Director of the Bureau of the Budget finds to be a part of a group of buildings which are (A) located in the same vicinity, (B) utilized wholly or predominantly for the special purposes of the agency having custody thereof, and (C) not generally suitable for the use of other agencies; or

"'(5) of the Treasury Building, the Bureau of Engraving and Printing Building, the buildings occupied by the National Bureau of Standards, and the buildings under the jurisdiction of the regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

"'(e) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Administrator is authorized, in accordance with policies and directives prescribed by the President under section 205 (a) and after consultation with the heads of the executive agencies affected, to assign and reassign space of all executive agencies in Government-owned and leased buildings in and outside the District of Columbia upon a determination by the Administrator that such assignment or reassignment is advantageous to the Government in terms of economy, efficiency, or national security.

"'MOTOR VEHICLE IDENTIFICATION

"'SEC. 211. Under regulations prescribed by the Administrator, every motor vehicle acquired and used for official purposes within the United States, its Territories, or possessions, by any Federal agency or the District of Columbia shall be conspicuously identified by showing thereon either (a) the full name of the department, establishment, corporation, or agency by which it is used and the service in which it is used, or (b) a title descriptive of the service in which it is used if such title readily identifies the department, establishment, corporation, or agency concerned, and the legend "For official use only"; *Provided*, That the regulations issued pursuant to this section may provide for exemptions from the requirement of this section when conspicuous identification would interfere with the purpose for which a vehicle is acquired and used.'

"SEC. 6. The Federal Property and Administration Services Act of 1949 is amended by—

"(a) redesigning 'title V' of such Act as 'title VI' thereof, and 'title V', wherever it appears therein, is amended to read 'title VI';

"(b) redesignating sections 501–505, inclusive, of such Act, respectively, as sections 601–605, inclusive, thereof, and wherever any such section number appears in such Act as originally enacted, it is amended to conform in numbering to the redesignation prescribed by this subsection;

"(c) inserting at the proper place in the table of contents to such Act the following:

"'TITLE V—FEDERAL RECORDS

"'Sec. 501. Short title.
"'Sec. 502. Custody and control of property.
"'Sec. 503. National Historical Publications Commission.
"'Sec. 504. Federal Records Council.
"'Sec. 505. Records management; the Administrator.
"'Sec. 506. Records management; agency heads.
"'Sec. 507. Archival administration.
"'Sec. 508. Reports.
"'Sec. 509. Legal status of reproductions.
"'Sec. 510. Limitation on liability.
"'Sec. 511. Definitions.'

"(d) inserting, immediately following title IV thereof, the following new title:

"'TITLE V—FEDERAL RECORDS

"'SHORT TITLE

"'SEC. 501. This title may be cited as the "Federal Records Act of 1950".

"'CUSTODY AND CONTROL OF PROPERTY

"'SEC. 502. The Administrator shall have immediate custody and control of the National Archives Building and its contents, and shall have authority to design, construct, purchase, lease, maintain, operate, protect, and improve buildings used by him for the storage of records of Federal agencies in the District of Columbia and elsewhere.

"'NATIONAL HISTORICAL PUBLICATIONS COMMISSION

"'SEC. 503. (a) There is hereby created a National Historical Publications Commission consisting of the Archivist (or an alternate designated by him), who shall be Chairman; the Librarian of Congress (or an alternate designated by him); one Member of the United States Senate to be appointed for a term of four years, by the President of the Senate; one Member of the House of

istration provisions will not be operative for a considerable time, if ever. What is needed is authority to take preventive action against the specific danger of sabotage without prolonged legal proceedings. The authority requested by the President, and which I hope will be restored in S. 4037, will provide the tools for this necessary job.

Section 23 of the McCarran bill is derived from H. R. 10 (the Hobbs bill) and deals with the problem arising out of the fact that many aliens under final orders of deportation cannot actually be deported because no other country will receive them. Section 23, in accordance with the President's recommendation, provides the Attorney General with new powers of supervision over such aliens which in my judgment will be sufficient to cope with the problem. As you know, the President in his recent message to the Congress strongly opposed any provision for the indefinite detention of such aliens. I should also like to add that in my opinion the provision for criminal penalties recommended by the President, and set forth in section 7 of S. 4061 will be more enforceable than the corresponding paragraph (c) of section 23 of S. 4037 (the McCarran bill) and I urge that it be substituted for the latter provision.

With these changes, sections 18 through 21 and section 23 of S. 4037 (the McCarran bill) will embody all of the recommendations of the Interdepartmental Intelligence Committee consisting of representatives of the military intelligence services and the Federal Bureau of Investigation. If enacted into law, they will provide the additional weapons which we need to deal with fifth-column tactics, while leaving intact our constitutional liberties.

Sections 1 through 17 of S. 4037 embody the provisions of S. 2311, better known as the Mundt-Ferguson-Johnston bill. Since I am sure that you are familiar with the constitutional problems posed by these provisions, I shall only state that in my judgment they will be completely ineffective to accomplish their purpose. They will be ineffective because the registration provisions, upon which most of the other provisions are hinged, will not apply to any Communist organization until after prolonged administrative and judicial proceedings. When, finally, an organization is required to register, it will in all probability dissolve itself, then reappear with a new name and new officers. Even if this registration process could be made effective, most of the penalties which would be imposed upon registered organizations and their members would be superfluous in that they are already applied under existing law. Communists and fellow travelers are already excluded and removed from Federal employment under the President's loyalty program, the State Department denies passports to Communists, and the Bureau of Internal Revenue withholds tax exemptions and deductions from subversive organizations and their contributors—and all this without going through the cumbersome procedures of the Mundt-Ferguson provisions. Thus, the new result of these procedures will be meager in contrast with the staggering and perhaps futile enforcement burden which would be placed upon the Department of Justice.

Also, I wish to point out that section 22 of the McCarran bill, embodying the objectives of S. 1832, would change the laws governing the exclusion and deportation of aliens in respects that will probably create serious problems in the conduct of our foreign relations. I trust that these proposed changes will receive the most careful consideration.

Finally, it must be assumed that these provisions will have the effect of hastening the present tendency of the Communist Party to go underground. In this connection, I wish to call your attention to a paragraph contained in the Department's report to the Judiciary Committee of the Senate on an earlier form of this legislation:

"Outlawing of the Communist Party appears to this department to be unwise, even if doubts as to the constitutionality of such a step were removed. Outlawing would materially increase the Department's problem of law enforcement. Whereas the Communist Party, to some extent, now operates on the surface, if this bill becomes law it will be forced underground where surveillance of its activities will become increasingly difficult. Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation of this Department, in his testimony before the House Un-American Activities Committee in March 1947, admonished that he would hate to see a group that does not deserve to be in the category of martyrs have the self-pity that they would at once invoke if they were made martyrs by some restrictive legislation that might later be declared unconstitutional."

The present world situation requires the prompt enactment of practical and constitutional legislation which will give to the Department of Justice adequate weapons to deal with the precise dangers which we face, while preserving our traditions of personal liberty. We in the Department favor the general purpose of this type of legislation, but we do not feel that there is time enough remaining for novel experiments in law enforcement over a period of years, with doubtful, meager, and inadequate results.

Yours sincerely,

J. HOWARD MCGRATH,
Attorney General.

PROMOTION OF VETERANS IN FIELD SERVICE OF POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT—VETO MESSAGE

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I do not see the majority leader in the Chamber at the moment, but I wish to have brought up at the earliest possible opportunity the veto message on House bill 87. That bill has already been passed by the House of Representatives, over the veto, by a vote of 213 to 71. I hope the matter may soon be taken up by the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It cannot be brought up at this time, under the agreement in regard to procedure.

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The conference report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read.

(For conference report see pages 13574–13577, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 24, 1950, House proceedings.)

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the report be adopted.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Tennessee wish to be recognized now to speak on the conference report?

Mr. MCKELLAR. Let me inquire whether the Senator from New Hampshire has any objection to adoption of the conference report.

Mr. BRIDGES. I wish to make a few comments on it, first.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Of course; but let the report be adopted now.

Mr. BRIDGES. No; I wish to speak on it before it is adopted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Unless the Senator from Tennessee wishes to speak at this time, the Chair will recognize the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, this is the conference report on the first over-all appropriation bill which the Congress has acted on. It naturally involved a tremendous task on the part of the conference committee. It is entirely conceivable that in such a huge over-all bill, touching so many subjects and relating to items, and containing so many figures, mistakes may be made. However, by and large, I think the conference committee has done an excellent job.

There are two items I wish to comment on, however. One is the so-called 10-percent-cut amendment, which was adopted by the Senate by a very substantial margin. That was the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and some 35 other Senators. That amendment was agreed to in the Senate by such an overwhelming vote that certainly the Senate conferees should have given very special attention to the particular approach by which that cut was proposed to be made.

It was not a blank-check cut or a meat-ax cut, but the Bridges-Byrd amendment spelled out specifically how the cut was to be made and the specific exemptions which were to be granted for certain agencies and departments mainly of a defense and security nature. The exemptions exempted agencies which are of vital importance at this partciular time.

However, the conference committee saw fit to ignore that approach, and, instead, agreed to an amendment which was proposed by one of the House Members, which is a meat-ax approach, a blank-check, and everything which many Members of the Senate have been speaking against. It is a complete delegation of authority; it grants to the President and to the Bureau of the Budget complete blank-check authority.

I wish to point out that that is exactly contrary to the approach of the Byrd-Bridges amendment, which was supported overwhelmingly in the Senate. I regret very much that the Senate conferees saw fit to yield on a very important matter of principle in that connection. As the ranking Republican member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, and as a member of the conference committee, I could not concur in the action taken by the conference committee on that item, and I did not agree to that part of the report.

Let me call attention to another part of the conference report, as agreed to by the conferees. I refer to the elimination of the appropriation for the Children's Fund. I stood on the floor of the Senate and spoke and voted to cut the appropriation for the Children's Fund 10 percent in line with my general desire to make such cuts. The Senate, in its wisdom, by a record vote, defeated the attempt to cut the Chil-

dren's Fund appropriation 10 percent; the Senate was not willing to cut that appropriation even 10 percent. Yet the conferees have eliminated the item entirely. If the Senate was not willing to cut the item 10 percent, how can the Senate conceivably agree to cut the item 100 percent—in other words, to eliminate it?

These are some of the inequities of the conference report.

However, by and large, I think the conferees have done a good job. I think the work they undertook on this overall appropriation bill was most difficult, and I think generally speaking they should be commended. Nevertheless, there are certain inequalities and inequities in the situation of which I think the Senate should be aware when it acts on the report.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Will the Senator describe briefly what the conferees did with regard to the Bridges-Byrd amendment?

Mr. BRIDGES. They eliminated the so-called 10-percent cut proposed by Bridges-Byrd amendment, which was adopted by the Senate by an overwhelming vote, and substituted an instruction to the executive branch of the Government—namely, the President and the Bureau of the Budget—to cut $550,000,000 from the fund. Under that instruction, they could cut it anywhere; for instance, they could cut the appropriation for the armed services if they wished to do so, and if they deemed that such a cut would not be harmful to the national defense, or they could cut the appropriations for the FBI or for the Bureau of Internal Revenue or for any other agency or function of government. In this respect the action by the conferees proposes a wide delegation of authority, a blank check. That is what I object to.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. From reading the newspapers, I do not understand that the President or the Bureau of the Budget would have to make the cut; my understanding is that it would be somewhat discretionary on their part.

Mr. BRIDGES. I believe the cut is mandatory, but if the cut is not mandatory, then the amendment is worse than I have stated. I assume from its wording that it is mandatory that the cut be made.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. From reading the press, I understood that the conferees had specifically cut the ECA appropriation $200,000,000; or was that left to the discretion of the President?

Mr. BRIDGES. No; the conferees cut the ECA appropriation $200,000,000. The Senator from New Jersey will recall that in the Senate he made a successful fight to exempt the ECA appropriation from the 10-percent cut; but in the conference the ECA appropriation was cut $200,000,000.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. $200,000,000 more than the appropriation was as the Senate left it?

Mr. BRIDES. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. In other words, the conferees have cut that appropriation an additional $200,000,000. Is that correct?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I should like to call attention to that fact for the record, because later it may be necessary for the ECA to make a further request for appropriations.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. With respect to the Children's Fund, is it not true that it is the only international cooperation fund for which the local contribution has been far more than our contribution?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. When we put up $25,000,000, for instance, $100,000,000 has been contributed from other sources, and that fund has taken care of approximately 3,000,000 helpless children.

Mr. BRIDGES. I believe the Senator is correct.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. In the event the conference report is agreed to, can the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire tell us what will be the net result in dollars by way of a reduction in the recommendations of the Budget Bureau?

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not have the exact figure in mind, but it is over $2,000,000,000. The specific cuts, I may say to the Senator from North Dakota, total $1,640,000,000-plus, and in addition thereto a reduction of $550,000,000 is authorized. So the appropriations would be some $2,000,000,000 below the budget estimates.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield for a question.

Mr. LODGE. What did the conference committee do regarding the amount for technical and economic assistance to economically underdeveloped areas?

Mr. BRIDGES. It is my understanding that the conference agreed upon a sum of $15,000,000, and, from what I have read in the press, I understand that the House disagreed to that provision of the conference report and so it now restored the original figure of $26,500,000.

Mr. LODGE. So it has not been cut, then. Is that correct?

Mr. BRIDGES. The conference committee cut it to $15,000,000, and then, as I understand, under the further procedure, when the report was considered by the House, instead of accepting the amount of $15,000,000 as recommended by the conferees, the House voted to overturn that item in the conference report and to restore the full figure.

Mr. LODGE. I should like to know about that, if the Senator will yield further.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. ROBERTSON rose.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I should like to have the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Virginia, if he can give the answer.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Virginia is seeking the floor in his own right.

Mr. ROBERTSON. There are two matters connected with the report which I desire to discuss.

Mr. LODGE. I think it is an item that is utterly indispensable to making our foreign commitments effective.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I intend to vote for the conference report, but I desire to mention two items in it in which I have had particular interest. One has to do with the appropriation for civil functions. The committee recommended a figure to the Senate which was 10 percent below the Budget estimate. That is point No. 1. Point No. 2 is that the Senate adopted the Bridges-Byrd amendment and cut it another 10 percent. When it went to the conference it was cut $76,000,000 more. Then, in addition to that, a provision was inserted that no project under that title of the bill should be proceeded with unless the President certified it was a contribution to the national-defense program.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. That provision relates only to new projects, not to projects which are under way at the present time.

Mr. ROBERTSON. It relates to the new projects, then.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Then, I wrote to the Chief of the Army and asked him to give me an answer as to what would have been the result of the 50 percent cut proposed by the Douglas amendment, had it been adopted. I voted against it, because I felt there were involved hydroelectric projects which could be brought into operation within the next year, which were highly essential to the war effort, and to stop which now would be poor economy from every standpoint. He wrote me that in his opinion if we had made a 50 percent horizontal cut across the board of all those projects we would have to pay liquidated damages to contractors, and we would have left unfinished construction so exposed to the elements that in his opinion there would have been no saving whatever by that cut.

But, the way we have operated, we do have a saving. We saved 10 percent on the Bridges-Byrd amendment. We saved $76,000,000, which was further cut,

and we saved on all new projects in the bill, including some of those items about which I frankly had some doubt, which doubt I expressed in the committee. However, I do not have the controlling vote. They cannot be started unless the President certifies that they are essential to the defense effort.

So, Mr. President, I feel that those of us who believed in economy but who did not believe in the approach to it on this particular item advanced by the Douglas amendment, have been fully justified in the stand which we took.

The other item to which I desire to refer is the loan to Spain, which has created quite a bit of discussion. We provided that the Export-Import Bank was to make a loan to Spain of $100,000,000, and everyone knows that the bank has control over loans of that kind, to see how the funds are expended. The conference committee cut that to $62,500,000, and left the Senate provisions in the bill rather intact, except to this extent: The ECA is required to exercise the same type of administration and supervision over the use of this fund that is used in any ECA country.

Why did I vote for a loan to Spain? I believe in democracy. I believe in the system of private enterprise. I do not believe anyone more firmly believes in that than I. My colonial ancestors left the Church of England to join with Thomas Jefferson in America in the fight for religious freedom. They joined a Baptist church, and we have been Baptists ever since. We believe in religious freedom of every kind, and in complete separation of church and state. But what was the situation which confronted us? We spent untold billions of dollars and the flower of our youth on foreign battlefields to win a war against aggression. Did we win the peace? We did not. Then, when our constituents said, "Bring the boys home. Bring the boys home" we brought them home. We demobilized the greatest army we had ever had, and the greatest Navy the world has ever seen. Then one of our allies, Russia, would not allow us to have a peace in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, of which she was a member. We set out to buy the peace. We put $22,000,000,000 into a program and into an effort to buy the peace. Still we did not get the peace.

So what were we then forced to do? We were compelled to add some $20,000,000,000 to an already burdensome defense program and to add $4,000,000,000 to the Atlantic Pact nations. We urged Mr. Hoffman to channel ECA funds as far as possible into military preparedness instead of business as usual in western Europe. We did not stop there.

What else did we do? We made our plans to win the peace. We made an Export-Import Bank load of $20,000,000 last year to Tito, and we made another Export-Import loan of $20,000,000 to him this year. Then I called the president of the Export-Import Bank and said, "Did you get any collateral for the loan to Tito?" "Why," he said, "of course not." I said, "You made it on the faith and credit of Yugoslavia?" He said, "Of course." I said, "Do you think you will get that loan repaid if Russia moves against Tito and overruns and controls Yugoslavia?" "Well," he said, "I do not know." I said, "You ought to know, because you ought to know that one of the first things the Communists did in Russia was to repudiate every obligation of the Czarist government." They never paid a nickel of it that was due. They never paid anything that was due us from Russia in World War I. And, of course, they are not going to pay a nickel of this. Why then was the loan made to Tito? If it had any validity, it was because Tito had said to the Politburo, "If you start to cross my border, I am going to fight—and we have something to fight with."

Is Tito an exponent of representative democracy? He is as much a Communist dictator as anyone who can be named. I visited in Spain last fall. There is a great deal more personal freedom in Spain than there is in Yugoslavia. I could circulate anywhere in Spain. As a matter of fact, I said to the Prime Minister of Spain, "The treatment which you have given my Baptist and Methodist friends over here is a stumbling block to closer unity between Spain and the United States." He said, "You have my permission to visit anywhere in Spain. You may investigate every alleged act of intolerance, and," he said, "when you come back, I will take your word and the word of your Baptist missionaries for what is done over here."

I replied, "Mr. Prime Minister, I do not have an opportunity to make that investigation, but I certainly appreciate your willingness to let me make it." Do Senators think that Tito would let me make an investigation of what was done to Archbishop Stepanic and to the other of the Catholics in Yugoslavia? Of course he would not. Do Senators think there is any comparison between the situation in Spain and what has been done in the way of religious intolerance in Yugoslavia? Of course not.

But we accepted the credit risk of Yugoslavia, because we thought Tito would fight the Russians if they tried to cross his border.

Anyone can draw any distinction he pleases between a dictator in Yugoslavia and a dictator in Spain. I cannot draw such a distinction. I found in Europe that the Communists in Italy and in France—and they total approximately 4,000,000—were so bitter against Franco because he destroyed communism in Spain that they prevailed upon those nations to sponsor a resolution in the United Nations that we would not recognize Spain or have anything to do with that nation, that we would treat her as an outcast. We went along with that program.

Last winter the Secretary of State told me that he was planning to pull away from that agreement. I now understand that he does not plan to pull away from it.

I was recently at the White House, and the President had some remarks to make about those who voted for a loan to Spain. I said, "With all due deference, Mr. President, we have 92 employees in the Embassy in Madrid, and there is no one to speak over there on the level of a cabinet officer. We have a full staff in Yugoslavia. We recognized Yugoslavia and made a loan to her."

Let those who please draw a distinction. I am for taking steps to meet the Communist aggression. I intend to support the McCarran bill with such appropriate amendments as I think will be adequate, and I hope we shall consider that bill as soon as the other "must" bills are completed. We must combat communism on our home front.

I rejoice in our support of Greece, because Greece fought the Communists and won, and I think, if necessary, she will fight them again. I was very much encouraged when I was in Oslo and found the indomitable, irrefragable spirit of the Norwegians against communism. They will stand up and fight to the last man. When I went to Madrid and asked about Communists, I was told, "If there are any of them here we do not know where they are. They are underground, if they are here."

If Spain will not fight against communism, no one will fight against communism. When we are pouring out billions of dollars to stem the tide of future communistic aggression, let those who will draw the distinction between furnishing funds to the Communists in Yugoslavia to help them make their fight and denying funds to the anti-Communists in Spain, who have more men under arms today and a larger potential of men than Tito ever hoped to have. There are between 300,000 and 400,000 men, well trained and equipped soldiers, in Spain, and a million men could be brought to the colors and trained within 6 months, if they had the support of planes, tanks, and the heavy artillery they need. Certainly the Pyrenees are a barrier that will not be easily crossed.

I heard over the radio that regardless of what we do, the President claims the right to impound any money we appropriate. I do not challenge that right. If, after Congress appropriates funds, he sees fit to decide that he is not going to spend a nickel of the amount, that will be his responsibility. Spain may never get any of this money and we may never receive any help from Spain. Some day we may be on the battle front in western Europe fighting the onrushing tide of communism and wanting allies who have been receiving not $62,500,000, but hundreds of millions of dollars of ECA money, and they may say "Gentlemen, we prefer to be neutral. We are so sorry, but we can not put our cities in this situation. Please count us out."

If anyone thinks we have bought lasting friends with ECA money, he should go to Europe and take a quick look at the situation. I have been in favor of voting ECA funds because I felt that if we did not give the western European nations rehabilitation funds, the propaganda put out by the Communists would sway so many poverty-stricken people that they would yield to it. It is not

poverty, as someone recently pointed out, that makes Communists. We can go to some of the mountain areas in Virginia where the people do not know what $250 cash means, but they would fight, until their gun barrels got hot, for freedom and against communism. We are dealing in Europe with many people who have never known real freedom. We have tried to sell them a conception of democracy and the enterprise system which they do not know anything about. I have been saying that if we tried to sell them the principles of the Christian religion, on which our democracy is founded, they would know something about it. We do not have to tell them the meaning of God or of the estical principles of the Bible which the Communists seek to destroy.

But the point I make, Mr. President, is that we spent approximately $2,000,000,000 in a program of trying to buy friends and trying to buy peace, and it did not work. Therefore I exercised the privilege, with other Members of the Senate, to use my best judgment as to how to appropriate future funds in a struggle in which our destiny and our future are vitally concerned.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I am in complete agreement with the statement which has been made by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] in regard to the fact that the Senate conferees apparently made little effort to secure the rentention of the amendment adopted by the Senate by an overwhelming vote to reduce nondefense spending by 10 percent. This amendment was very carefully prepared. It was prepared after consultation with the Budget Bureau, with the Comptroller General, and other officials of the Government. It was so prepared that it required a 10-percent reduction in nondefense spending by each department. Instead of that, the Senate conferees have agreed to an amendment suggested by the House which permits the President to cut nondefense expenditures by $550,000,000, approximately the same reduction which would have resulted from the Bridges-Byrd amendment. Under the provision now contained in the conference report the President can in the case of any department of the Government use a meat ax and cut those things he does not like, or, perhaps, hold the power given him as a threat over the heads of Senators in connection with appropriations in their own States, such as those for rivers, harbors, and other public improvements. He can suspend the construction of public works and say that it is the result of the reduction contemplated by the conference report.

Mr. President, I am very sorry that the Senate has abdicated in this matter. I think Congress should say where its appropriations are to be cut. The amendment which was proposed and adopted by the Senate was effective and workable, and was so declared by the Budget Bureau. It would have accomplished the desired result and we should still have retained control of the purse strings, which is the duty of the Congress.

Mr. BYRD subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement which I have prepared in defense of an omnibus appropriation bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD IN DEFENSE OF THE ONE-APPROPRIATION BILL

The Congress today, has completed legislative action on what may be regarded as the complete regular appropriation side of the Federal budget. This was accomplished in the first consolidated appropriation bill of modern history.

The last of the 11 appropriation bills required for the expenditure budget for fiscal year 1950 was not passed until October 29, 1949. The consolidated bill for fiscal year 1951 embracing virtually all of the appropriations for the current year, except those incident to the unanticipated Korean outbreak, is ready for the President's signature two full months ahead of the budget completion date last year. At this date last year less than half of the 1950 appropriations had been enacted.

As an advocate of the consolidated appropriation bill procedure, I cannot refrain at this time from remarking on the record that Congress has made in the first year of its operation. Actually the single appropriation bill this year accomplishes what was done last year in 11 separate and virtually unrelated supply bills. With the exception of the interest on the debt and some other permanent and indefinite appropriation items the single appropriation bill this year embraced the appropriation objects covered by Presidential requests in January totaling $34,800,000,000 including contract and loan authorizations and reappropriations. As the bill goes back to the President, the total has been reduced by $2,000,000,000, the largest reduction yet made in an appropriation bill.

In contrast Presidential requests covered by the 11 separate bills last year totaled $38,800,000,000 and congressional action, spread over 10 months resulted in increasing the aggregate by nearly $100,000,000.

Last year the actual debate on the 11 bills in the House and the Senate totaled 290 hours in the aggregate. This year actual debate on the single appropriation bill in the two Houses totaled 236 hours; a reduction of 54 hours.

Last year 292 Members of the House and Senate participated in the debates on the 11 bills. This year 308 Members of the 2 Houses participated in the debate on the single appropriation bill; an increase of 16.

From the RECORD there is no way of computing the Members on the floor at all times when a bill is under consideration, but the RECORD does show that the average number of announced absentees on days during which the 11 appropriation bills of last year were under debate in the Senate was 14. Absentees announced on days when the single appropriation bill was debated this year averaged the same number—14.

In summary, the record shows that enactment of the single appropriation bill this year required less time, promoted fuller participation and resulted in savings rather than increases.

These statements are based on examination of the RECORD itself and they are submitted in the nature of a factual reply to criticism which may be summarized by the remarks of the majority leader of the Senate, who, at the conclusion of the debate on the single appropriation bill, August 4, 1950, (column 2 of p. 12017 of the RECORD), said:

"When the Congress convenes next year I think it will seriously consider the repeal of the rule which provides that an appropriation may be considered in one package. I am convinced that, as the result of the experience we have had this year, the work we are now going through has saved no money, so far as decreases in appropriations are concerned. I am convinced that we have consumed more time than was necessary in handling this appropriation bill collectively than would have been consumed had we considered the bill in separate categories. I have talked with many Senators and have found none who disagreed with this particular thought."

As a sponsor of the resolution for the single appropriation bill procedure which was approved by unanimous votes in both the Senate Rules Committee and the Senate itself, I would not expect the majority leader to have included me among those to whom he talked in an effort to find agreement with his view that we should seriously consider changing the procedure. Of course I know that the single appropriation bill required changes—changes in committee procedure, changes in committee staff work, changes, in some cases, in committee and subcommittee organization, changes in preparation of the bill and report, and changes in the management and presentation on the floors of Congress. And I know that changes in long established customs are the most difficult changes to make. But I believe in this case, the record shows that the changes have been good and progressive in all of the aspects involved.

I believe especially they have been in the interest of more intelligent consideration of the budget by the Congress, individually and collectively. I dare say more Members of Congress know more about what is in the budget this year than at any other time since World War I, when the budget first began to assume colossal proportions.

Contrary to the views which were found by the Senate majority leader, the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, who more than anyone else in Congress has the responsibility for appropriation legislation, on June 20, after he had steered the single appropriation bill through the House Committee and the House itself, said "the single appropriation bill offers the most practical and efficient method of handling the annual budget and the national fiscal program. Judged by our experience there is no legitimate reason which can be advanced against it. Conversely, there is every reason for the consideration of all appropriations in one bill. The consolidated bill is in conformity with the best business thought of the Nation. It is supported by the weight of public opinion. It has been approved by metropolitan newspapers in every section of the country."

These are quotations this year, after he had worked with the single appropriation bill, by the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee. He summed up his remarks on experience with the single appropriation bill, in contrast with his long experience with the old methods to which the majority leader of the Senate, would return, by saying:

"It is inconceivable that the Congress should consider taking a backward step reverting to multiple supply bills. They are the quill and pen and the three-legged stool in an adding-machine age. They are the ox-cart and the kayak in a jet-plane era. The decision on the applicability of the one bill to modern budgetary conditions determines whether under our form of Government the representatives of the people can control national spending or whether they will continue on down the rapidly accelerating declivities of the road to unbalanced budgets and mounting national debt."

These quotations from the Hon. CLARENCE CANNON are taken from the beginning and

th end of his June 20 estimates of the value of the single appropriation bill. In between he refuted every criticism that has been made of the new procedure.

As to the charge that the single appropriation bill opens the way for more partisan manipulation of the budget, Mr. CANNON said: "Neither party can possibly gain or lose any political advantage except by making it in any case an instrument for carrying out more completely and more effectively its platform pledges for economy and better administration."

Chairman CANNON'S answers to other criticisms may be paraphrased as follows:

1. The single appropriation bill provides a means of proper and orderly retrenchment through better allocation of funds.

2. The single appropriation bill permits earlier reporting of the appropriation recommendations in the aggregate. (The House had the full appropriation bill before it on March 21.)

3. The single appropriation bill lends itself to better organization of subcommittee, and committee staff organization, with the result of a more thorough consideration and processing of estimates and appropriations. The effect was demonstrated by the relatively few changes made in the committee recommendations found by the House to be necessary.

4. The single appropriation bill, lending itself to a more complete and comprehensive understanding of the fiscal situation, protects the bill against ill-conceived and poorly drafted amendments.

5. The chairman of the House Appropriations Committee found that the single appropriation bill tended to keep members on the floor during its consideration.

6. He emphatically refuted the contention that the single appropriation bill would be conducive to increased log-rolling. Actually, he said experience with the single appropriation bill this session demonstrates that it effectively disposes of the old system of log-rolling so prevalent in the consideration of individual departmental bills.

7. The House chairman said the single bill visualizes at a glance the outline of national income and expenditures and centers the attention of the country on the national fiscal program. "It was the pitiless limelight of national attention concentrated on the final votes" he said, "that offset the pleas and importunities of the pressure groups and special interests."

8. He said that the single appropriation bill procedure eliminated the practice of a dozen or more subcommittees, working in their segregated corners of the budget, spending in the dark.

9. He said the single appropriation bill, in itself, tends toward the elimination of conflicts, duplications and overlapping expenditures.

10. He said the single appropriation bill discourages the practice of attaching irrelevant riders either in committee or by floor amendment.

11. The House chairman disclaimed the contention that the Senate must mark time until final action on the single appropriation bill is taken by the House. On the contrary, he said, under the new system the Senate may begin work much sooner than before—within a week or two after the session opens—because the House subcommittee transmit to the Senate committee the printed hearings as they progress.

12. As to the item veto objection, Chairman CANNON first referred to the constitutional question involved and then said the item veto could be used on the single appropriation bill as well as on the separate bills and that the veto power would be stronger on the single bill than on any of the separate bills because operation of virtually all of the Government instead of a relatively small segment would be involved.

13. Chairman CANNON said the most untenable of all the objections to the single appropriation bill was that it was unwieldly. To this he replied the experience of every major nation in the world and every State in the Union belies such criticism.

These are the views, based on experience with both the old system and the new, of the man who has the prime responsibility for appropriation legislation in Congress.

Anything I would say, of course, would be anticlimatic. But in my humble judgment the Congress has done a better, a more thorough and a more intelligent job on appropriations this year than at any time since I have been privileged to be a Member of the Senate. That goes for the membership of the committees as well as the full membership of both Houses. I think the procedure has been more orderly, the debate more complete and enlightening, and the action has by far been based on better consideration as a whole.

I believe the public has a better comprehension of the task involved, that it has a better appreciation of the problems which have to be solved, and that it, too, has benefited from the more intelligent debate.

This in itself is progress. I believe that we would have come close to producing a balanced budget, despite the President's January requests for $5,000,000,000 of deficit financing, if it had not been for the outbreak in Korea.

I believe under normal conditions, with the single appropriation procedure we can do a better job, a more intelligent job, and balance the budget with less time consumed and a fuller participation in debate. It is certain that it would have been impossible to write $2,000,000,000 of reduction in 11 regular appropriation bills scattered hit and miss over the 8 months since January.

Even if it had taken half of an entire session to pass the appropriation bill, the time and the effort and the study would be fully justified, for the budget of the United States is the biggest fiscal operation on earth. And without sound financial conditions in this Government there can be no hope for the preservation of our freedoms, or security against invasion.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I concur in the remarks made by the distinguished ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee [Mr. BRIDGES] and also in the remarks just made by the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], with reference to section 508 of the conference report. I do so as a Member of the Senate and as one who sat as a conferee attempting to iron out the differences confronting the Senate and the House.

The so-called Bridges-Byrd amendment was worked out over many weeks. It provided a sound formula. If we are to make cuts in appropriations from now on, I doubt if we could find a formula which would be more practical than the one that was submitted. The Bridges-Byrd amendment, calling for a 10-percent cut was adopted by the Senate by an overwhelming majority. Under it the responsibility would be placed squarely on the Congress. We would not have delegated the authority. I remember the complaint that was made a year ago by columnists throughout the country. They said, "This is a meat-ax cut. You are simply squirming out of your responsibility and putting it on the shoulders of the President." Yet here we are supplanting the so-called Bridges-Byrd formula with the old meat-ax formula. That is exactly what is being done. The power is delegated to the President to make the cuts where he pleases. Granting that he would make them and get the most efficient economy possible, yet it is very difficult to do the job. It is very difficult, indeed, because the bill contains one chapter here, another chapter there, and various subsections in the chapters. They were all gone over very carefully, and the Congress accepted the full responsibility and told the Bureau of the Budget and the executive agencies where to make the cuts percentagewise. That constituted a sound formula. It was adopted, as I said before, by an overwhelming vote of the Senate. Now it has been taken out in conference. That is to say, there was no agreement on it because of the pressure to pass the appropriation bill. It was said "We must pass the appropriation bill out. If you hold it out any longer, this and that will be jeopardized."

If the conference report is adopted, I trust that the membership of the Senate will remember that the formula we are adopting is the old meat-ax formula. The cuts will be made by the President through his executive agencies, and they will be made where and when he wants to make them. He takes the full responsibility off the shoulders of Congress under a delegated authority. It is contrary to the basic theory of the Byrd-Bridges amendment, which I think would have been most successful in application.

Mr. President, no doubt the conference report will be adopted. There are other things about which I might comment, because I worked very diligently with the committee. I voted with the Senator from New Hampshire to strike out section 508, because I felt that if cuts are to be made, they should be made under the formula, not in the manner in which they would be made under the conference report, with instructions to the President to cut approximately $550,000,000 from appropriations which now total, or will total, when we add the supplemental deficiencies to the omnibus appropriation bill, in the neighborhood of $60,000,000,000.

Mr. President, I hope when the Committee on Appropriations does its work in another year, the program which was industriously worked out by the members of the committee will not be disregarded. If it were not for the fact that apparently there is much anxiety about having the appropriation bill passed, I think this would be one time when Members of the Senate would be justified in attempting to resist the conference report in order to strike out the provision delegating the authority to the President, and reinsert the Byrd-Bridges amendment. It seems to me that if we want to do the job and do it right, and provide a formula which can be used from now on, we should not disregard the formula, which we would surely do if we were to accept the conference report.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I regret to hear my friends denounce the conference report and charge that the reduction is to be made with a meat ax.

The committee took almost 10,000 pages of printed testimony. It heard practically everyone who wanted to be heard; no one was denied a hearing. The committee did not turn down the Bridges-Byrd amendment. There was all kinds of evidence about the Byrd-Bridges amendment. We took evidence on practically every item in the bill, which consists of nearly 500 pages—478 pages as I recall—and embraces many subjects. Meat ax? Oh, no. It is based on testimony. Since January 23, 1950, the committee has been diligently at work. It did not work for some weeks and then do nothing the next week, but it worked diligently every day and every week. Meat ax? Oh, no. That is ridiculous, Mr. President. I am astonished that my friends should complain about the Byrd-Bridges amendment not being retained and that the committee used a meat ax. What in the world would they want us to do? Let us look at the report. By how much did the committee reduce the appropriations originally contained in the bill? I have some figures before me.

The House bill as passed—I am making a recapitulation of the figures—appropriated $27,346,713,664. The Senate bill as passed appropriated $32,577,362,231. The conference action, as is usually true in conference actions, was a compromise. Incidentally, in this instance there was a real and free conference, not only in the opinion of myself, but in the opinion of many other members of the conference committee. The conference action provides appropriations of $32,253,455,425, which is under the amount in the Senate bill by $323,906,806. It is under the Budget estimate by $1,646,753,223. Does that look as though the committee had used a meat ax?

Let me tell the Senate something else. The Appropriations Committee worked from the 26th of January to the 28th of August, or approximately 7 months, in preparing the bill.

It is said we should have cut the appropriations 10 percent, and left them there. There is not a Senator in this body who would have done that; not one would have voted for such a thing. Would any Senator have voted to cut by 10 percent the amount required to pay the interest on our bonds? Would any Senator have voted to cut 10 percent from the amount going to our soldiers and sailors of the First World War, the Second World War, or any other war, who went forth to fight for the Nation? It is said the conferees excepted those items. They did except some, it is true. But what about a proposal that would take in everything, and make no exception?

This is the first unified bill we ever had. The chairman of the committee time and again said we were going to give the unified bill the fairest show in the world, and if the committee did not give the unified plan a fair show, then it is impossible to give it one, because we made every effort to do so. There was not a member of the committee who did not try to give it a fair show.

Before we went to conference, the House had abandoned the plan for a reduction to the extent of not including the ECA funds.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I will state the reason.

Mr. BYRD. I think the Senator should tell the whole story. The authorization bill had not been passed.

Mr. McKELLAR. That was the excuse for it; but it could have been put in just as easy as not.

Mr. President, that is not all. The House abandoned something else. Names were given for the various appropriations, like the "Army bill," the "Navy bill," the "Treasury bill," and the various other bills. The House changed those to "chapters," but the bills are virtually the same as before. The various appropriations are contained as "chapters," instead of being designated "Army bill," and various other bills.

Before I leave the subject of the 10-percent reduction, I wish to say that we have reduced the bill more than 10 percent. As I remember the figure, it is reduced by nearly 12 percent. It has not been reduced by guess, not by a formula that says it shall be reduced 10 percent whether the appropriation is good, bad, or indifferent. We have not reduced it in that way. We have taken proof, we have heard evidence on the bill, and after taking the proof and after cutting as much as we could, we had to make provision for war expenses. Some might have conceived that we would have a war, but I do not think all did. That changed the action of the committee to some extent. It should have changed it. We had to change it.

Mr. President, I am a realist when it comes to some things. Looking at both sides of the Senate, not leaving out the Republicans on the other side, I ask if there is a Senator who thinks we should not have increased the war items when requested to do so by the President after we got into the Korean war. If there is one, I would like to have him hold up his hand. I want to see what Senator would have reduced those items by 10 percent or any other percentage.

Under our rules, the committee hears the evidence and determines on the evidence what the appropriations shall be, and after we pass a bill we have a conference with the House. As I have said, we worked on this bill for more than 7 months and we worked on it daily, not merely when Senators happened to be in town.

While I am talking about what the committee itself has done, I wish to say a word or two about those in the employ of the committee, from Mr. Everard Smith on down to the last employee. I have never known the employees of a committee to do such outstanding work as has been done by the attachés of the Committee on Appropriations in this case, and I take my hat off to them. I would not say a word in criticism of any of them. I cannot agree with my friends who are so violently opposed to the conference report. I believe six or seven Senators already have spoken stating this was the most outrageous bill ever to be passed. These men are well-intentioned, but the members of the Committee on Appropriations are not violent characters one would assume they were from what has been heard from five or six speakers. They are fine men, and they want to do what is right, and have tried to do what is right. As God is my judge, I have had but one idea, and that was to do the best I could for the people of the country. That has been emphasized as we met the unfortunate circumstance of being in war. We have had to increase the appropriations. We could not decrease them by 10 percent.

Mr. President, what has been the history of this body? The Senate has been in existence since 1789, and the committees have been in existence for that time. There is nothing in the law, there is nothing in the rules, providing that appropriations shall be reduced according to percentages.

My good friend the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is seated just in front of me. He is one of the finest men God ever made; there never was a finer. I have known him since he was a youngster, and there is nothing but good I could say about him. But he cannot demonstrate that a straight cut of 10 percent would be a cure-all for the difficulties in which we find ourselves with regard to appropriations. They have to be investigated. They have to be examined. The committee has to take testimony. It has to know where to make a cut and where not to make a cut.

Mr. President, I am asking the Senate to stand by the committee. Of course, errors have been made by the members of the committee. I know errors have been made by the chairman of the committee. I freely confess to mistakes and errors. But we were trying to do our best for the country, and that was emphasized when the war unexpectedly came on. It was unexpected to me. I never dreamed we would be in a war. That made the condition worse and made the obligation on the members of the committee greater. I want to say to Senators who are for this bill and Senators who are against the bill that the committee has done its best to do what is right.

At this point I wish to read the remainder of the recapitulation to show what the committee has done. From what has been said about the committee's action one might think it had not done anything. One might think that perhaps the members of the committee had looked into the committee room occasionally, but had not really done anything. One would think our employees have not done anything. Mr. President, I wish to say that in all my life I have never seen any employees work like those of the committee.

What are the savings the committee has effected? I have the figures before me. I shall state first of contract authority. The amount carried in the House bill was $2,147,626,500. The amount carried in the Senate bill was $2,184,570,000. The conference action left the amount at $2,170,145,000. The reduction made in conference is $14,-

425,000. That is in contract authority alone.

In cash the total amount of the reduction made in conference is $323,906,806, which added to the contract authority reduction of $14,425,000, makes a total of $338,331,806.

We have taken $1,600,000,000 off the bill, and authorized the President to take off more. Some say we should not have done that. As a general thing, I should say it would have been better not to have done so. It was done this time, however, because the President wrote a letter to the Congress, which he gave out to the press, as well, in which he told us what he wanted to do. The Constitution says he must do so. He merely carries out his duty as President. He may be wrong. I do not know. Presidents are sometimes wrong. But certainly there is no reason in the world to think that he would disregard the wishes of Congress. The Congress said, "We will cut off 10 percent and give you authority to change the percentage if you want to." We have appropriated for the specific items. We have told the President what we wanted. It is going to be done, too. We all know that.

Those of us who have been here these many years, who have seen Presidents come and go, and some have even seen Senators and Representatives come and go, know how these matters are carried out. I believe that President Truman will do his duty. He did his duty when he was a member of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate. He was a member of that committee for a number of years. He is familiar with the committee, its operations, and the thoughts of the members of the committee. In my judgment, he wants to do the right thing.

I have seen a number of Presidents ever since President McKinley. I have seen President McKinley, President Theodore Roosevelt, President Taft, President Wilson—one of the greatest human beings I ever laid my eyes on, one of the most remarkable statesmen who ever walked these halls. I have seen President Harding, President Coolidge, President Hoover, President Franklin Roosevelt, and President Truman. I think every one of them was an honorable man and wanted to do what was best for his country.

Mr. President, I do not have much sympathy for abuse of men. Perhaps that is because I myself have received too much of it in my own life. But I think we could get along better perhaps by looking at things in a kindlier way. Sometimes it is necessary to use somewhat stern language, but it is not often necessary, and we should endeavor to avoid the use of such language as much as we can. Why should the Appropriations Committee be abused in view of the hard work it has done? We have passed on every item it was necessary for us to act upon. We have dealt with every problem with which we were confronted. We have heard every witness who desired to be heard. We have denied to no one the right to come before the committee and testify. Believe me, many witnesses came before us. There are 10,000 printed pages of hearings in connection with this one bill.

Mr. ECTON rose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUMPHREY in the chair). Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield for a question.

Mr. ECTON. No, Mr. President. I wanted to make a few remarks.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thought the Senator from Montana wanted to ask me a question.

Mr. President, I wish to say a word or two about some other matters. Much has been said about the Byrd-Bridges amendment. More has been said about that particular item than any other item in the bill. The Congress has never adopted such a method of dealing with appropriations. I know the Senator from Virginia so well and I know the Senator from New Hampshire so well that I know they want to save money, and that they honestly believe their method is the best way to save money. I have the same feeling as they do; that is, I want to save every dollar that can be saved. The bill resulted in saving more than $2,000,000,000, when all items are included. The bill was $2,000,000,000 under the budget estimate. It is not often a committee reports a saving of $2,000,000,000. Did anyone hear of that having been done before? Any Senator who has ever heard of the Appropriations Committee saving more than 2,000,000,000 in one bill let him hold up his hand. I do not see any hands held up. I did not see any hands held up a while ago when a similar question was asked. We have taken $1,600,000,000 off the bill and authorized the President to take off $550,000,000 more. The committee has saved more than $2,000,000,000 in this one bill, Mr. President. Why has that been done? It has been done because of a plan.

Mr. President, it is a remarkable thing that today we have reached the rather unusual situation in which a man cannot be a statesman unless he has a plan. We have the Jones plan, the Smith plan, innumerable plans. If a Senator is to be regarded as a statesman, he must have a plan. Let me say to the Senator from Virginia, whom I know affectionately as Harry, that I think that is one mistake he and I have made; I do not believe either of us ever has reached the point of having a plan. Under present circumstances, it seems to be obvious that a Senator cannot be a statesman unless he has a plan; he must have a plan. Similarly, legislation is not regarded as the kind of legislation it should be unless it is based on a plan; there must be a plan.

My friend the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is looking at me now, and is smiling—delightful gentleman that he is. I say to him that he had better get a plan as soon as possible.

My good friend—I started to say my lifelong friend, for he is very nearly that—the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], one of the handsomest and one of the best men I know, has a plan, does he not? He has been so successful that I am rather inclined to think he does have some plan.

Mr. President, not long ago I was talking to an outsider about the same thing. He said the mistake I have made in my official life has been that I never had a plan; and he pointed out that if a man is to be a statesman he must have a plan. I suppose that is so.

Of course, Mr. President, there are plans and plans—some of them very good, some not so good.

Although I have not had a plan, I wish to assure the Senate, Mr. President, in the presence of Almighty God, that I have had but one desire in connection with this bill, and that has been, and still is, to save as much money as possible and, at the same time, to provide the necessary funds in order to permit the Government to realize its ideals and to effectuate its policies to the greatest extent possible. I believe that has been the attitude which all of us have maintained, and certainly it has been mine.

The able Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who preceded me as chairman of the Appropriations Committee, is one of the finest men in the world. Despite all he has had to say about this measure, I think that inwardly he knows that this is the way to legislate, namely, to legislate item by item, to take the proof, to obtain the facts, and to legislate on the basis of the facts, not on the basis of guesses.

Mr. President, let us not legislate on the basis of percentages. Whenever I think of percentages, I think of my early days, when I had to borrow some money. I did not like percentages then because I had to pay a good deal more than is required to be paid in these days when a person borrows money. I never liked percentages then, and I am still not wedded to percentages. They are all right in a way, but I am not wedded to them insofar as legislation is concerned. I think we should be more reasonable, more accurate, and more aware of exactly what should be done so that we can deal in exact amounts rather than in percentages.

Mr. President, complaint is made because the conferees voted to provide a little more money for ECA—although we voted to reduce the amount by $200,000,000—than some persons thought should be provided. Some Members of Congress think we should reduce that amount by an additional 10 percent.

I wonder whether the Senators who now are listening to my remarks—and I thank them very much for doing so—remember that about a year ago I tried my best to have the Senate reduce the amount of the appropriation for ECA. I am in favor of the ECA appropriation carried in this bill because the Senate directed me to be in favor of it. The Senate voted for the largest amount proposed for that purpose, and so I have tried to do my duty, just as my friend who is sitting across the aisle—I refer to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who is smiling, as he always is—always tries to do his duty. The Senate will recall that a majority of the Senate voted against me in connection with that item, and a majority of my

own committee voted against me then. After my own committee opposed me on the question of reducing our gifts to foreign countries, I accepted the judgment of my friends in the Senate, for this is a wonderful body, made up of wonderful men, and all Senators should stand by its collective judgment. I am not one of those who disbelieve in the Senate or who disbelieve in our form of government. I am not one who believes in a one-man government. In my opinion the time will never come when we have a one-man Government.

I am in favor of the United States Government as it is constituted under our wonderful Constitution. I held up my hand before Almighty God and took an oath forever to defend this Government of the United States, and I will always do so.

I think the Senate is a great body—although not because the Senate usually goes along with me, for actually the Senate usually goes against me. Many of my friends on the committee have voted against me at this time. Nevertheless, I know that the Senate does what it thinks is best for the Republic, and I commend the Senate.

Mr. President, there is another thing which I do not think should be done. I refer to the way some Senators voted in regard to the appropriation for Spain. I shall not go into the details of that matter, other than to say that the committee voted in favor of the proposal, and the House agreed to it, and the item is carried in the conference report. So I think it is our duty to uphold what has been done by the committee, by the House and by the Senate up to this time.

Mr. President, I hope to heaven this conference report will be adopted promptly. I was in hope that it would be agreed to very quickly, as quickly as I have seen many other conference reports on appropriation bills agreed to—in short, without any discussion at all. In fact, I was so much in hope of having that done that, as Senators know, I had not even prepared a speech on this measure.

A short time ago I was talking about the conference report to another member of the committee, and he wished to know how long I would speak on it. I told him I would not speak at all, if I could avoid doing so. He said, "I think the report will be adopted in about 45 minutes." Well, Mr. President, we have already been considering the conference report for over an hour now, and and we have not yet begun to vote on it.

Ordinarily the Senate does not take long to act on a conference report on an appropriation bill which has been thoroughly considered, a bill which the committee has gone over thoroughly, item by item, and then has reported to the Senate, and after the Senate has gone over all the items and has argued every one of them. Every one of the items which has been referred to in the debate today has been argued before this body and has been approved by this body by an overwhelming majority, and then has gone to the House, and the House conferees have agreed to it; and the House itself has agreed to all these items, with one exception, which I shall mention in a moment. Certainly the Senate already has voted in favor of these items. Under these circumstances, the Senate usually takes very prompt action on a conference report on such a measure.

By the way, Mr. President, one of the finest men I ever knew was a predecessor of mine. Some persons know him simply because he was General Pershing's father-in-law, but I knew him as Francis E. Warren, a Senator from Wyoming, an able and splendid man, conscientious to the highest degree. He served as governor of his State, and he served his people well and faithfully; he served them as few men ever did.

I have seen him do as I have done, when I attempted quietly to lay a conference report before the Senate and move that it be agreed to. I have seen Senator Warren time and again rise to say, "Mr. President, I submit the conference report, and ask for its immediate consideration"—and he got what he wanted. He would then say, "Mr. President, I move that the Senate agree to the conference report." Without objection, the conference report would be agreed to. Frequently I have seen conference reports agreed to without objection, though, of course, if any Senator opposed it and wanted a vote he could have a vote and be recorded as voting against it.

Mr. President, I wonder whether Senators knew that some of those who supported the bill seem now to be against it. I am not referring to my friend the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], because he told us when he signed the report that there was one item in it which he did not like, but he would sign the report because he thought the bill ought to pass.

Mr. President, this bill ought to pass. It is now nearly 2 months overdue. That, by the way, brings up something else. I wonder whether I can state it. In doing so I hope I may be able to state it without offense to anyone. Senators will remember that when early in the session the question came up of a unified appropriation bill—not 12 or 13 separate appropriation bills, as we had before that, but of combining them all in one bill—I did not favor it. We were informed by Members of the House that a unified bill would be passed by the House and sent to us for consideration by April 15, and that we would have 2½ months in which to pass it. It was not long until, judging from the newspapers, it appeared that it would be impossible for the House to pass it by April 15. June 1 was being discussed. First, it was thought it could be passed by May 15, I think it was, and then by June 1. I called upon our committee to begin work on it. We took testimony on the bill before it ever came to us. I was about to say we took tons of testimony—it was not tons, but there were 10,000 pages of it, all told. We began in January, and when we concluded, about April 15, we were informed it would be about May 1 before the bill would reach the Senate; which was later changed to May 15, then to June 15, and then to July 1. I think it came to the Senate about June 26. Am I correct in that? Mr. President, I believe this is the first time I have ever wanted to ask a question of one of our able assistants to the Appropriations Committee when they were not on hand. I see that Mr. Everard Smith is on hand. He is always on hand. He informs me the bill passed the House on May 10. But it reached the Senate later than that. I desire to be accurate in my statements, and if I am in error I shall ask to have it corrected. I have no desire to say anything except what is the truth.

Senators see how the unified bill works. I may say it has worked the Senate Appropriations Committee tremendously hard. But we have done our duty. I ask Senators, not as members of the Democratic Party or as members of the Republican Party, but as Senators to stand by the good work which the committee has done in cutting one bill—think of it—more than $2,000,000,000. I am very proud of that. I may be the only Senator who is proud of it. Other Senators may think it should have been cut less. It may be said we could have saved a great deal more than that by adopting certain rules. Yes, Mr. President, by adopting a rule, perhaps we could have saved the entire $34,000,000,000, the amount we are to appropriate this year. We could have saved the entire amount, not by cutting it 10 percent, but by cutting it all out.

Mr. President, I believe I have now said everything I wanted to say, except on the subject of Spain. Let me return to that for a moment. I have never talked to Mr. Franco. In fact, I have not talked with any of the men who control the affairs of other countries. But, in times gone by, when I did not have so much work to do, when I had a little free time after the courts had adjourned for the summer, I occasionally went to Europe. In fact, I went a number of times. I saw the people there. All their governments are very similar. Why should Spain be excluded? Why should we treat her differently from other European countries? I am not going to argue the question at all. A lady once wrote me a letter in which she gave me, if I may use the expression, "unshirted Hades" for favoring such a tyrant as Franco. I do not know Mr. Franco. There may be other Senators who know him, and if so, they know whether he is a tyrant; I do not know. I did not make my decision on that basis. I decided it upon the facts. I am a great believer in that. I know there were many people in the city of Memphis where I lived who sold goods to Spain. I took it up with them, and they informed me that the Spaniards paid their debts certainly as well if not better than the people of any other European nation. That is a pretty good recommendation. In these days it is an exceedingly good recommendation. I like people who pay their debts.

I was trying to reach a conclusion, and I did so. I believe that if we lend them money they will pay it back. We are not giving it to them; we are loaning it to them.

With that, Mr. President, I leave things to take care of themselves.

One other point, and I am through. It has been stated that they should be a horizontal cut. I want to have an experience meeting here. I wonder if there is a Senator listening to me—and there are a goodly number on both sides who, I think, are my friends—I wonder if there is a Senator in this body, including my very dear friend whom I see before me now, Mr. CORDON, who believes we should reduce expenditures by horizontal cuts. If there is such a Senator present, I should like to have him hold up his hand.

I see no hands held up.

In what do Senators believe? They believe, with me, that we should get the facts and pass upon the items of the bill, just as the committee did, and cut certain items.

I see my friend from Oregon looking at me rather quizzically.

Mr. CORDON. And approvingly.

Mr. McKELLAR. He is one of the ablest members of the committee. I want to take time to say that, Mr. President. He is one of the ablest men on the committee. I have told him, confidentially, of course, that if I should get into trouble, if I were ever prosecuted for any offense, I wanted to engage him as my lawyer so that I would be certain that he was on my side and not on the other side.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield. I yield to the Senator every day.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon would suggest that this is the first time he has ever found the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee off base.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall take a chance on that. I have taken a great many chances in my life, and I shall probably take a great many more.

Mr. President, I have already consumed too much time. I say to those who are taking such a strong stand on the other side that they may be right and I may be wrong, but there is no chance to put through their plan this time. If there is anything in the plan, it will certainly be adopted in days to come. The appropriation bill is on its last legs. We have fought over it for nearly 8 months. Let it go through. Ordinarily, the chairman of a committee, when he presents a bill to the Senate, makes a speech about it, and he should do so. I have already done that. I had hoped that after the bill had gone through all the processes, when it came to agreeing to the conference report, there would be an agreement without debate. When I talked to my friend from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] it was his idea that it would take approximately three-quarters of an hour to agree to the conference report. I did not think it would take that long.

Mr. President, we should adopt the report now. It does not give the President any greater powers than any President has had. The statement of the President was in every way a proper and able statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I think we all appreciate what the very able and distinguished Senator from Tennessee has said. We likewise appreciate the long months of hard work which he devoted to the consideration of this bill. I do not believe there is any Member of the Congress who would even intimate that he did not think the Senator from Tennessee and his committee had done a good job.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ECTON. I want my very good friend to understand that what I am going to say is absolutely no reflection on him, on the members of his committee, or on any member of the conference committee, but I still do not like the conference report. I appreciate the fact that there are many thousands of words printed with reference to the appropriation bill. I also appreciate the fact that the Senator from Tennessee and his committee labored day and night listening to everyone, on both sides, with reference to the intended appropriations. I want to compliment them on their judgment and their recommendations. They made some splendid recommendations to the Senate, and the Senate supported them by a substantial majority on most of their recommendations. But what concerns some of us is that after they had devoted to the bill many months of consistent hard work, they felt they had to abdicate in conference.

I am not blaming them. I realize what they were up against. I realize they could not do anything else. But, Mr. President, I think it behooves us all to recognize now what happened in the conference committee and in the conference report. If we open our eyes we can really see bureaucracy in action behind what has been done.

I am not talking about the cuts on various items. I am going to talk about something about which I think I know a little bit, for it pertains to my own State. Otherwise I would have nothing to say. I believe in the importance of each and every man who represents a State knowing the problems which confront his State a little better than they are known by anyone else.

I express my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee on the way he and his committee have always treated me in connection with the problems concerning my State when I have appeared before the committee and asked for consideration. I could not wish for any better attention or for any more wholehearted consideration than I have received.

Mr. President, I do not know whether we realize just what is happening in this country. We are going a long way toward a goal, and I think we shall be very sorry about it some time. Not only have the people been warned but time and time again over the years, and yet it is being said, "Oh, it cannot happen in America. This is America. It cannot happen here."

I believe the Senate of the United States recognizes what can happen and what might happen in this country. I congratulate the Senator from Tennessee and his committee again for making specific recommendations in the report which was submitted to the Senate on this bill some time ago.

At this time, the Reclamation Bureau is busily engaged in building numerous dams and making plans for building many more in my State. We have all been in favor of reclamation. We all recognize that the arid West must have dams, electricity, and new acres of land brought under cultivation and under irrigation.

It has been recommended by the Senate time and time again that the Government should work in cooperation and in unison with private capital and private industry to help bring these things about. The Committee on Appropriations has made such recommendations. Mr. President, if I may, I should like to read from the committee report at page 145. It relates to a power company which operates in Montana, and tries to formulate a policy which Congress should follow.

> The funds appropriated in the fiscal year 1950 were appropriated with the understanding that the funds would not be used by the Bureau if a wheeling agreement could be entered into with the Montana Power Co. whereby the REA's in the area involved could be supplied with power at the Reclamation Bureau rate. Such a wheeling agreement was not entered into and testimony at the Senate hearing this year was to the effect that the Reclamation Bureau felt it should build these facilities even though a wheeling agreement should be entered into with the Montana Power Co. On April 12, 1950, the Montana Public Service Commission approved a 5½ mills per kilowatt-hour rate for all REA's on the Montana Power Co. system, which rate is identical with the rate offered REA's by the Reclamation Bureau. Inasmuch as any savings to REA's in Montana resulting from the construction of the Havre-Shelby transmission line and substations by the Reclamation Bureau have been met by the new REA rate of the Montana Power Co. approved by the Montana Public Service Commission, the committee does not believe the Reclamation Bureau should continue its work on these facilities, which was only recently begun.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ECTON. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The chairman of the subcommittee which has the matter in charge is not present today. I refer to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. He is in Arizona. I am sorry he is not present, because probably he could give the Senate the reason why the Senate conferees yielded on this amendment. However, I have the idea—and the Senator can correct me if I am wrong—that it involved a fight between the power companies in Montana and the REA, and the House would not accept the amendment under the circumstances after hearing all the proof.

Mr. ECTON. I believe the Senator has been misinformed in that respect.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am asking the Senator for information.

Mr. ECTON. I do not think it is a controversy between the power companies and the REA. The difficulty lies with the Reclamation Bureau in Washington, which wants to monopolize all

the power in Montana, and put our own companies out of business. That is where the trouble lies. Nine REA's signed contracts with the Montana Power Co. after the first of the year under which the REA's were to get a rate equal to the Bureau's rate. All they had to do was to have their contracts O. K.'d in Washington. What happened? The contracts have not been O. K.'d yet.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ECTON. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not correct to say that the nine REA's had to sign the contracts?

Mr. ECTON. They did.

Mr. LANGER. But they did not sign it until after the construction of the Havre-Shelby transmission line had commenced.

Mr. ECTON. They were not in on the Havre-Shelby transmission line.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that the line which the Senator is discussing was supposed to have been completed on the first day of September?

Mr. ECTON. It will be completed.

Mr. LANGER. It will be?

Mr. ECTON. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. As a matter of fact, the entire matter was gone into very carefully, and it would have meant the loss of over a million dollars if the line had not been completed.

Mr. ECTON. It would mean a loss of $3,000,000 to the Federal Government.

Mr. LANGER. But it would have meant the loss of over a million dollars to the Bureau of Reclamation, because the work would have to be abandoned.

Mr. ECTON. I realize nothing can be done about it now. What I am trying to have the Senate understand is that after the Montana Power Co. reduced its rate to the level of the Bureau rate, and the Senate committee had recommended that construction of the line be not continued, the Bureau went ahead and worked practically day and night to get the line as nearly completed as possible. I admit they have gone so far that no one can buy them out. The Government is in the power business in Montana at the expense of the taxpayers. The Bureau would never have needed to build that line in the first place if they had let the Montana Power Co. take it over and operate it.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not correct to say that unless the Bureau of Reclamation had built it the farmers in that area would not have obtained the cheap rate.

Mr. ECTON. No; that is not correct.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ECTON. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. What were the farmers charged before the Bureau of Reclamation put in the line?

Mr. ECTON. The Bureau of Reclamation operating through the REA's told them they would never get electricity unless the Government built the line. That is what they said.

Mr. LANGER. That is true, is it not?

Mr. ECTON. When the Bureau of Reclamation was first created it was designed to bring land under irrigation. They have forgotten all about irrigation. The main thing they are interested in is corralling all the power in the country. I venture to say, Mr. President, that one investigation that will have to be made within the near future is an investigation of the policy and determination of the Bureau of Reclamation to get into the power business.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator knows, does he not, that literally thousands of farmers in Montana and North Dakota would not have REA current on their farmers if it were not for the Bureau of Reclamation?

Mr. ECTON. The Bureau of Reclamation had nothing to do with setting up the REA. We were all in favor of rural electrification long before the Bureau of Reclamation ever thought about it. They had nothing to do with it. We had REA in Montana before the Bureau of Reclamation ever started to get in there.

Mr. LANGER. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ECTON. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator knows, does he not, that the Bureau of Reclamation has built lines in North Dakota.

Mr. ECTON. I do not know anything about North Dakota. I will leave the interests of that State to be taken care of by the Senator from North Dakota. I would appreciate it if sometimes someone else thought that I knew something about my own State. When the Bureau of Reclamation was created, it was established on a bipartisan basis. It was not ever designed as a political medium. I venture to say that the Bureau has resorted to the direst kind of questionable politics during the past few years, and it will continue to do so. It condemns the private power companies on the ground they have a monopoly. That is what the Bureau want themselves. They want a Government monopoly. To my way of thinking, it is 10 times worse to have a Government monopoly than a private monopoly, which is financed by individual stockholders. I do not own any stock in any private power company. If I did, I could at least sell the stock and get something out of it. I would like to know how much the Federal taxpayers can get out of the stock if they own Federal power lines all over the United States.

Mr. President, I wish to make it plain that I never opposed Federal power lines where they were necessary. What I am disgusted with, and what I condemn Congress for, and what I condemn the bureaucracy for furthering, is the building of power lines at taxpayers' expense, parallel to power lines which have already been built by private enterprise.

We hear many people condemning capitalism in this country. When they talk about it, they are talking about the old feudal capitalistic system of Europe. Our economy is based on a people's capitalism. It is from the people that the money comes to form the corporations to manufacture the articles which we use—automobiles, refrigerators, radios, and the like. The people individually invest in the companies. It is people's capitalism.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ECTON. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I know it is true in Montana, because the same company operates there that operates in North Dakota, but is it not true that before the REA's came in, a utility company line would go by a farmer's house, even though it was only four or five poles away, and the company would charge from a thousand to fifteen hundred dollars to hook the farm up to the company line? That is why the REA came into existence.

Mr. ECTON. I do not know about that, but I do know what happened in my own experience. I was in an REA one time trying to get electricity to my ranch, and we were to obligate ourselves to pay in the neighborhood of $10 every month for 20 years. I never figured it out. We had to guarantee that we would put up that much to the REA in order to get them to hook up.

We fooled around 2 or 3 years and we could not complete the project. Then the Montana Power Co. in that neighborhood offered to permit us to hook up to their line. They built the first 1,000 feet free, and if we were more than 1,000 away from their line, they built the line, and we paid them 15 cents a foot for building it. We did not have to look after the wire, or poles, or insulators, or transformers, or anything of that kind. They gave every farmer the first 1,000 feet, and then charged 15 cents a foot thereafter. We had the same rate after that as if we had lived in town. If one had a pumping station or shop equipment, he got a reduced rate, just as the industrialist in town gets a little reduction on the quantity he uses. So do not say they did this and did that. I know what happened in my own actual experience.

Mr. President, probably some private companies did have bad relationships with public officials; I do not know anything about that. I am not here defending anyone. I am merely telling what could have been done and what the Senate was willing to do and recommended being done. But the conferees on the part of the House had the advantage. There are more of them, they are backed up by the bureaucracy down town and all they have to do is to sit tight. The conferees on the part of the Senate do not have a chance. They have to accept what is offered.

Does anyone think the men on the conference committee over there would do anything about parallel lines in Montana? They did not ask me about conditions. I doubt if they asked the other Senator from Montana.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ECTON. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. This is one time we did not have to do what the Senator has indicated we did.

Mr. ECTON. I have the information here. I can almost prove it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Then I ask the Senator to prove it. The Senator made a

statement a while ago that the bureaucrats in Washington——

Mr. ECTON. I said it was bureaucracy in action.

Mr. McKELLAR. That it was a bureaucracy matter. I wish to say that not a single member from a Government bureau called on me at any time.

Mr. ECTON. Certainly not; they would know better than that.

Mr. McKELLAR. No lobbyists called on me, either.

Mr. ECTON. They did not have to. They get the job done. The Senator has been around here for a good many more years than I hope to be——

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator does not mean what he said, surely. He does not mean that I am controlled by anybody, surely. I resent that statement.

Mr. ECTON. I beg the Senator's pardon; I am not accusing the Senator of anything.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes, the Senator is. I desire to say it is absolutely without the slightest foundation in fact that anyone controls me. I have been controlling myself a long time, and I still do it, and I am very active about it. I do not talk to a lobbyist that I know of, and I think they all know me and that I do not talk to them at all. I do not talk to lobbyists in the Government or lobbyists out of the Government. I think they all know it. The Senator has not been here long enough, or he would not have made such a statement about me.

Mr. ECTON. I am not accusing the Senator of anything. I said that the Senate conferees did not have a chance.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is wholly incorrect. The Senate conferees got more out of this appropriation bill from the conferees of the House than they have ever received in any conference since I have been a member of the Committee on Appropriations, and that has been a long time.

Mr. ECTON. That may be, but at the same time they restored all the items for parallel public power lines, and that is what I am objecting to, after the Senate recommended that they be left out. The testimony was brought out.

Mr. McKELLAR. I was not on the subcommittee, therefore, I do not know what the facts are. I am taking the facts as the Senator has stated them. I believe the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] was chairman of the subcommittee having this matter in charge, and he is not now present, but I had the very distinct impression, as a member of the committee, that there was a fight between the private power companies and the rural electrification people.

Mr. ECTON. Oh, sure, that is the old gag.

Mr. McKELLAR. It may be an old gag, but it is a well-known gag, I tell the Senator. I do not believe there are many here who do not know the difference between the power companies and the Rural Electrification Administration. The latter has done wonders in my State, and I hope it has done wonders in the Senator's State. I like to see the whole country improved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana can yield only for a question.

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I want the Senator from Tennessee to understand that I have not intended to impugn his motives in any wise.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is very kind of the Senator, and I accept what he says in the spirit in which he says it.

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, in order to show that this is not merely a question of the REA's, raised under amendment 273, the conference committee provided an appropriation of $295,828,000, instead of $297,467,000 as proposed by the House, and $294,713,000 as proposed by the Senate. That is for construction of the Brighton-Brush transmission line substations, Colorado-Big Thompson project.

But with the following exceptions to such ratification:

(a) In addition to $343,000 allowed by the Senate for the Fort Peck project, Montana, $750,000 is also allowed to complete construction of the Havre-Shelby transmission line and substations. This is in lieu of the $1,400,000 allowed by the House and of the entire disallowance of funds for this line as proposed by the Senate.

In other words, money was provided so as to insure that the Havre-Shelby line would be completed after the Montana Power Co. on April 12 reduced their rates to equal the Bureau rates. On top of that, the Montana Power Co. offered to purchase from the Government at cost all the materials which had been delivered on the project at that time. After they built that line as fast as they could, the Montana Power Co. made a cash offer in addition to a stretch of line between two places in Montana that did not have a line. The company offered to purchase that, and hook it up to their own line in order to supply the farmers and the people in that section of the State at the same rate as that charged by the Bureau. The Senate recommended that that be done.

I agree with the Senator from Tennessee that now it is too late to take corrective action. I agree with the recommendations of the conference committee in that respect for the line has been completed at public expense, at the taxpayers' expense, although the Montana Power Co. has a line there, and another line was not needed. So there is nothing to do but to proceed with the line and operate it at the taxpayers' expense. That is what happened.

Let us now consider item (b) of amendment No. 273. This is the thing that makes one's hair stand on end. This is what prompted me to say what I have said. The Bureau of Reclamation is building what they call the Canyon Ferry Dam in Montana. I think I know what I am talking about when I speak of that project, because it is only about 80 miles from where I live. What did the conference committee do? They put back in the bill $365,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to build a line from Canyon Ferry Dam to Great Falls. The Bureau of Reclamation knows that the Montana Power Co. has two 100,000-volt lines into Great Falls from East Helena. It is only 17 miles from East Helena to the Canyon Ferry Dam, and the Montana Power Co. offered to build a line to take the power off the Canyon Ferry Dam when the dam is completed. Then the conferees put back $365,000 for the Government to build a parallel line from Canyon Ferry into Great Falls, when there are already two 100,000-volt lines running between the two points. Money has been provided in the bill to build a 115,000-volt line. That line will serve no REA's in that territory.

The contention is made that it is REA versus Montana Power Co. No, Mr. President; it is not. The farmers of that area are told that the Montana Power Co. is out to get them. That argument is made for political reasons. The line from Canyon Ferry to Great Falls will serve no REA. It will be a duplicate transmission line. That is all it will be, pure and simple.

Mr. President, I realize it is useless for me to make any comments on this subject now. I realize it is useless for me to oppose the conference report because of this item. The damage has already been done. We thought we might be able to have inserted a proviso that if the power company did not permit the use of their lines into Great Falls, that is, enter into an agreement or complete negotiations to that effect with the Bureau within a reasonable time, then the Bureau could proceed and build these lines. But no, Mr. President, there is nothing in the bill like that; $365,000 was put back in the bill with which to proceed and duplicate power lines at the taxpayers' expense.

The people of my State are becoming tired of such things, Mr. President. We have a public service commission which regulates the power companies within my State. The three members of the commission are elected directly by the people. Then we find some board or bureau in Washington, in the name of reclamation, going into Montana and putting up parallel power lines. When we come down to the real nub of the matter, we cannot blame the Bureau of Reclamation. The fault lies with Congress. It is our fault because we give the Bureau the money. Those in the Bureau would not amount to a hill of beans if they did not have the Federal Treasury behind them. You and I, Mr. President, could be big shots, too, if we had the Federal Treasury to back us in all our plans. We could then be statesmen, as the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] said earlier today. We could all formulate plans if we could dig into the Treasury and back up our plans with the Treasury's dollars.

Mr. President, I say the time has come when a halt must be called on the actions of the Bureau of Reclamation. As I said before, they are no longer interested in irrigation. They are interested in creating power and controlling it. There was a man some years ago in the Bureau whose name was Raushenbush, or something like that. I remem-

ber he made the statement that one man within the Bureau with his plans is worth a hundred outside. Sometimes I believe there is not only one man with a plan in the Bureau, but that there are many such men, and that it will take thousands on the outside, yes it will take more than that, it will take the Congress of the United States to put a stop to their doings.

I am not against the Government building transmission lines where it is necessary, but I am against the Bureau of Reclamation building power lines at taxpayers expense, duplicating and paralleling already existing facilities. I am mighty sorry that the conferees saw fit to restore to the bill the $365,000 item with which to build the line from Canyon Ferry to Great Falls when it is not at all needed.

As I said before, it is useless to say anything now about the matter. It was railroaded through the conference committee. I cannot hold up the plan, and I suppose the Senate cannot either, because the conference report has already been adopted by the House. It was adopted there under such rules that no Representative dared speak on the subject except the chairman of the subcommittee, as I understand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. HUMPHREY obtained the floor.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am glad to yield, provided I do not lose my right to the floor. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Montana without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise to support the conference report. I regret very much that my distinguished colleague from Montana [Mr. ECTON] finds it necessary to make a serious attack upon the conference report. I think he is making a great error when he says that the people of Montana are tired of the program which has been carried on in respect to these transmission lines in our State.

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I cannot yield, for I have been yielded to by the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. ECTON. When the Senator says the people are not tired of the program which has been carried on——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. The Senator from Minnesota has the floor, and can yield only for a question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the senior Senator from Montana may make a brief reply, without causing me to lose my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BRIDGES. For how many minutes will the Senator from Montana speak?

Mr. MURRAY. I should like to speak for 5 or 6 minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let us provide 6 minutes for the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the senior Senator from Montana is recognized for 6 minutes.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I do not rise to make any criticism of my colleague. He has a perfect right to take the stand he has taken. I know his position very well. Since he has been a Member of the Senate, he and I have cooperated very nicely, and I do not criticize him for the stand he now takes. He has a perfect right to attack the program which has been carried out in Montana, but I think he makes a great mistake when he does so.

Heretofore the farmers of Montana have been compelled to pay high rates for electric power. Transmission lines did not reach some parts of Montana, and as a result it was necessary for the REA to undertake a program of making power available to the farmers. As a result of the building of the Hungry Horse Dam, it has also been necessary to build transmission lines. A huge transmission line carrying electric power from that dam to Anaconda, to serve the area there, has been built. It has also been necessary to build transmission lines in the Canyon Ferry-Great Falls area.

With reference to the Havre-Shelby transmission line, let me say that matter has been a subject of controversy here for a number of years. Last year we had a long debate in regard to that project, and after a full discussion the Senate finally voted in favor of the Havre-Shelby transmission line and provided appropriations for its construction.

Later on the Montana Power Co. sought to have construction of that line discontinued; but the line was in the course of construction, and as authorized it was completed. It already had been approved by the Congress. So it seems to me it is very unwise now for Senators to talk about discontinuing a line which has been wholly completed and will be of great benefit to the people of Montana.

As a result of this power development in Montana, our State now, for the first time in 40 years, is beginning to develop industries and, as a result, new settlers are beginning to come into the State. As a result of the reclamation program and the power-development program we have instituted, new industries are coming into Montana and the population is increasing, whereas theretofore the population had been decreasing.

So I think it is a great mistake for anyone now to attack a program so beneficial to Montana, especially after there was complete debate on it in 1949, and inasmuch as the program and the appropriations for its construction have been settled so far as the conference report is concerned. I submit that it is a very valuable program for the State of Montana and will be of tremendous benefit to all our people.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I rise for the purpose of directing my remarks to the portion of the conference report pertaining to the elimination of the International Children's Emergency Fund, under the United Nations.

Before I refer directly to that portion of the conference report, let me say that I appreciated and enjoyed very much and, I am sure, benefited from the remarks of the able chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR].

Many comments have been made today regarding the conference report. I suppose several of us are a little unhappy about the report. Nevertheless, all of us realize the great responsibility involved in connection with the preparation of an appropriation bill.

I, for one, as a newcomer in the Senate, wish to say that I did not find the over-all, one-package appropriation bill very desirable as it has operated to date. I believe it was much easier for us to know what is going on and to know the facts behind each appropriation request and recommendation when the appropriations were handled individually. With only one, large appropriation bill and one over-all report on it, the detailed factual material we needed was not available. To be sure, the members of the Appropriations Committee are fully informed; and, as the Senator from Tennessee has said, they act on the basis of the facts and the testimony, not on the basis of guesses and percentages. Nevertheless, those of us who are not on the Appropriations Committee, but who have a vote—a vote which is just as important as that of the committee members—must form our judgments on the basis of the report the committee makes. I have found that on the basis of the over-all, one-package appropriation bill, the one-package committee report was not as documented or detailed as it could have been under the procedure of handling the appropriations under a series of bills, as has been done in former years.

I shall not speak in regard to how best to make the proposed cuts, except I wish to say it should be clearly understood that substantial cuts were made in the appropriation items. It is always difficult to know whether there should be percentagewise cuts or cuts straight across the board, or whether certain exclusions should be provided for when cuts are made in the appropriations.

Be that as it may, the committee has reached its decision. The committee has decided to make a cut of approximately half a billion dollars in the appropriations—in fact, almost the same cut as would have been provided by the Byrd-Bridges amendment. Of course the exact method of making the cut is a matter of judgment which I shall not discuss now.

Neither shall I debate the merits of the Franco loan or of the loan to Yugoslavia. I listened with keen interest to the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], who made a very persuasive argument. I feel that any loan which is made should meet uniform conditions. However, once the decision is made, we have no choice but to follow it. After all, we operate on the principle of majority rule.

A decision has been made in reference to the United Nations Children's Emergency Fund. Certainly I am not going to balk at adoption of the conference report and try to prevent its approval, as one Member of the Senate, just because I do not care for this particular decision. However, I feel that it is important to have the record clear in regard to what happened in the conference committee to the appropriation for the children's fund. I understand that a deficiency appropriation bill is being prepared. Therefore, I make these remarks now for the benefit of the RECORD and for the benefit of the committee. The points I shall make in this connection have been fairly well substantiated, I think, by the evidence produced before the committee.

I was literally shocked and amazed when I read in the newspapers that the provision in the appropriation bill for the International Children's Fund had been eliminated from the conference report. The appropriation for that purpose was $12,500,000, and it had been voted by the Senate after considerable debate. I cannot understand how the Senate conferees could recede from supporting that appropriation, when it had been strongly supported by the Senate.

Let me remind the Senate what happened in regard to that item.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy to yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Does the Senator realize that, as I have been told, the House conferees were under the impression that $25,000,000 was left over from last year's appropriation and would be available this year? However, that appropriation expired; and our whole point in providing $12,500,000 in this measure was because the previous appropriation had expired and had not been extended.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. It is my judgment that the conferees were laboring under a misapprehension in regard to the facts.

I am entirely in accord with the remarks of the Senator from Minnesota, and I think this point should be made for the RECORD, because the Children's Fund is one of the finest enterprises which has been underway since the war; but now it must go by the board, because no appropriation will be made for it, so far as this measure is concerned.

I thank the Senator from Minnesota very much for bringing up this question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from New Jersey for his remarks, for he has been in the forefront of the fight to obtain this appropriation. I recall very well the valiant effort he made a few months ago in its behalf, and I thank him for the observation he has made and for the information he has given the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

Mr. HUMPHREY. I now yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should like to say that there was such a statement made before the committee, as the Senator from New Jersey says. For myself, I am very much in favor of the fund designed to aid children. I think the Government of the United States should participate, and later on, we shall have a bill coming up at this session of the Congress, at which time it might be well to submit the matter.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Tennessee, the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, for his last words, because it is our hope that we may come before his committee to plead again the cause of the children's fund.

Mr. McKELLAR. The committee will be glad to have the Senator do that.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The distinguished chairman has always been most courteous and most generous with his time, and I know he will give us a friendly hearing.

I desire now to go over the record, so that we have it clear in the RECORD as to what happened. Twenty Senators, from both sides of the aisle, including the very distinguished leaders of the minority and of the majority, sponsored the original authorization for $25,000,000. On the floor of the Senate this authorization was confirmed without a dissenting vote in connection with the Foreign Assistance Act of 1951. Then, thirdly, the conferees under the authorization bill cut the authorization from $25,000,000 to $15,000,000, and gave the President wide discretion in the use of the money.

Fourth. When the conference report was returned to the Senate floor it was severely criticized for the changes made by the conference committee.

Fifth. The Appropriations Committee tightened the legislation, but at the same time made another cut to $12,500,000, which is 50 percent of the original authorization. This appropriation was again supported, and I remind the Senate that it was supported without a dissenting vote, on the floor of the Senate. Then, later, on my request for a yea-and-nay vote on the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] to exclude the Children's Fund from the 10 percent, this body voted 44 to 41 against the 10-percent reduction. Right down the line there is a record of support in the Senate of the United States for the Children's Fund that is without equal. What is the logic then in exempting this organization from the 10-percent reduction, and then ultimately eliminating it entirely?

There has been much criticism of the United Nations on the floor of the Senate, and I am sure that most of that criticism has resulted generally from the idea that the United Nations is purely a public forum in which the delegates talk about international problems but never make an attempt to do anything about them. I do not concur in that statement, but there are some people who feel that way. But the United Nations Children's Fund program is a No. 1 demonstration that the United Nations can and has acted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be necessary to have order on the floor of the Senate. Let the Chair observe that the speakers would be more limited in their remarks if they were getting closer attention. I think we can all save time by giving the speakers undivided attention, thereby letting this bill move along.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this speaker has not very much more to say. But he is talking about a subject which is important in terms of world peace and world understanding. This program is a demonstration that the United Nations can and has acted to save millions of children from malnutrition and disease. At the same time it is establishing permanent services for child health and welfare. I still think that the value of this program must be measured not only in the terms of direct assistance to millions of children in 54 countries throughout the world but also in terms of the measure of cooperation which it has stimulated. I point out that this program operates in 54 nations of the world. First of all, there are 43 governments which have made voluntary contributions in the sum total of $30,000,000. In addition, the people of 45 countries have contributed another $10,000,000. In turn the recipient governments where the Children's Fund is used have provided more than another $100,000,000 in local supplies and services. The administrative costs of this fund have been from 2 to 4 percent—as low as 2 percent and 4 percent.

Mr. President, I point out that every newspaper in America, with very few exceptions, has supported this fund, and that many prominent citizens have supported it. I have a list here of people from public life, from agriculture, from labor, and others, starting, first of all, with former President Hoover, who, in April of this year wrote a letter to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] supporting this program. There are also endorsing letters from William Green, prpesident, AFL; Philip Murray, president, CIO; John Lynn, legislative director, American Farm Bureau; Wallace Campbell, the Cooperative League; Mr. Sanders, the National Grange; and Russell Smith, National Farmers Union.

There were also endorsing letters from all the church organizations. How in the name of common sense, with all that support, with the House and with the Senate of the United States again and again reiterating support of this fund, it could have been dropped in conference is more than I can understand.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I may say in answer to the Senator's question—and he put it in the form of a question—that I was a member of the conference committee. I voted for the international children's fund in the subcommittee and also in the full committee. I tried to retain it in the bill. The only reason the Senate conferees allowed it to be dropped was that they were convinced that it would be impossible to get a conference report without doing so. The

conferees on the part of the House were adamant in their opposition to it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I see.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If there is any method by which an appropriation for the children's fund can be provided, as the Senator wishes, that is another matter.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am very grateful for the action and statement of the Senator from Massachusetts. I also understand that our State Department was not in support of the children's fund.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The State Department was not enthusiastically in favor of the International Children's Fund, either before the subcommittee or the full committee. In spite of that, the Senate voted a substantial amount for it, which it yielded in conference, when it became perfectly clear, in the opinion of one conferee—myself—that it would be impossible to obtain an agreement to have the item included.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Being a member of the conference, I want to assure the Senator from Minnesota that the Senator from Michigan was in favor of the Children's Fund. It had passed the Senate, and he felt that it had a place in our scheme of things. But I am also satisfied, as was the Senator from Massachusetts, that it was impossible to get agreement with the House on a report on the omnibus appropriation bill with the Children's Fund in it, and it was therefore removed, over the protests of conferees on the part of the Senate. In the final compromise it had to be omitted in order to get a bill. It was not because of the merits or the lack of them, so far as the Senate was concerned at all. As the Senator has indicated, the State Department was not enthusiatstic about it, but that was not a reason for omitting it from the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am very grateful for that information.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I may say that I desire to submit a report from the Committee on Foreign Relations. It will only take a moment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall conclude in a moment.

Mr. GREEN. I thought the Senator had concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. No, I am not through, but when I have concluded, I shall be more than happy to yield the floor to my friend from Rhode Island.

All I want to say is this: We are appropriating billions and billions of dollars for the war—and that is absolutely essential. Here is one program which is directed toward the lives of children who have not made up their minds what kind of politics they favor, whether they are going to be Communists or non-Communists, whether they are going to be social democratc or Christian democrats, who have not made up their minds as to what their party politics may be. To think that the Congress of the United States would miss this opportunity for psychological advantage, for what I call effective political advantage, is something that I simply cannot quite understand. I shall go before the Appropriatijons Committee, and I understand my friend, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], is going to appear before that committee, and, if the House of Representatives is adamant in its resistance, then we shall have to break down the resistance, because this is an important program.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not also true that the State Department must bear a large share of responsibility for the defeat of this program?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I was referring to that but a moment ago. I want to say now that if the State Department is opposed to this program, the State Deparment is wrong, it is lacking in vision, and it is about time that some of us who have supported the State Department told the State Department to get in line, where it belongs, which is on the side of the people.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is my judgment that the State Department has been almost a malignant enemy of the children's fund, that it is not interested in saving the lives of children, that it is primarily interested in conferences, where there is talk, talk, talk, with very little action. In my judgment, the State Department should be told to keep out of appropriation matters and to let the Congress of he United States legislate. I say that as one who has supported most of the proposals of the State Department.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I concur in the statement of my friend from Illinois and tell him, very frankly, that I think his position is sound. The Senator from Minnesota is very much aware of the validity of the comment of the Senator from Illinois. I had taken upon myself, as one Member, to express a very sharp rebuke to members of the State Department for opposing this appropriation measure. They always seem to get themselves, on this issue, on the wrong side. Why, in the name of common sense, they cannot understand that this is an operating agency of the United Nations where we learn to work together before we get together politically, I do not know.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Minnesota mean to emphasize the word "this" when he says the State Department is on the wrong side of this issue?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Minnesota put the proper emphasis on the proper word at the right time. We will take up the other issues one by one. This is the children's fund.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, when the appropriation bill was under consideration in the Senate, and before final passage on August 4, I made some remarks about it. These remarks appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at page 12012. I do not need to repeat at this time what I then said. What I said about the bill I believe to be equally true of the conference report. It is my belief that the report is unrealistic in that it does not take into consideration the demands upon the Government and upon the American people for national defense at this time. It represents the thinking of the Appropriations Committee prior to the time the bill was reported, and in that sense it is not in keeping with the present situation. This is unfortunate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a statement which I have prepared on the subject of the conference report on the omnibus appropriation bill.

There being no objection, Mr. O'CONOR's statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR O'CONOR

In acting today upon the conference report on the omnibus appropriations bill, the Congress of the United States has opened the way for deserved consideration to the already overburdened taxpayers of the country. With approval of the conference report it remains for the President to take decisive action to affect substantial reductions in the budget.

It is a tribute to the earnestness and patriotism of the American people that they have expressed such a general willingness to supply whatever funds are needed to see us through the emergency caused by the conflict in Korea. This state of mind entails a great responsibility on the part of the Congress and of the Executive Department of the Government. There is an imperative need for elimination of nondefense items for the saving of critical material and manpower in this time of crisis.

There is ample authority under the bill for the President to cut nondefense spending to the limit. In fact there is unmistakable evidence of the determination of the people, speaking through their elected legislative representatives that numerous projects be eliminated or reduced.

I feel it is the will of the Congress and of the people that such items should be cut to the fullest extent possible, without impairment of any essential functions of Government, and I sincerely trust that the sum of $550,000,000, recommended in the bill be realized by deferment of the nondefense projects. This action by the Executive will go far to convince the citizenry of the readiness of Government to curtail in times of grave emergency.

In this connection I ask that an editorial from this morning's Baltimore Sun entitled

"Nondefense Spending Is the Place To Save" be inserted in the RECORD as an appendix to my remarks, as follows:

"NONDEFENSE SPENDING IS THE PLACE TO SAVE

"Now that the House has passed the $16,771,384,479 emergency defense bill we begin to realize what the operation in Korea and other defense measures are going to cost us. This is just a beginning. We are warned that the Defense Department is preparing an additional request for approximately $10,000,000,000.

"In his report from Washington on the action of the House, Mr. William Knighton, Jr., calls attention to the unpleasant prospect that the total budget for the fiscal year ending next June 30 will be around $70,000,000,000. In short, $20,000,000,000 to $25,000,000,000 are being added to military outlay.

"It should be obvious that with this vast emergency expenditure for defense involving all-out war in Korea, partial mobilization and arms for our allies, life in this country cannot go on without change. Unless we are to invite financial disaster drastic efforts must be made to meet a part of these excessive expenditures as they occur.

"Without question there must be an increase in taxes. The Senate is debating a bill that would raise personal income taxes by $2,700,000,000 and corporation taxes by $1,500,000,000 for a total of $4,200,000,000. But that will go a small way to balance the emergency defense costs.

"Another means of bringing expenditures more into line with income is to cut down on nondefense expenditures. Attention already has been called here to the claim of Senator BYRD, of Virginia, that nondefense spending can be cut as much as $10,000,000,000. Yet, he says, that would still leave the administration as much to spend for its domestic schemes as it had in 1948.

"It is not necessary to check Senator BYRD's estimate to the exact dollar to know that there are many public works projects and other programs for the outlay of Federal funds that are not urgent. They have nothing to do with national defense. They could easily wait until more propitious times. But as yet, little more than a start has been made in this direction. Our best efforts at defense will be useless if they result in national bankruptcy. Our enemies know that all too well. The safeguard is to cut down on nondefense spending."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I shall not, so far as I am personally concerned, ask a record vote on the adoption of the conference report. I think it is quite evident from the speeches of Senators today that there is dissatisfaction with certain sections of the report. I think there is an over-all need of passing the bill; as has been stated, the major portion of the bill is satisfactory. On most points the conference committee did a good job; but I think what I said earlier, and what other Senators have said, should show that there is dissatisfaction with some parts of the report which are very fundamental. I think the necessity for the adoption of the report and the fact that such an excellent job was done on most sections of it warrants the position I take in not asking for a record vote.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, as a member of the conference on the omnibus appropriation bill, I desire to make a few remarks.

I am not satisfied with the report. I feel that $550,000,000 is not a sufficient reduction in the nonessential expenditures provided for by the bill. There are other items with which the Senator from Michigan is not at all pleased, but he had to come to the conclusion, after the sessions with the House conferees, that it was necessary to take the bill as it now stands. Otherwise, we would be unable to agree upon the report.

That does not mean, Mr. President, that we do not at times have to compromise on some figures. I hope the President of the United States, when he receives the bill, will revamp his thinking and that the Budget Director and his organization will revamp their thinking as to where they can cut certain items and reduce the cost of Government. I have come to the conclusion that it is very difficult, if not impossible, for committees to take the fat out of the cost of Government. Every department which appears before the committee lays stress upon the fact that every item is essential; every project must be given its full amount in order that the agency requesting the appropriation may function at all. That is not a fact, but we are unable to get from the witnesses who come before the committee any idea as to where we can cut the budget.

Last year the Senator from Michigan was of the opinion that there should be a cut very similar to the one recommended this year, and that the President of the United States should do the cuting, because he would be able to eliminate the excess and get down to rock bottom. The Senate thought otherwise. This year there may be a reason why the President will decide actually to take $550,000,000 out of the various funds. Let me say, for one, that if he should take much more out, $550,000,000 should not be a limitation; it should be only a suggestion. He will find many places in which he can eliminate more than that amount. He saw last year places in the defense budget amounting to more than a billion dollars, which could be eliminated, and he said he would not expend the amount. Therefore, Mr. President, I hope he will find in the civilian end of the budget this year that there are items as to which he can save money, that it is unnecessary to spend the full amount of money which we have appropriated and which we shall appropriate for national defense, and that he can save more than a billion dollars, even though we have limited the reduction he may make to $550,000,000.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Was not the Byrd-Bridges amendment, on which the Senator from Michigan worked so hard over a number of months, the most practical method which could be found by the group who worked on it, without hurting any Government agency or any of the defense departments involved?

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan feels that the Byrd-Bridges amendment, of which he was a cosponsor, together with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], was the ideal way of saving a part of the cost of government without in any way adversely affecting the Defense Department or any of the other essential departments of government; but in the conference committee we discovered that the House conferees argued about the method we had been using, which was, in effect, a scientific method, which had been taken up with the Office of the Comptroller General, with the Office of the Director of the Budget, and had been worked out so that it would not create any hardship. They had a small rider they wished to insert which would not compel the President to do the cutting, so that no one would be on the spot.

It is the old practice of passing the buck. We could have made the cut under a scientific method. That was the proper way of doing it. However, it could not be done that way, and therefore it was essential that we take the bill as we find it now.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the distinguished Senator from Michigan agree—and I am satisfied that I should also ask the same question of the Senator from Massachusetts, in view of the fact that he raised the question—that approving the conference report in no way convinces the Senator from Michigan, the Senator from Massachusetts, or the Senator from Nebraska that the formula which was submitted is not the proper way to make the cuts in the appropriations. If the conference report is adopted without a record vote, it does not mean that the Senator from Michigan is repudiating in any way the formula that ought to be used in making cuts in appropriation bills. To the contrary, we are accepting the conference report because apparently there is no other way of getting the bill passed.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Nebraska is correct. It is not a repudiation. If I had the right to vote on a method of effecting cuts in the appropriation bill, I would vote to do it under the Bridges-Byrd amendment, because I think that is the proper way. However, in the Senate of the United States one does not always get a vote on the exact issue involved. Sometimes we get a vote, as we are getting one today, on what it is possible to get through the Senate. Therefore if we can save $550,000,000, as I said before, as a suggestion to the President that Congress wants a cut in unnecessary expenditures, he should do the rest and make a real cut in expenditures.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, in connection with the pending conference report, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the RECORD a letter from Mr. Paul G. Hoffman, administrator of the Economic Cooperation Administration.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECONOMIC COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., August 28, 1950.

Hon. TOM CONNALLY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CONNALLY: The news which greeted me upon my return to Washington that the Congress is considering a further

$200,000,000 cut in the ECA appropriation came as a great shock. We requested from the Senate Appropriations Committee an appropriation of $2,653,000,000. Since that request was made, prices of goods to be purchased under the program (largely in the United States of America) have increased by approximately $300,000,000. That means, of course, that there must be a cutback in the goods supplied under the program to offset this increased cost. Then the Senate made a further cut of $203,000,000, which, of course, involved another cutback. Now an additional cut of $200,000,000 is proposed. I would be derelict in my duties as administrator of ECA if I did not state that this latest cut represents a serious threat to the effectiveness of our program.

It is also proposed that there be a reduction of ECA administrative funds by $1,250,000. This comes at a time when the administrative task of ECA has become more difficult and complicated as a result of superimposing an intensive rearmament effort upon our program for economic recovery. We will, of course, continue to operate this program as economically as possible, but if we are effectively to supervise the expenditure of funds entrusted to us, it may be necessary to apply to Congress after the first of the year for additional administrative funds.

I stated that the cuts made in the ECA appropriation came as a shock to me. I was shocked because these cuts indicated that too many people have not yet recognized that to safeguard the security of the United States we must not only step up our military program, but also our programs in the economic, political and informational fields in those areas of the world vital to our security, which certainly include the areas in which ECA now operates. In those areas, we must, in my opinion, help (1) to build up the military strength so that aggression can successfully be resisted, (2) to build up economic strength so the people will have a real incentive to resist communism, and (3) to promote an understanding through intensive informational activities of the advantages to them of democracy and of the perils of communism.

In closing, I would like to extend my thanks to you as chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the other members of your committee, and all those Senators who have fought so stalwartly for the Economic Cooperation Administration.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL G. HOFFMAN, *Administrator.*

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 7786, which was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered

(Chapter II) 11, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 23, 26, 28, 39, 46, 47, 48, 49, 51;

(Chapter III) 94, 107;

(Chapter V) 142, 148, 151;

(Chapter VI) 157, 166, 201, 223, 224, 232, 234;

(Chapter VII) 254, 275, 277, 278, 279, 285, 295, 300, 302, 306;

(Chapter VIII) 342, 353;

(Chapter IX) 398;

(Chapter X) 417, 418, 451, 456;

(Chapter X–B) 474, 478, 480, 481, 482, 483, 485, 486, 488; to the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In line 13 of the Senate amendment, strike out "$832,000" and insert the following: "$722,000, and the affairs of the Joint Committee on Foreign Economic Cooperation, provided for in Senate Resolution 298, Eighty-first Congress, shall be liquidated not later than August 31, 1950."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 68, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert: "of which sum $100,000 may be available for the purpose of preserving friendships with the peoples of western European countries by means of radio broadcasts, said programs to be created and produced under the supervision and control of the Department of State by experienced private international broadcasting organizations; and"

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 72, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$1,000,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 92, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: "$17,500."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 175, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken by said amendment insert the following: ", including $30,000 for the acquisition of land and construction of buildings for inspection of livestock at Canadian border ports of entry."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 189, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: "$1,250,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 192, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: "$750,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 198, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: "$700,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 200, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: "$41,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 209, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: "$8,315,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 215, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken by said amendment insert the following: ": *Provided further,* That not to exceed 5 percent of the allocation for the agricultural conservation program for any county may be allotted with the approval of the State committee to the Soil Conservation Service for services of its technicians in formulating and carrying out the agricultural conservation program and the funds so allotted shall not be utilized by the Soil Conservation Service for any purpose other than technical and other assistance in such county."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 238, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the words "on or before August 1, 1950" in said amendment insert the following: "within 30 days after enactment of this act."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 284, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert: "payment, except as otherwise provided for, of compensation and expense of persons on the rolls of the Bureau of Reclamation appointed as authorized by law to represent the United States in the negotiation and administration of interstate compacts without reimbursement or return under the reclamation laws;".

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 288, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken out and proposed by said amendment insert: ": *Provided,* That no part of any appropriation made herein shall be available pursuant to the act of April 19, 1945 (43 U. S. C. 377), for expenses other than those incurred on behalf of specific reclamation projects except $7,200,000 under the head 'General administrative expenses' and $1,193,205 ($197,925 for reconnaissance, $769,080 for basin surveys, and $226,200 for general engineering and research) under the head 'General investigations.'"

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 289, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In the last line of the matter proposed by said amendment, before the period, insert: ": *Provided,* That amounts equal to the value of all property transferred hereunder and used shall be charged, in the same manner as appropriations are charged, as part of the construction or appropriate other costs of the Columbia Basin project, such value to be determined by appraisal approved by the Administrator of General Services of the market value of such property current at the time of transfer hereunder less expenditures on such property by the Bureau of Reclamation prior to such transfer."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 319, and concur to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Displaced Persons Commission: For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended by the act of June 16, 1950 (Public Law 555), including personal services and rents in the District of Columbia; travel expenses, including travel expenses outside continental United States without regard to the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, as amended, and the rates of per diem allowances under the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926, as amended; purchase (not to exceed three) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; printing and binding, including printing and binding outside the continental limits of the United States without regard to section 11 of the act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111); expenses incident to the primary and secondary education of American children who are dependents of Government personnel paid from this appropriations and stationed overseas; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672); health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); employment of aliens; and

payment of rent in foreign countries in advance; $8,000,000: *Provided,* That allocations may be made from this appropriation by the Commission upon approval by the Bureau of the Budget to any department, agency, corporation, or independent establishment of the Government for direct expenditure for the purposes of this appropriation, and any such expenditures may be made under the specific authority herein contained or under the authority governing the activities of the department, agency, corporation, or independent establishment to which amounts are allocated: *Provided further,* That the Commission may enter into agreements with United States governmental agencies and may make payment in advance or by reimbursement for expenses incurred by such agencies in rendering assistance to the Commission in carrying out the provisions of this act."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 337 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: $4,350,000".

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 338 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: "$1,324,000".

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 345 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: "$9,889,600 (and any part of the amounts of $100,000 for valuations of pipelines, and $3,831,920 for the work of the Bureau of Motor Carriers, contained in this paragraph, may be transferred as the Commission may determine for carrying out other functions of the Commission)."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 354 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "or, in any case involving charges of such collaboration or disloyalty which have not been adjudicated by any such court, where the Commission, after hearing and evidence, certifies that it is satisfied that the person so charged is guilty of such collaboration or disloyalty."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 361 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: ": *Provided,* That not to exceed $64,875,000 of the funds and contract authority made available for new ship construction, including reconditioning and betterment, in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1950, shall continue to be available until December 31, 1950: *Provided further,* That no part of this appropriation or contract authorization shall be used (1) to start any new ship construction for which an estimate was not included in the budget for the current fiscal year; or (2) to start any new ship construction the currently estimated cost of which exceeds by 10 percent the estimated cost included therefor in such budget unless the Director of the Bureau of the Budget specifically approves the start of such ship construction and the Director shall submit forthwith a detailed explanation thereof to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and of the House of Representatives; and, as used herein, the term 'budget' includes the detailed justification supporting the budget estimates."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 363 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: ": *Provided further,* That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be available for obligation, nor any obligation made, for the payment of an operating-differential subsidy for any number of ships in excess of the number of 263, unless a certificate has been received from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, that an operating-differential subsidy is required for a larger number of such ships in connection with national defense."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 373 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: "$15,024,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 388 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In line 13 of said amendment, and after the figure $76,000, change the colon to a period and strike out the remainder of the paragraph.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 399 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In line 2 of said amendment strike out the words "not to exceed 23."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 467 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

Strike out the language proposed by the said amendment and insert in lieu thereof the following: "'During the current fiscal year, appropriations, funds, and contract authorizations, available for military functions under the Department of Defense, shall not be subject to the provisions of subsection (c) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by section 1111 of this act.'"

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 471 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in line 15 of said amendment insert "$2,250,000,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 472 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in line 6 of said amendment insert "$62,500,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 473 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$14,000,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 475 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$500,000,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 476 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert ": *Provided further,* That after November 1, 1950, no funds herein appropriated shall be made available to any nation of which a dependent area fails in the opinion of the President to comply with any treaty to which the United States and such dependent area are parties."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 477 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert ": *Provided further,* That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be used to provide assistance to any participating country which, in the opinion of the President, has failed, refused, or neglected to support the United Nations in resisting aggression."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 68, 72, 92, 175, 189, 192, 198, 200, 209, 215, 238, 284, 288, 289, 319, 337, 338, 345, 354, 361, 363, 373, 388, 399, 467, 471, 472, 473, 475, 476, and 477.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator wish to be recognized on his motion?

Mr. McKELLAR. I think not. They are all inconsequential amendments. The one disagreement will be explained by the Senator from Nevada in a few moments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In lieu of the matter proposed by the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, it is proposed to insert the following:

Eight hundred and thirty-two thousand dollars, and the affairs of the Joint Committee on Foreign Economic Cooperation, provided for in Senate Resolution 298, Eighty-first Congress, shall be liquidated not later than August 31, 1950.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate agree to the amendment proposed by me to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands it is the remaining amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is on what is known as the watchdog committee. It will be explained by the Senator from Nevada, the chairman of the subcommittee. It is the only remaining amendment in the conference report.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this is an amendment adopted by the House with reference to the watchdog committee, which would eliminate the joint committee. The amendment which came over from the House reduced the amount of the appropriation by $100,000. The Senate amendment would reinstate the $100,000, to which we understand the House will agree. However, the Senate agrees that the watchdog committee as a joint committee will, under the language of the Senate amendment, go out of business.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. May I inquire where the money is to come from? Under the present arrangement, does it come out of the contingent fund?

Mr. McCARRAN. It is an appropriation which goes into the contingent fund of the Senate, the same as any other appropriation that goes to the contingent fund.

Mr. LUCAS. The joint committee would be eliminated by the adoption of the amendment?

Mr. McCARRAN. It would go out of business on August 31, 1950, by the adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. LUCAS. We would have a watchdog committee composed of Senators only?

Mr. McCARRAN. Probably we would have a watchdog committee composed only of Senators.

Mr. LUCAS. How much is involved in the amendment? What is the total amount involved?

Mr. McCARRAN. One hundred and ten thousand dollars.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am not quite clear what is happening. As a member of the watchdog committee, may I inquire what responsibility we are assuming?

Mr. McCARRAN. The language of the amendment adopted on the floor of the House would eliminate the joint committee entirely. As the Senator will recall, in July or August the House passed an appropriation bill declaring that the joint committee should wind up its affairs on June 31 of this year. In the meantime the Senate passed a resolution giving the joint committee $130,000 to carry on its work. In order to get that money it had to go into the contingent fund of the Senate.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Was that action taken by the watch dog committee when the Senator from New Jersey was absent? I do not recall any action authorizing that appropriation.

Mr. McCARRAN. It was taken by the Committee on Appropriations, providing $130,000 to continue the work of the watch dog committee. It came entirely out of the contingent fund of the Senate. It did not come about by the joint action of the House and Senate. It came entirely out of the contingent fund of the Senate. The House amendment strikes out the language which would continue the joint Committee, strikes out $110,000 from the appropriations which would go into the contingent fund of the Senate and declares that the affairs of the joint committee shall be terminated on August 31. That is the language of the House amendment. In the meeting today of the Committee on Appropriations the committee decided to accept the language of the House, thereby doing away with the joint committee, but restored the $110,000 to the contingent fund of the Senate. The Senate Committee on Appropriations can do as it likes about watching its own appropriations.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. May I understand what we are doing? Do I understand what is left of the watch dog committee is only the Senate part of it, and the committee will have $130,000 to spend for its operations?

Mr. McCARRAN. No.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Is that still in abeyance?

Mr. McCARRAN. The joint committee goes out of business. Therefore the entire committee goes out of business. It applies to both the Senate and the House parts of the committee. As I understand, it will go out of business by August 31, 1950. As chairman of that committee, I say I think we are in a position so that we can finish the business of the committee by August 31, and the balance we have on hand will go into the contingent fund of the Senate.

The House struck $110,000 completely out of the appropriation for the contingent fund of the Senate. The House is now content that we restore the $110,000 to the contingent fund of the Senate, but we agreed to the language of the House which abolishes the joint committee.

The House language is really an amendment to a legislative bill. We could have amended it, but we did not do so. We thought it best not to hold up the appropriation bill, but rather to agree to the House language, let the joint committee go out of business, and the Committee on Appropriations, if it sees fit, can set up its own committee, or do as it likes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I wish to make a statement, in view of what the Senator from New Jersey has said about having a joint committee, which has taken no action whatever on this appropriation, yet the Committee on Appropriations assumed the jurisdiction to appropriate $110,000 for a committee that is not in existence.

Mr. McCARRAN. I beg the Senator's pardon for interrupting——

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator is in error. Let me again clear the atmosphere as best I can. By the language inserted by the House, the joint committee goes out of business. By the change which the Senate committee would suggest, we restore $110,000 to the contingent fund of the Senate, that is all. We give nothing to the joint committee whatever. The joint committee goes out of business.

Mr. LUCAS. Who is going to handle the $110,000 if the joint committee is out of business?

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senate of the United States.

Mr. LUCAS. Another committee will have to be appointed if a watchdog committee is desired?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes; if the Senate wants a watchdog committee, another committee will have to be appointed. It can be appointed by the Committee on Appropriations or by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I think I understand the situation. I was under the impression in the beginning that $110,000 had been appropriated for a committee that was not in existence; but the Senator from Nevada has explained that the $110,000 goes into the contingent fund.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. The Committee on Appropriations has agreed that that be done. Perhaps that is the best thing to do. However, the committee that has been called the watchdog committee, according to what the Senator from New Jersey has said, has had nothing to say about this particular $110,000 item.

I thought it was a mistake for the Congress to appropriate money for the joint committee out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and I so stated on the floor of the Senate when this matter was up a couple of months ago. It did not seem to me to be the way to do business. In other words, we were paying all the freight.

I am very glad we have gotten completely out from under the joint committee, and are now appropriating a certain amount of money to go into the contingent fund. Whether or not the committee will be established remains for the Senate to say in the future.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to.

The Presiding Officer laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 272, which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Clerk of the House of Representatives in the enrollment of H. R. 7786, the general appropriation bill, 1951, is authorized and directed to correct chapter and section numbers.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate agree to the concurrent resolution.

The motion was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 3659) to amend title IV of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, as amended, so as to provide for the issuance of dealers' identification tags for use on trailers, to provide for the revocation and suspension of dealers' registration and identification tags, to change the fee for dealers' identification tags, to provide for the issuance of special use identification tags, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 2887. An act to amend the Architects' Registration Act for the District of Columbia in order to safeguard life, health, and property, and to promote the public welfare;

H. R. 6804. An act for the relief of certain Italian aliens;

H. R. 7447. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, with respect to sound-recording materials for use in connection with moving-picture exhibits and news reels; and

H. R. 8726. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to exempt from duty sound recordings for news broadcasts.

The message further announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 6343. An act relating to customs duties on articles coming into the United States from the Virgin Islands;

H. R. 6832. An act for the relief of Choko Nishida; and

ing particularly about what is described here as big-time gambling.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

[Mr. TACKETT addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(By unanimous consent the pro forma amendments were withdrawn.)

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further amendments, under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. JACKSON of Washington, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 3357) to prohibit transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce, pursuant to House Resolution 807, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not the chair will put them en grosse.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BARING. I am opposed to the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualified. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BARING moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for further study and investigation.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BARING) there were—yeas 10, noes 116.

So the motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 272. Concurrent resolution authorizing correction of chapter and section numbers in the enrollment of H. R. 7786.

The message also announced that the Senate had ordered that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] be excused as conferee on the bill H. R. 9176, entitled "An act to establish a system of priorities and allocations for materials and facilities, authorize the requisitioning thereof, provide financial assistance for expansion of productive capacity and supply, strengthen controls over credit, regulate speculation on commodity exchanges, and by these measures facilitate the production of goods and services necessary for the national security, and for other purposes," and the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] be appointed in his stead.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7786) entitled "An act making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 68, 72, 92, 175, 189, 192, 198, 200, 209, 215, 238, 284, 288, 289, 319, 337, 338, 345, 354, 361, 363, 373, 388, 399, 467, 471, 472, 473, 475, 476, and 477; and be it further

Resolved, That the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, with an amendment to the above-entitled bill.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes tomorrow at the conclusion of the legislative business and any special orders heretofore entered.

GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1951

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment, and consider the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Amendment No. 35: In lieu of the matter proposed by the House amendment, insert the following: "$832,000, and the affairs of the Joint Committee on Foreign Economic Cooperation, provided for in Senate Resolution 298, Eighty-first Congress, shall be liquidated not later than August 31, 1950."

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House concur in the amendment of the Senate to the amendment of the House to Senate amendment No. 35.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PUERTO RICO AND THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 3546) to extend the act of June 6, 1933 (48 Stat. 113), as amended, to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 (b) of the act of June 6, 1933 (48 Stat. 113), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(b) Whenever in this act the word 'State' or 'States' is used, it shall be understood to include Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands."

SEC. 2. Section 5 of said act is amended to read as follows:

"(a) There is authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such amounts from time to time as the Congress may deem necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

"(b) The Secretary shall from time to time certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to each State which (i), except in the case of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, has an unemployment compensation law approved by the Secretary under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act and is found to be in compliance with section 303 of the Social Security Act, as amended, and (ii) is found to be in compliance with the Act of June 6, 1933 (48 Stat. 113), as amended, such amounts as the Secretary determines to be necessary for the proper and efficient administration of its public employment offices."

SEC. 3. Sections 6 and 7 of the act are hereby repealed.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LAKE ASHTABULA

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 163) to designate the reservoir above the Baldhill Dam in North Dakota as Lake Ashtabula.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the reservoir located above the Baldhill Dam in North Dakota shall hereafter be known as Lake Ashtabula, and any law, regulation, document, or record of the United States in which such reservoir is designated or referred to shall be held to refer to such reservoir under and by the name of Lake Ashtabula.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BERNARD F. ELMERS

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4803) for the relief of Bernard F. Elmers, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. BYRNE of New York, DENTON, and KEATING.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, on last Saturday, I was unavoidably absent. If present on roll call No. 255, I would have voted "nay." This is the roll call by which the bill H. R. 9526, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, was passed.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ADMINISTRATION SUPPRESSION OF GENERAL MacARTHUR'S REPORT ON DEFENSE OF FORMOSA

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the action of President Truman directing General Douglas MacArthur to suppress his communication to the Veterans of Foreign Wars, constituting his appraisal of the necessity to defend Formosa, is an unfortunate act.

It is to be taken by the American people as another flagrant example of the incredible bungling by the administration over the past 5 years, bungling which delivered Manchuria and most of China to the Communists and which culminated in the Korean conflict. It is simply another chapter in a long series of blunders whereby sound military advice was suppressed and political decisions, in keeping with the policy of appeasing the Soviet Union, were superimposed for political reasons. It is simply another exhibit of a bankrupt leadership which suppressed the Wedemeyer report for 2 years because it urged aid for the enemies of communism in China.

General MacArthur is not only the supreme commander in Japan for the allied forces, but he is the Commander in the Field for the United Nations, and in the latter capacity has already submitted two reports to the United Nations Security Council, which is presided over by Jacob Malik, the Soviet Union's delegate. Certainly, if the Soviet Union is entitled to MacArthur's views, through Jacob Malik, then the American people likewise have a right to them.

Although the White House has authority to suppress the utterances of the military, we in America still are fortunate enough to have a free press. Therefore, I am able to hold in my hand a copy of the suppressed MacArthur communication to the Veterans of Foreign Wars, which has been printed in the United States News and World Report in its issue which will appear on the newsstands tomorrow and which was already off the press and in the mails and could not be recalled. Thus, the White House scheme to withhold General MacArthur's views has been thwarted by one of the cornerstones of American liberty, a free press.

Mr. Speaker, because of the importance of this document, I now ask unanimous consent to have General MacArthur's communication, as published in the United States News and World Report, appear in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks and the proceedings of the House.

I would call the attention of the House to one of the probable reasons for the suppression of this report. You will recall that last January 12 Secretary of State Acheson, in a speech to the National Press Club here in Washington, declared that our (and I quote) "defensive perimeter runs along the Aleutians to Japan and then goes to the Ryukyus," (unquote) thus virtually inviting the Communists to go in and take Korea and Formosa, both of which were byond Mr. Acheson's "perimeter."

General MacArthur, in his suppressed communication to the Veterans of Foreign Wars, lays down a much more realistic defense perimeter which embraces all free lands off-shore Asia in the Pacific—which, of course, includes Formosa. I would also like to call your attention to the General's words, in contrast to those of our political Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, and I quote General MacArthur: "If we hold this line, we may have peace—lose it and war is inevitable."

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I cannot conclude the rest of this statement, but I hold in my hand a copy of General MacArthur's statement which appears in the United States News and World Report of September 1, 1950, which undoubtedly will go to every part of the United States. If this publication is permitted to use it, certainly the rest of the people of the country should have it.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be incorporated in my remarks as part of my statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

(The statement is as follows:)

FORMOSA MUST BE DEFENDED—A DECLARATION BY GEN. DOUGLAS MacARTHUR, SUPREME COMMANDER IN JAPAN FOR THE ALLIED POWERS

To Clyde A. Lewis, commander in chief, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Chicago, Ill.:

Your inspiring message of the 17th has moved me deeply, and I trust that you will convey to all of my comrades in arms of the Veterans of Foreign Wars assembled on the occasion of our fifty-first annual national encampment my assurance that their confidence and support will give this command much added strength to meet the tests of battle which lie immediately ahead. Tell them that I am happy to report that their successors in arms now engaging the enemy along our battle lines in South Korea are exemplifying that same high standard of devotion, fortitude, and valor which characterized their own march to victory when they themselves engaged in combat in the field. From senior commanders down through all ranks, their tactical skill, their invincible determination, and their fighting qualities against a fanatical foe, well trained, expertly directed, and heavily armed, have upheld our country's finest traditions. Toward victory, however, difficult the road, they are giving an account of themselves which should make every American heart beat with pride and infinite satisfaction.

In view of misconceptions currently being voiced concerning the relationship of Formosa to our strategic potential in the Pacific, I believe it in the public interest to avail myself of this opportunity to state my views thereon to you, all of whom having fought overseas understand broad strategic concepts.

To begin with, any appraisal of that strategic potential requires an appreciation of the changes wrought in the course of the past war. Prior thereto the western strategic frontier of the United States lay on the littoral line of the Americas with an exposed island salient extending out through Hawaii, Midway, and Guam to the Philippines. That salient was not an outpost of strength but an avenue of weakness along which the enemy could and did attack us. The Pacific was a potential area of advance for any predatory force intent upon striking at the bordering land areas.

All of this was changed by our Pacific victory. Our strategic frontier then shifted to embrace the entire Pacific Ocean, which has become a vast moat to protect us as long as we hold it. Indeed, it acts as a protective shield for all of the Americas and all free lands of the Pacific Ocean area. We control it to the shores of Asia by a chain of islands, extending in an arc from the Aleutians to the Marianas, held by us and our allies.

From this island chain we can dominate with airpower every Asiatic port from Vladivostok to Singapore and prevent any hostile movement into the Pacific. Any predatory attack from Asia must be an amphibious effort. No amphibious force can be successful without control of the sea lanes and the air over those lanes in its avenue of advance. With naval and air supremacy and modest ground elements to defend bases, any major attack from continental Asia toward us or our friends of the Pacific would be doomed to failure.

Under such conditions the Pacific no longer represents menacing avenues of approach for a prospective invader—it assumes instead the friendly aspect of a peaceful lake. Our line of defense is a natural one and can be maintained with a minimum of military effort and expense. It envisions no attack against anyone nor does it provide the bastions essential for offensive operations, but properly maintained would be an invincible defense against aggression. If we hold this line we may have peace—lose it and war is inevitable.

The geographic location of Formosa is such that in the hands of a power unfriendly to the United States, it constitutes an enemy salient in the very center of this defensive perimeter, 100 to 150 miles closer to the adjacent friendly segments—Okinawa and the Philippines—than any point in continental Asia.

At the present time there is on Formosa a concentration of operational air and naval bases which is potentially greater than any similar concentration on the Asiatic mainland between the Yellow Sea and the Strait of Malacca. Additional bases can be developed in a relatively short time by an aggressive exploitation of all World War II Japanese facilities.

An enemy force utilizing those installations currently available could increase by 100 percent the air effort which could be directed against Okinawa as compared to operations based on the mainland and at the same time could direct damaging air attacks with fighter-type aircraft against friendly installations in the Philippines, which are currently beyond the range of fighters based on the mainland. Our air supremacy at once would become doubtful.

As a result of its geographic location and base potential, utilization of Formosa by a military power hostile to the United States may either counterbalance or overshadow the strategic importance of the central and southern flank of the United States front-line position. Formosa in the hands of such a hostile power could be compared to an unsinkable aircraft carrier and submarine tender ideally located to accomplish offensive strategy and at the same time checkmate defensive or counteroffensive operations by

COPY

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Washington, D. C., August 30, 1950.

Hon. Frederick J. Lawton,
Director, Bureau of the Budget,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Director:

The General Appropriation Act for 1951 includes section 1214, which reads:

"Appropriations, reappropriations, contract authorizations, and reauthorizations made by this act for departments and agencies in the executive branch of the Government shall, without impairing national defense, be reduced in the amount of not less than $550,000,000 through the apportionment procedure provided for in section 1211 of this act."

Under the provisions of this section it will be necessary for you, as the official empowered to make apportionments under subsection (d) of section 3679, as amended, to place in reserve and withhold from expenditure not less than $550,000,000 of the amounts provided in the general appropriation bill. In view of the fact that there has been some discussion as to how this reduction would be applied to the various items in the budget it occurs to me that I should call your attention to a few of the considerations in the legislative history of the act for your guidance in making the fund reserves contemplated.

You will recall that an amendment was offered on the floor of the House by Mr. Thomas, of Texas, requiring the President to impound $500,000,000 of funds appropriated in the bill with certain restrictions as to the amount by which single items might be reduced and also exempting items related to the national defense. As a substitute Mr. Taber, of New York, offered an amendment to make reductions totaling $600,000,000 and proceeding to specify percentage reductions in the standard budget classifications such as personal services, travel, etc. The proposal of Mr. Taber applied to every item in the budget but specifically reduced those amounts chargeable to budget classifications 1 to 9, inclusive.

Also the House adopted the so-called Jensen amendment which would have frozen 90 percent of the vacancies occurring in Federal employment during the fiscal year excepting certain exempted categories such as law-enforcement officers, hospital personnel, and so forth.

During the consideration of the bill in the Senate the Taber-Thomas and Jensen amendments were stricken from the bill and there was substituted therefor the so-called Byrd-Bridges amendment (Senate amendment No. 508) which reduced by 10 percent all appropriations in the bill except certain specified items.

The conference between the Houses was confronted with the Taber-Thomas, Jensen and Byrd-Bridges amendments, all of which were subject to inclusion, in either original or revised form, in the bill or exclusion from the bill by the conferees. After considerable discussion the conferees determined upon the language which now appears in section 1214 of the appropriation act.

I recite all this rather obvious and well-known history for the purpose of demonstrating that it is the clear intent of the Congress that the reduction imposed by section 1214 is intended to apply generally to the items in the Act. Any other interpretation would not be supported by the facts. The specific phraseology of the statute is that reduction shall be accomplished "without impairing national defense." That phrase does not necessarily mean that all items appearing in the national defense chapter of the budget are untouchable. It does mean that any item in either the national defense chapter or any other chapter of the bill which is related to the national defense shall not be reduced to the point where such reduction would impair national defense and, further, that any item in either the national defense or other chapters of the bill which can be reduced must be reduced. Every effort that has been made during the consideration of the bill in both the House and the Senate and in conference has been to obtain general reduction in the nondefense portions of the budget.

Opponents of the theory of section 1214 have stated--and I do not agree with their reasoning--that the Director of the Budget has been granted plenary powers to impose reductions wherever he may please and, in so doing, thwart the will of Congress. The Director of the Budget in discharging his responsibilities under the law is restricted in several ways. He is restricted by the law in two specifi provisions. In the first place he is required by section 3679, as amended, to apportion funds in such a manner as to avoid deficiency or supplemental appropriations except in those special cases meeting the tests of other provisions of the law and therefore beyond his control. Secondly, he is required to so apportion the funds as to achieve the most effective and economical use thereof. He is also very pointedly restricted by the force of circumstances surrounding the adoption of section 1214. It seems obvious that he must give consideration to a general revision of the nondefense portions of the budget. To fail to do so would result in failure to recognize the clear intent of Congress in enacting the legislation as every proposal for a general reduction in the budget applied across the board to every item. The only difference between section 1214 and the Taber-Thomas and Byrd-Bridges and Jensen amendments is to leave to the Director of the Budget a degree of discretion in applying the reduction so as adequately to maintain essential services of the Government. It has also been stated that the Director of the Budget can defeat the purpose of the law by deferring meeting obligations until a later date or by paper savings such as postponement of essential items which will not affect the actual expenditure of funds. To accomplish the reduction in such manner would be such an obvious violation of the spirit of the statute that no responsible official would think of it. I mention it here only because the possibility has been suggested and I want to make it clear that while technically such action might be possible it is entirely without the realm of reason when the legislative history of the law is considered.

There is an important part of the language in section 1214 which has been obscured in the publicity regarding it. The section has been generally stated to be a reduction of $550,000,000 whereas the reduction reads "not less than $550,000,000 I want to particularly call your attention to this phraseology and to point out to you that this wording places the burden on the Director of the Budget to impose reductions above and beyond $550,000,000 to such a degree as is possible without impairing national defense. The clear intent of the section is to secure as large a reduction as possible in nondefense activities and $550,000,000 is only a minimum figure. In view of the radical change in conditions since the original budget was prepared there is no alternative.

In order that the committee may be fully advised in the matter I shall appreciate it if you will send me a report showing the reserves established.

I have known you personally for a number of years and I know your personal integrity and devotion to duty so well that I realize the lack of necessity of writing this letter to you but I thought it well to record the legislative history and atmosphere surrounding the item in order that there may be no misunderstanding in the future.

Sincerely yours,

(S) Clarence Cannon,

Chairman.

[PUBLIC LAW 759—81ST CONGRESS]

[CHAPTER 896—2D SESSION]

[H. R. 7786]

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the support of the Government, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, namely:

CHAPTER I—DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

For the general fund of the District of Columbia, $9,800,000, and for the water fund, established by law (D. C. Code, title 43, ch. 15), $1,000,000, both amounts to be advanced July 1, 1950.

CHAPTER II—LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

SENATE

SALARIES AND EXPENSE ALLOWANCE OF SENATORS, MILEAGE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE AND OF SENATORS, AND EXPENSE ALLOWANCE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT

For compensation of Senators, $1,200,000.

For mileage of the President of the Senate and of Senators, $51,000.

For expense allowance of the Vice President, $10,000.

For expense allowance of Senators, $240,000.

SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

For compensation of officers, employees, clerks to Senators, and others, as authorized by law, including increased and additional compensation provided by the "Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945", as amended, and the "Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1950", as follows:

OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT

For compensation of the Vice President of the United States, $30,000.

For clerical assistance to the Vice President, at rates of compensation to be fixed by him in multiples of $5 per month, $50,370.

CHAPLAIN

Chaplain of the Senate, $2,646.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

For office of the Secretary, $355,230.

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

For professional and clerical assistance to standing committees, $1,441,040.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

For professional and clerical assistance to the Select Committee on Small Business, $88,645, authorized by S. Res. 272, agreed to May 26, 1950, at rates of compensation to be fixed hereafter in accordance with the provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, with respect to standing committees.

CONFERENCE COMMITTEES

For clerical assistance to the Conference of the Majority, at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman of said committee, $30,280.

For clerical assistance to the Conference of the Minority at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman of said committee, $30,280.

ADMINISTRATIVE AND CLERICAL ASSISTANTS TO SENATORS

For administrative and clerical assistants and messenger service for Senators, $5,036,185.

OFFICE OF SERGEANT AT ARMS AND DOORKEEPER

For office of Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, including three in lieu of two assistant chief telephone operators at $2,400 each and thirty-three in lieu of twenty-six telephone operators at $1,800 each, $1,028,205.

OFFICES OF THE SECRETARIES FOR THE MAJORITY AND THE MINORITY

For the offices of the secretary for the majority and the secretary for the minority, $57,060.

CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE

Legislative reorganization: For salaries and expenses, legislative reorganization, including the objects specified in Public Law 663, Seventy-ninth Congress, $100,000.

Senate policy committees: For salaries and expenses of the Majority Policy Committee and the Minority Policy Committee, $45,715 for each such committee; in all, $91,430.

Joint Committee on the Economic Report: For salaries and expenses of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, $125,585.

Joint Committee on Atomic Energy: For salaries and expenses of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, including the objects specified in Public Law 20, Eightieth Congress, $160,135.

Joint Committee on Printing: For salaries for the Joint Committee on Printing, $22,080, for expenses of compiling, preparing, and indexing the Congressional Directory, $1,600, and for travel and subsistence expenses at rates provided by law for Senate committees, $4,500; in all $28,180.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce: To enable the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to engage by contract the services of private firms or corporations for making a survey of

Acts of August 29, 1935, and June 24, 1937, and authorized to be appropriated to the railroad retirement account established under section 15 (a) of the latter Act, $457,832,724: *Provided*, That such total amount shall be available until expended for making payments required under said retirement Acts, and the amount not required for current payments shall be invested by the Secretary of the Treasury in accordance with the provisions of said Railroad Retirement Act of June 24, 1937.

This title may be cited as the "Railroad Retirement Board Appropriation Act, 1951".

TITLE VI—FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the Service to carry out the functions vested in it by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947 (29 U. S. C. 171–180, 182), including expenses of the Labor-Management Panel as provided in section 205 of said Act; temporary employment of arbitrators, conciliators, and mediators on labor relations at rates not in excess of $75 per diem; expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with labor and industrial relations; printing and binding; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); and payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672); $2,949,700.

Boards of inquiry: To enable the Service to pay necessary expenses of boards of inquiry appointed by the President pursuant to section 206 of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947 (29 U. S. C. 176–180, 182), including printing and binding; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); and rent in the District of Columbia, $50,000.

This title may be cited as the "Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service Appropriation Act, 1951".

This chapter may be cited as the "Labor-Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1951".

CHAPTER VI—DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

TITLE I

RESEARCH AND MARKETING ACT OF 1946

To enable the Secretary to improve and develop, independently or through cooperation among Federal and State agencies, and others, a sound and efficient system for the distribution and marketing of agricultural products under the provisions of title II of the Act of August 14, 1946, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1621–1629), including the objects for which funds are available for titles II and III of such Act of August 14, 1946, $6,000,000: *Provided*, That not less than $650,000 of this amount shall be available for contracts in accordance with the provisions of section 205 of said Act: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may make available to any bureau, office, or agency of the Department such amounts from this appropriation as may be

necessary to carry out the functions for which it is made (but amounts made available to the Office of the Secretary, Office of the Solicitor, and Office of Information, shall not exceed those which the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives of the Department, shall determine), and any such amounts shall be in addition to amounts transferred or otherwise made available to other appropriation items of the Department: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for work relating to fish or shellfish or any product thereof, except for the support of equitable transportation rates before Federal agencies concerned with such rates and for development of foreign markets.

BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

For necessary expenses in carrying out the provisions of the Act establishing the Bureau of Agricultural Economics (5 U. S. C. 673) and related Acts, as follows:

Economic investigations: For conducting investigations and for acquiring and diffusing useful information among the people of the United States, relative to agricultural production, distribution, land utilization, and conservation in their broadest aspects, including farm management and practice, utilization of farm and food products, purchasing of farm supplies, farm population and rural life, farm labor, farm finance, insurance and taxation, adjustments in production to probable demand for the different farm and food products; land ownership and values, costs, prices and income in their relation to agriculture, including causes for their variations and trends, $2,600,000: *Provided*, That no part of the funds herein appropriated or made available to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics under the heading "Economic investigations" shall be used for State and county land-use planning, for conducting cultural surveys, or for the maintenance of regional offices.

Crop and livestock estimates: For collecting, compiling, abstracting, analyzing, summarizing, interpreting, and publishing data relating to agriculture, including crop and livestock estimates, acreage, yield, grades, staples of cotton, stocks, and value of farm crops and numbers, grades, and value of livestock and livestock products on farms, production, distribution, and consumption of turpentine and rosin pursuant to the Act of August 15, 1935 (5 U. S. C. 556b), and for the collection and publication of statistics of peanuts as provided by the Act approved June 24, 1936, as amended May 12, 1938 (7 U. S. C. 951–957), $2,904,000: *Provided*, That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be available for any expense incident to ascertaining, collating, or publishing a report stating the intention of farmers as to the acreage to be planted in cotton, or for estimates of apple production for other than the commercial crop.

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR

For necessary expenses of the Office of Administrator, including the purchase of one passenger motor vehicle, travel and subsistence expenses of advisory committees authorized by title III of the Act of August 14, 1946 (7 U. S. C. 1628–1629), and the maintenance, oper-

ation, and furnishing of facilities and services at the Agricultural Research Center, $600,000: *Provided*, That the appropriation current at the time services are rendered may be reimbursed (by advance credits or reimbursements based on estimated or actual charges) from applicable appropriations, to cover the charges, including handling and other related services, for equipment rentals (including depreciation, maintenance, and repairs); for services, supplies, equipment, and material furnished: *Provided further*, That of the several appropriations of the Agricultural Research Administration, not to exceed $15,000 shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706 (a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as amended by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a): *Provided further*, That the several appropriations of the Agricultural Research Administration shall be available for the construction, alteration, and repair of buildings and improvements: *Provided, however*, That unless otherwise provided, the cost of constructing any one building (excepting headhouses connecting greenhouses) shall not exceed $5,000, the total amount for construction of buildings costing more than $2,500 each shall be within the limits of the estimates submitted and approved therefor, and the cost of altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed $2,500 or 2 per centum of the cost of the building as certified by the Research Administrator, whichever is greater.

WORKING CAPITAL FUND, AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH CENTER

For the establishment of a working capital fund, to be available without fiscal year limitation, for expenses necessary for furnishing facilities and services by the Agricultural Research Center to Government agencies, $300,000. Said fund shall be reimbursed from applicable appropriations or other funds to cover the charges for such facilities and services, including handling and related charges, for equipment rentals (including depreciation, maintenance, and repairs), for supplies, equipment and materials, stores of which may be maintained at the Center, and for building construction, alterations, and repair, and applicable appropriations or other funds may also be charged their proportionate share of the necessary general expenses of the Center not covered by the annual appropriation.

RESEARCH ON STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL AGRICULTURAL MATERIALS

For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to carry out his responsibilities under section 7 (b) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act of July 23, 1946 (50 U. S. C. 98f), $399,000, including not to exceed $30,000 for alterations at the Eastern Regional Research Laboratory, Wyndmoor, Pennsylvania, to provide pilot plant facilities for tannin extraction, and such amount shall be in addition to amounts otherwise available for alterations.

RESEARCH ON AGRICULTURAL PROBLEMS OF ALASKA

For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to conduct research into the basic agricultural needs and problems of the Territory of Alaska, through such agencies of the Department as he may designate, independently or in cooperation with appropriate agencies of the Territory of Alaska, $280,000.

OFFICE OF EXPERIMENT STATIONS

Payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico

For payments to the States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico to be paid quarterly in advance where applicable, to carry into effect the provisions of the following Acts relating to agricultural experiment stations:

Hatch, Adams, Purnell, Bankhead-Jones, and related Acts: Hatch Act, the Act approved March 2, 1887 (7 U. S. C. 362, 363, 365, 368, 377–379), $720,000; Adams Act, the Act approved March 16, 1906 (7 U. S. C. 369), $720,000; Purnell Act, the Act approved February 24, 1925 (7 U. S. C. 361, 366, 370, 371, 373–376, 380, 382), $2,880,000; Bankhead-Jones Act, title I of the Act approved June 29, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 427–427g), sections 3 and 5, $2,863,708, and sections 9 and 11 of said Act as added by the Act of August 14, 1946 (7 U. S. C. 427h, 427j), including administration by the Office of Experiment Stations in the United States Department of Agriculture, $5,000,000, no part of which latter amount shall be used for beginning construction of any building costing in excess of $15,000, except that a poultry breeding house may be constructed at Purdue University at a cost to this appropriation of not to exceed $29,000; Hawaii, the Act approved May 16, 1928 (7 U. S. C. 386–386b), extending the benefits of certain Acts of Congress to the Territory of Hawaii, $90,000; Alaska, the Act approved February 23, 1929 (7 U. S. C. 386c), extending the benefits of the Hatch Act to the Territory of Alaska, $15,000, and the provisions of section 2 of the Act approved June 20, 1936 (7 U. S. C. 369a), extending the benefits of the Adams and Purnell Acts to the Territory of Alaska, $37,500; Puerto Rico, the Act approved March 4, 1931, as amended (7 U. S. C. 386d–386f), extending the benefits of certain Acts of Congress to Puerto Rico, $90,000; in all, payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico, $12,416,208.

Salaries and Expenses

For necessary expenses in connection with administration of grants and coordination of research with States, to carry out the provisions of the Acts approved March 2, 1887, March 16, 1906, February 24, 1925, May 16, 1928, February 23, 1929, March 4, 1931, and June 20, 1936, and Acts amendatory thereto (7 U. S. C. 361–363, 365–383, 386–386f), and title I of the Act approved June 29, 1935, as amended by the Act of September 21, 1944 (7 U. S. C. 427–427g), relative to their administration and for the administration of an agricultural experiment station in Puerto Rico, $237,500; and the Secretary shall prescribe the form of the annual financial statement required under the above Acts, ascertain whether the expenditures are in accordance with their provisions, coordinate the research work of the State agricultural colleges and experiment stations in the lines authorized in said Acts with research of the Department in similar lines, and make report thereon to Congress.

Federal Experiment Station, Puerto Rico

For expenses necessary to establish and maintain an agricultural experiment station in Puerto Rico, including the preparation, illustration, and distribution of reports and bulletins, and not to exceed

$24,950 to replace water supply line and increase capacity of reservoir, $175,000.

BUREAU OF HUMAN NUTRITION AND HOME ECONOMICS

For necessary expenses in connection with conducting investigations of the relative utility and economy of agricultural products for food, clothing, and other uses in the home, with special suggestions of plans and methods for the more effective utilization of such products for these purposes, and such economic investigations, including housing and household buying, as have for their purpose the improvement of the rural home, for coordinating nutrition services made available by Federal, State, and other agencies, and for disseminating useful information on these subjects, $1,500,000.

BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY

Salaries and Expenses

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Act, as amended, establishing a Bureau of Animal Industry, and related Acts, and for investigation concerned with the livestock and meat industries and the domestic raising of fur-bearing animals, as follows:

Animal husbandry: For investigations and experiments in animal husbandry and animal and poultry feeding and breeding, and for carrying out the purposes of section 101 (b) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U. S. C. 429) authorizing cooperation with State authorities in the administration of regulations for the improvement of poultry, poultry products, and hatcheries, $2,294,000.

Diseases of animals: For scientific investigations of diseases of animals, and for investigations of tuberculin, serums, antitoxins, and analogous products, $1,325,000, including not to exceed $8,000 for the purchase of land and appurtenances near Ames, Iowa, for continuation of a hog cholera experiment station.

Animal disease control and eradication: For the control and eradication, including inspections and quarantines, of tuberculosis and paratuberculosis of animals, avian tuberculosis, Bang's disease of cattle, scabies in sheep and cattle, southern cattle ticks, hog cholera and related swine diseases, and dourine in horses, and inspection and quarantine work; for supervision of the transportation of livestock, including administration of the twenty-eight-hour law; for inspection of vessels; and for carrying out the provisions of the Act of March 4, 1913 (21 U. S. C. 151–158), relating to veterinary biological products, $7,950,000, including $30,000 for the acquisition of land and construction of buildings for inspection of livestock at Canadian border ports of entry: *Provided*, That no payment hereunder as compensation for any cattle condemned for slaughter for tuberculosis, paratuberculosis, or Bang's disease shall exceed (1) $25 for any grade animal or $50 for any purebred animal, (2) one-third of the difference between the appraised value and the value of salvage thereof, or (3) the amount paid or to be paid by the State or other cooperating agency, and no payment hereunder shall be made for any animal if at the time of test or condemnation it shall belong to or be upon the premises of any person, firm, or corporation to which it has been sold, shipped, or delivered for slaughter: *Provided further*, That inspec-

tion service shall be maintained at all stockyards having such service during the current fiscal year.

Meat inspection: For carrying out the provisions of laws relating to Federal inspection of meat and meat-food products, $12,800,000.

Marketing Agreements, Hog Cholera Virus and Serum

The sum of $49,300 of the appropriation made by section 12 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, approved May 12, 1933 (7 U. S. C. 612), is hereby made available during the fiscal year for which appropriations are herein made to carry into effect sections 56 to 60, inclusive, of the Act approved August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 851–855).

Eradication of Foot-and-Mouth and Other Contagious Diseases of Animals

For expenses necessary in the arrest and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, rinderpest, contagious pleuropneumonia, or other contagious or infectious diseases of animals, or European fowl pest and similar diseases in poultry, including the payment of claims growing out of past and future purchases and destruction of animals (including poultry) affected by or exposed to, or of materials contaminated by or exposed to, any such disease, wherever found and irrespective of ownership, under like or substantially similar circumstances, when such owner has complied with all lawful quarantine regulations; and for foot-and-mouth disease and rinderpest programs undertaken pursuant to the provisions of the Act of February 28, 1947 (21 U. S. C. Supp. II, 114b–114d), and the Act of May 29, 1884, as amended (7 U. S. C., 391; 21 U. S. C., 111–122), including expenses in accordance with section 2 of said Act of February 28, 1947, the Secretary may transfer from other appropriations or funds available to the bureaus, corporations, or agencies of the Department such sums as he may deem necessary, to be available only in an emergency which threatens the livestock or poultry industry of the country, and any unexpended balances of funds transferred under this head in the next preceding fiscal year shall be merged with such transferred amounts: *Provided*, That, except for payments made pursuant to said Act of February 28, 1947, the payment for such animals hereafter purchased may be made on appraisement based on the meat, egg-production, dairy, or breeding value, but in case of appraisement based on breeding value no appraisement of any such animal shall exceed three times its meat, egg-production, or dairy value, and, except in case of an extraordinary emergency, to be determined by the Secretary, the payment by the United States Government for any such animals shall not exceed one-half of any such appraisements: *Provided further*, That poultry may be appraised in groups when the basis for appraisal is the same for each bird.

BUREAU OF DAIRY INDUSTRY

For necessary expenses in carrying out the provisions of the Act of May 29, 1924 (7 U. S. C. 401–404), including investigations, experiments, and demonstrations in dairy industry, for carrying out the applicable provisions of the Act of May 9, 1902 (26 U. S. C. 2325, 2326 (c)), relating to process or renovated butter, as amended, and the Act of May 23, 1908 (21 U. S. C. 94 (a)), insofar as it relates to the exportation of process or renovated butter, $1,617,500.

BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL AND INDUSTRIAL CHEMISTRY

For expenses necessary for investigations, experiments, and demonstrations established under the provisions of section 202 (a) to 202 (e), inclusive, of title II of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U. S. C. 1292); for the development of new and extended food, feed, and industrial uses for agricultural commodities, both plant and animal, and potential replacement crops, and processing, biological, chemical, physical, pharmacological, toxicological, and technological investigation thereof, $7,960,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed $20,000 shall be available for the alteration to buildings of the Naval Stores Station at Olustee, Florida.

BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY, SOILS, AND AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING

For expenses necessary for investigations, experiments, and demonstrations in connection with the production and improvement of farm crops and other plants and plant industries; soils and soil-plant relationships, and the application of engineering principles to agriculture; plant diseases, including nematodes, and methods for their prevention and control; plant and plant-disease collections, and surveys; the distribution of weeds and means for their control; methods of handling, processing, transportation, and storage of agricultural products; and plants in foreign countries and our possessions for introduction into the United States, including explorations and surveys, and propagation and testing in this country; and for the operation and maintenance of airplanes, as follows:

Field crops: For investigations on the production, improvement, and diseases of alfalfa, barley, clover, corn, cotton, flax, grasses, oats, rice, rubber crops, sorghums, soybeans, sugar beets, sugarcane, tobacco, wheat, and other field crops, $3,437,500.

Fruit, vegetable, and specialty crops: For investigations on the production, improvement, and diseases of fruit, vegetable, nut, ornamental, and related crops and plants, $3,012,500.

Forest diseases: For investigations of diseases of forest and shade trees and forest products, and methods for their control, $452,500.

Soils, fertilizers, and irrigation: For investigations of soil management methods to increase and maintain productivity, including fertilization, liming, crop rotations, tillage practices, and other means of improving soils; fertilizers, fertilizer ingredients, and their improvement for agricultural use; soil management and crop production on dry and irrigated lands, and the quality of irrigation water and its use by crops; and for the classification of soils in a national system and indication of their extent and distribution on maps, and determination of their potential productivity under adapted cropping and improved soil management, $2,723,750, including not to exceed $100,000 for construction or acquisition of buildings, facilities, and equipment for the station at Brawley, California.

Agricultural engineering: For investigations involving the application of engineering principles to agriculture, including farm power and equipment, rural water supply and sanitation, and rural electrification; farm buildings and their appurtenances and buildings for processing and storing farm products, and the preparation and distribution of building plans and specifications; cotton ginning, and other

engineering problems relating to the production, processing, transportation, and storage of agricultural products; $1,130,000.

National Arboretum: For the maintenance and development of the National Arboretum established under the provisions of the Act approved March 4, 1927 (20 U. S. C. 191–194), $152,700.

BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY AND PLANT QUARANTINE

Salaries and Expenses

For expenses necessary for investigations, experiments, demonstrations, and surveys for the promotion of economic entomology, for investigating and ascertaining the best means of destroying insects and related pests injurious to agriculture, for importing useful and beneficial insects and bacterial, fungal, and other diseases of insects and related pests, for investigating and ascertaining the best means of destroying insects affecting man and animals, and the best ways of utilizing beneficial insects, for carrying into effect the provisions of the Plant Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912, as amended (7 U. S. C. 151–167), the Honey Bee Act (7 U. S. C. 281–283), the Insect Pest Act (7 U. S. C. 141–144), the Mexican Border Act (7 U. S. C. 149), and the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U. S. C. 147a), as amended, authorizing the eradication, control, and prevention of spread of injurious insects and plant pests; including the operation and maintenance of airplanes and the purchase of not to exceed two, as follows:

Insect investigations: For the investigation of insects affecting fruits, grapes, nuts, trees, shrubs, forests and forest products, truck and garden crops, cereal, forage and range crops, cotton, tobacco, sugar plants, ornamental and other plants and agricultural products, household possessions, and man and animals; for bee culture and apiary management; for classifying, identifying, and collecting information to determine the distribution and abundance of insects; for investigations in connection with introduction of natural enemies of injurious insects and related pests and for the exchange with other countries of useful and beneficial insects and other arthropods; for developing methods, equipment, and apparatus to aid in enforcing plant quarantines and in the eradication and control of insect pests and plant diseases; and for investigations of insecticides and fungicides, including methods of their manufacture and use and the effects of their application, $4,157,500: *Provided*, That of the amount allotted for oriental fruitfly, not to exceed $250,000 may be used for contracts with public or private agencies for research without regard to provisions of existing law, and the amounts obligated for contract research shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That $50,000 shall be transferred to applicable appropriations of the Public Health Service for investigations and studies of effects of insecticidal and fungicidal residue on human health.

Insect and plant-disease control: For carrying out operations or measures to eradicate, suppress, control, or to prevent or retard the spread of Japanese beetle, sweetpotato weevil, Mexican fruitflies, phony peach and peach mosaic, cereal rusts, pink bollworm and Thurberia weevil, golden nematode, citrus blackfly, white-fringed beetle, and the Hall scale, including the enforcement of quarantine regulations and cooperation with States to enforce plant quarantines

as authorized by the Plant Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912, as amended (7 U. S. C. 151–167), and including the establishment of such cotton-free areas as may be necessary to stamp out any infestation of the pink bollworm as authorized by the Act of February 8, 1930 (46 Stat. 67), and for cooperation with States in the compensation of growers for losses resulting from the destruction of or for not planting potatoes and tomatoes on lands infested or exposed to infestations of the golden nematode for the purpose authorized by the Golden Nematode Act (Public Law 645, approved June 15, 1948), and for the enforcement of domestic plant quarantines through inspection in transit, including the interception and disposition of materials found to have been transported interstate in violation of Federal plant quarantine laws or regulations, and operations under the Terminal Inspection Act (7 U. S. C. 166), $4,450,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay the cost or value of trees, farm animals, farm crops, or other property injured or destroyed, except potatoes and tomatoes as authorized under the Golden Nematode Act: *Provided further*, That, in the discretion of the Secretary, no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the control of sweetpotato weevil in any State until such State has provided cooperation necessary to accomplish this purpose, or for barberry eradication until a sum or sums at least equal to such expenditures shall have been appropriated, subscribed, or contributed by States, counties, or local authorities, or by individuals or organizations for the accomplishment of this purpose, or with respect to the golden nematode except as prescribed in section 4 of the Golden Nematode Act.

Foreign plant quarantines: For operations against the introduction of insect pests or plant diseases into the United States, including the enforcement of foreign-plant quarantines and regulations promulgated under sections 5 and 7 of the Plant Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912, as amended (7 U. S. C. 151–167), the Insect Pest Act of 1905 (7 U. S. C. 141–144), and the Mexican Border Act of 1942 (7 U. S. C. 149), for enforcement of domestic-plant quarantines as they pertain to Territories of the United States and enforcement of regulations governing the movement of plants into and from the District of Columbia promulgated under section 15 of the Plant Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912, as amended, and for inspection and certification of plants and plant products to meet the sanitary requirements of foreign countries, as authorized in section 102 of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U. S. C. 147a), $2,354,700.

Control of Emergency Outbreaks of Insects and Plant Diseases

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the joint resolution approved May 9, 1938 (7 U. S. C. 148–148e), including the operation and maintenance of airplanes and the purchase of not to exceed two, and surveys and control operations in Canada in cooperation with the Canadian Government or local Canadian authorities, and the employment of Canadian citizens, $2,100,000, of which $1,250,000 shall be apportioned for use pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes for the purposes of said joint resolution only to the extent that the Secretary, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, finds necessary to meet emergency conditions.

CONTROL OF FOREST PESTS

For expenses necessary for carrying out operations, measures, or surveys necessary to eradicate, suppress, control, or to prevent or retard the spread of insects or diseases which endanger forest trees on any lands in the United States, and for such quarantine measures relating thereto as may be necessary pursuant to the Plant Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912, as amended (7 U. S. C. 151–167), including the purchase (not to exceed three) and operation and maintenance of airplanes, construction and alteration of necessary buildings, not to exceed $23,500 for the purchase of one building at Greenfield, Massachusetts: *Provided*, That the cost of constructing or altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed $2,500, as follows:

Gypsy and brown-tail moths: Gypsy and brown-tail moths, pursuant to section 102 of the Act of September 21, 1944 (7 U. S. C. 147a), $560,000.

Forest Pest Control Act: For carrying out the provisions of the Act approved June 25, 1947 (16 U. S. C., Supp. I, 594–1—594–5), $1,650,000, of which $750,000 shall be apportioned for use pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes for the purposes of said Act only to the extent that the Secretary, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, finds necessary to meet emergency conditions.

White pine blister rust: White pine blister rust, pursuant to the Act of April 26, 1940 (16 U. S. C. 594a), $3,490,000, of which amount $537,050 shall be available to the Department of the Interior for the control of white pine blister rust on or endangering Federal lands under the jurisdiction of that Department or lands of Indian tribes which are under the jurisdiction of or retained under restrictions of the United States; $1,837,475 of said amount to the Forest Service for the control of white pine blister rust on or endangering lands under its jurisdiction; and $1,115,475 of said amount to the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine for leadership and general coordination of the entire program, method development, and for operations conducted under its direction for such control, including, but not confined to, the control of white pine blister rust on or endangering State and privately owned lands.

FOREST SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary including not to exceed $10,000 for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706 (a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as amended by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); to experiment and make investigations and report on forestry, national forests, forest fires, and lumbering, but no part of this appropriation shall be used for any experiment or test made outside the jurisdiction of the United States; to advise the owners of woodlands as to the proper care of the same; to investigate and test American timber and timber trees and their uses, and methods for the preservative treatment of timber; to seek, through investigations and the planting of native and foreign species, suitable trees for the treeless regions; to erect necessary buildings: *Provided*, That the cost of any building purchased, erected, or as improved,

exclusive of the cost (not to exceed $1,000) of constructing a water-supply or sanitary system and of connecting the same with any such building, and exclusive of the cost of any tower upon which a lookout house may be erected, shall not exceed $15,000, with the exception that any building erected, purchased, or acquired, the cost of which was $15,000 or more, may be improved out of the appropriations made under this chapter for the Forest Service by an amount not to exceed 2 per centum of the cost of such building as certified by the Chief of the Forest Service, and that not to exceed $8,000 may be expended for the installation of an elevator in the Yeon Avenue warehouse in Portland, Oregon; to protect, administer, and improve the national forests, including tree planting and other measures to prevent erosion, drift, surface wash, soil waste, and the formation of floods, and to conserve water; to ascertain the natural conditions upon and utilize the national forests, to transport and care for fish and game supplied to stock the national forests or the waters therein; to collate, digest, report, and illustrate the results of experiments and investigations made by the Forest Service, as follows:

General administrative expenses: For general administration, including expenses of the National Forest Reservation Commission as authorized by section 14 of the Act of March 1, 1911 (16 U. S. C. 514), $665,000.

National forest protection and management: For the administration, protection, use, maintenance, improvement, and development of the national forests, including the establishment and maintenance of forest tree nurseries, including the procurement of tree seed and nursery stock by purchase, production, or otherwise, seeding and tree planting and the care of plantations and young growth; the operation and maintenance of aircraft and the purchase of not to exceed three; the maintenance of roads and trails and the construction and maintenance of all other improvements necessary for the proper and economical administration, protection, development, and use of the national forests, including experimental areas under Forest Service administration, except that where direct purchases will be more economical than construction, improvements may be purchased; the construction (not to exceed $15,000 for any one structure), equipment, and maintenance of sanitary and recreational facilities; timber cultural operations; development and application of fish and game management plans; propagation and transplanting of plants suitable for planting on semiarid portions of the national forests; estimating and appraising of timber and other resources and development and application of plans for their effective management, sale, and use; examination, classification, surveying, and appraisal of land incident to effecting exchanges authorized by law and of lands within the boundaries of the national forests that may be opened to homestead settlement and entry under the Act of June 11, 1906, and the Act of August 10, 1912 (16 U. S. C. 506–509), as provided by the Act of March 4, 1913 (16 U. S. C. 512); investigation and establishment of water rights, including the purchase thereof or of lands or interests in lands or rights-of-way for use and protection of water rights necessary or beneficial in connection with the administration and public use of the national forests; and all expenses necessary for the use, maintenance, improvement, protection, and general administration of the national forests,

$27,100,000, of which not to exceed $75,000 shall be available for the purchase of three nursery sites, and not to exceed $5,000 shall be available for the purchase of administrative sites.

Cooperative range improvements: For artificial revegetation, construction, and maintenance of range improvements, control of rodents, and eradication of poisonous and noxious plants on national forest lands, pursuant to section 12 of the Act of April 24, 1950 (Public Law Numbered 478), $700,000, to remain available until expended.

Fighting forest fires: For fighting and preventing forest fires on or threatening lands under Forest Service administration, including lands under contract for purchase or in process of condemnation for Forest Service purposes, and for liquidation of obligations incurred in the preceding fiscal year for such purpose, $6,000,000, of which $2,500,000 shall be apportioned for use, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, only to the extent that the Secretary, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, finds necessary to meet emergency conditions.

Forest research: For forest research in accordance with the provisions of sections 1, 2, 7, 8, 9, and 10 of the Act approved May 22, 1928, as amended (16 U. S. C. 581, 581a, 581f–581i), including the construction and maintenance of improvements, as follows:

Forest and range management investigations: Fire, silvicultural, watershed, and other forest investigations and experiments under said section 2, as amended, and investigations and experiments to develop improved methods of management of forest and other ranges under section 7, at forest or range experiment stations or elsewhere, $3,030,000, of which $41,000 shall be available for such investigations and experiments at Bartlett Experimental Forest only.

Forest products: Experiments, investigations, and tests of forest products under section 8, at the Forest Products Laboratory, or elsewhere, $1,300,000, of which $30,000 shall be made available for the establishment of a forest utilization service unit in the Southwest.

Forest resources investigations: A comprehensive forest survey under section 9, and investigations in forest economics under section 10, $880,000.

FOREST DEVELOPMENT ROADS AND TRAILS

For expenses necessary for carrying out the provisions of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act approved November 9, 1921, as amended (23 U. S. C. 23, 23a), relating to forest development roads and trails, including the construction, reconstruction, and maintenance of roads and trails on experimental areas under Forest Service administration, $10,348,000, which sum is authorized to be appropriated by the Act of June 29, 1948 (Public Law 834), to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for the rental, purchase, construction, or alteration of buildings necessary for the storage and repair of equipment and supplies used for road and trail construction and maintenance, but the total cost of any such building purchased, altered, or constructed under this authorization shall not exceed $15,000 with the exception that any building erected, purchased, or acquired, the cost of which was $15,000 or more, may be improved within any fiscal year by an amount not to exceed 2 per centum of the cost of such buildings certified by the Chief of the Forest Service.

ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR NATIONAL FORESTS

Weeks Act: For the acquisition of forest lands under the provisions of the Act approved March 1, 1911, as amended (16 U. S. C. 513–519, 521), $300,000, to be available only for payment toward the purchase price of any lands acquired, including the cost of surveys in connection with such acquisition: *Provided*, That no part of such funds shall be used for the purchase of lands in the counties of Adair, Cherokee, and Sequoyah, in the State of Oklahoma, without the specific approval of the Board of County Commissioners of the county in which such lands are situated.

Superior National Forest: For the acquisition of forest land within the Superior National Forest, Minnesota, under the provisions of the Act approved June 22, 1948 (Public Law 733), $150,000, to remain available until expended.

Special Acts: For the acquisition of land to facilitate the control of soil erosion and flood damage originating within the exterior boundaries of the following national forests, in accordance with the provisions of the following Acts authorizing annual appropriations of forest receipts for such purposes, and in not to exceed the following amounts from such receipts: Uinta and Wasatch National Forests, Utah, Act of August 26, 1935 (Public Law 337), as amended, $40,000; Cache National Forest, Utah, Act of May 11, 1938 (Public Law 505), as amended, $10,000; San Bernardino and Cleveland National Forests, Riverside County, California, Act of June 15, 1938 (Public Law 634), as amended, $22,000; Nevada and Toiyabe National Forests, Nevada, Act of June 25, 1938 (Public Law 748), as amended, $10,000; Angeles National Forest, California, Act of June 11, 1940 (Public Law 591), $20,000; Cleveland National Forest, San Diego County, California, Act of June 11, 1940 (Public Law 589), $5,000; Sequoia National Forest, California, Act of June 17, 1940 (Public Law 637), $35,000; in all $142,000.

FOREST-FIRE COOPERATION

For cooperation with the various States or other appropriate agencies in forest-fire prevention and suppression and the protection of timbered and cut-over lands in accordance with the provisions of sections 1, 2, and 3 of the Act approved June 7, 1924, as amended (16 U. S. C. 564–566), $9,500,000.

FARM AND OTHER PRIVATE FORESTRY COOPERATION

To enable the Secretary through the Forest Service to advise timberland owners and associations, wood-using industries or other appropriate agencies in the application of forest management principles to federally owned lands leased to States and to private forest lands, so as to attain sustained-yield management, the conservation of the timber resources, the productivity of forest lands, and the stabilization of employment and economic continuance of forest industries, and to carry into effect, through such agencies of the Department as he may designate, the provisions of the Cooperative Farm Forestry Act, approved May 18, 1937 (16 U. S. C. 568b), (not to exceed $785,034) and the provisions of sections 4 (not to exceed $449,200) and 5 (not to exceed $65,766) of the Act approved June 7, 1924 (16 U. S. C. 567–568), and Acts supplementary thereto; $1,300,000.

FLOOD CONTROL

For expenses necessary, in accordance with the Flood Control Act, approved June 22, 1936 (Public Law 738), as amended and supplemented, to make preliminary examinations and surveys, and to perform works of improvement, and to plan the agricultural phases of the development of the Columbia Basin area in accordance with the provisions of laws relating to the activities of the Department, to remain available until expended, $10,315,000, with which shall be merged the unexpended balances of funds heretofore appropriated or transferred to the Department for flood-control purposes: *Provided*, That no part of such funds shall be used for the purchase of lands in the Yazoo and Little Tallahatchie watersheds without specific approval of the county board of supervisors of the county in which such lands are situated, nor shall any part of such funds be used for the purchase of lands in the counties of Adair, Cherokee, and Sequoyah, in the State of Oklahoma, without the specific approval of the Board of County Commissioners of the county in which such lands are situated: *Provided further*, That of the funds available herein, not in excess of $8,315,000 may be expended in watersheds heretofore authorized by section 13 of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944, for necessary gulley control, floodwater detention, and floodway structures in areas other than those over which the Department of the Army has jurisdiction and responsibility.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Act approved April 27, 1935 (16 U. S. C. 590a–590f), which provides for a national program of erosion control and soil and water conservation, furnishing of subsistence to employees, operation and maintenance of aircraft, and the purchase and erection or alteration of permanent buildings: *Provided*, That the cost of any building purchased, erected, or as improved, exclusive of the cost of constructing a water supply or sanitary system and connecting the same with any such building, shall not exceed $2,500 except where buildings are acquired in conjunction with land being purchased for other purposes and except for eight buildings to be constructed at a cost not to exceed $15,000 per building: *Provided further*, That no money appropriated in this chapter shall be available for the construction of any such building on land not owned by the Government: *Provided further*, That in the State of Missouri where the State has established a central State agency authorized to enter into agreements with the United States or any of its agencies on policies and general programs for the saving of its soil by the extension of Federal aid to any soil conservation district in such State, the agreements made by or on behalf of the United States with any such soil conservation district shall have the prior approval of such central State agency before they shall become effective as to such district, as follows:

Soil conservation research: For research and investigations into the character, cause, extent, history, and effects of erosion, soil and moisture depletion and methods of soil and water conservation (including the construction and hydrologic phases of farm irrigation and land drainage, and water regulation to conserve the soil and reduce

fire hazards in the Everglades region of Florida, except that expenditures for all work in the Everglades region shall be limited to a sum not in excess of funds made available for such work by the State of Florida, or political subdivisions thereof); and for construction, operation, and maintenance of experimental watersheds, stations, laboratories, plots, and installations, $1,500,000.

Soil conservation operations: For carrying out preventive measures to conserve soil and water, including such special measures as may be necessary to prevent floods and the siltation of reservoirs, and including the improvement of farm irrigation and land drainage, the establishment and operation of conservation nurseries, the making of conservation plans and surveys, and the dissemination of information, $52,400,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation may be expended for soil and water conservation operations in demonstration projects: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $5,000 may be used for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706 (a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as amended by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a).

LAND UTILIZATION AND RETIREMENT OF SUBMARGINAL LAND

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1010–1012), and the provisions of the Act approved August 11, 1945 (7 U. S. C. 1011 note), $1,565,175.

WATER CONSERVATION AND UTILIZATION PROJECTS

For expenses necessary to carry into effect the functions of the Department under the Acts of May 10, 1939 (53 Stat. 685, 719), October 14, 1940 (16 U. S. C. 590y–z–10), as amended and supplemented, and June 28, 1949 (Public Law 132), relating to the construction, operation, and maintenance of water conservation and utilization projects, to remain available until expended, $500,000, which sum shall be merged with the unexpended balances of funds heretofore appropriated or transferred to said Department for the purposes of said Act.

PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION

CONSERVATION AND USE OF AGRICULTURAL LAND RESOURCES

To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, approved February 29, 1936, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590g–590q), including not to exceed $6,000 for the preparation and display of exhibits, including such displays at State, interstate, and international fairs within the United States; $282,500,000, to remain available until December 31 of the next succeeding fiscal year for compliance with the program of soil-building practices and soil- and water-conserving practices authorized under this head in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1950, carried out during the period July 1, 1949, to December 31, 1950, inclusive: *Provided*, That not to exceed $25,500,000 of the total sum provided under this head shall be available during the current fiscal year for salaries and

other administrative expenses for carrying out such program, the cost of aerial photographs, however, not to be charged to such limitation; but not more than $5,000,000 shall be transferred to the appropriation account, "Administrative expenses, section 392, Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938": *Provided further*, That payments to claimants hereunder may be made upon the certificate of the claimant, which certificate shall be in such form as the Secretary may prescribe, that he has carried out the conservation practice or practices and has complied with all other requirements as conditions for such payments and that the statements and information contained in the application for payment are correct and true, to the best of his knowledge and belief, under the penalties of title 18, United States Code: *Provided further*, That none of the funds herein appropriated or made available for the functions assigned to the Agricultural Adjustment Agency pursuant to the Executive Order Numbered 9069, of February 23, 1942, shall be used to pay the salaries or expenses of any regional information employees or any State information employees, but this shall not preclude the answering of inquiries or supplying of information at the county level to individual farmers: *Provided further*, That such amount shall be available for salaries and other administrative expenses in connection with the formulation and administration of the 1951 program of soil-building practices and soil- and water-conserving practices, under the Act of February 29, 1936, as amended (amounting to $285,000,000, including administration, and formulated on the basis of a distribution of the funds available for payments and grants among the several States in accordance with their conservation needs as determined by the Secretary, except that the proportion allocated to any State shall not be reduced more than 15 per centum from the distribution for the next preceding program year, and no participant shall receive more than $2,500); but the payments or grants under such programs shall be conditioned upon the utilization of land with respect to which such payments or grants are to be made in conformity with farming practices which will encourage and provide for soil-building and soil- and water-conserving practices in the most practical and effective manner and adapted to conditions in the several States, as determined and approved by the State committees appointed pursuant to section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590h (b)), for the respective States: *Provided further*, That not to exceed 5 per centum of the allocation for the agricultural conservation program for any county may be allotted with the approval of the State committee to the Soil Conservation Service for services of its technicians in formulating and carrying out the agricultural conservation program and the funds so allotted shall not be utilized by the Soil Conservation Service for any purpose other than technical and other assistance in such county: *Provided further*, That such amounts shall be available for the purchase of seeds, fertilizers, lime, trees, or any other farming materials, or any soil-terracing services, and making grants thereof to agricultural producers to aid them in carrying out farming practices approved by the Secretary under programs provided for herein: *Provided further*, That no part of any funds available to the Department, or any bureau, office, corporation, or other agency constituting a part of such Department,

shall be used in the current fiscal year for the payment of salary or travel expenses of any person who has been convicted of violating the Act entitled "An Act to prevent pernicious political activities", approved August 2, 1939, as amended, or who has been found in accordance with the provisions of title 18, United States Code, section 1913, to have violated or attempted to violate such section which prohibits the use of Federal appropriations for the payment of personal services or other expenses designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress to favor or oppose any legislation or appropriation by Congress except upon request of any Member or through the proper official channels.

ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS AND MARKETING QUOTAS

To enable the Secretary to formulate and carry out acreage allotment and marketing quota programs pursuant to the provisions of title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1301–1393), $32,300,000, of which not more than $5,500,000 shall be transferred to the appropriation account "Administrative expenses, section 392, Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938": *Provided*, That $4,000,000 of this appropriation shall be placed in reserve pending determination by the Secretary as to necessity of marketing quotas on the 1951 crops of wheat, corn, and rice, to be released in such amounts and at such times as determined by the Bureau of the Budget to be necessary in connection with such marketing quotas.

SUGAR ACT

To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948 (7 U. S. C. 1101–1160), $63,750,000, to remain available until June 30 of the next succeeding fiscal year: *Provided*, That expenditures (including transfers) from this appropriation for other than payments to sugar producers shall not exceed $1,500,000.

NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT

To enable the Secretary to carry out the provisions of the National School Lunch Act (42 U. S. C. 1751–1760), $83,500,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for nonfood assistance under section 5 of said Act.

MARKETING SERVICES

For expenses necessary in conducting investigations, experiments, and demonstrations, as follows:

Market news service: For collecting, publishing, and distributing, by telegraph, mail, or otherwise, timely information on the market supply and demand, commercial movement, location, disposition, quality, condition, and market prices of livestock, meats, fish, and animal products, dairy and poultry products (including broilers), fruits and vegetables, peanuts and their products, grain, hay, feeds, cottonseed, and seeds, and other agricultural products, $2,118,500.

Market inspection of farm products: For the investigation and certification, in one or more jurisdictions, to shippers and other interested parties of the class, quality, and condition of any agricultural commodity or food product, whether raw, dried, canned, or otherwise

processed, and any product containing an agricultural commodity or derivative thereof when offered for interstate shipment or when received at such important central markets as the Secretary may from time to time designate, or at points which may be conveniently reached therefrom under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, including payment of such fees as will be reasonable and as nearly as may be to cover the cost for the service rendered, $780,000.

Marketing farm products: For acquiring and diffusing among the people of the United States useful information relative to the needed supplies, standardization, classification, grading, preparation for market, handling, transportation, storage, and marketing of farm and food products, including the demonstration and promotion of the use of uniform standards of classification of American farm and food products throughout the world, for making analyses of cotton fiber as provided by the Act of April 7, 1941 (7 U. S. C. 473d), for carrying out the provisions of section 201 (a) to 201 (d), inclusive, of title II of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U. S. C. 1291), including not to exceed $25,000 for employment at rates not to exceed $100 per diem, pursuant to the second sentence of section 706 (a), of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as amended by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), and not to exceed $20,000 for transportation and other necessary expenses including not to exceed $10 per diem of persons serving without compensation while away from their homes or regular places of business, $1,260,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary may make available to any bureau, office, or agency of the Department such amounts from this appropriation as may be necessary to carry out the functions for which this appropriation is made, and any such amounts shall be in addition to amounts transferred or otherwise made available to appropriation items in this Act.

Tobacco Acts: To carry into effect the provisions of the Act to establish and promote the use of standards of classification for tobacco, to provide and maintain an official tobacco-inspection service, approved August 23, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 511–511q), the Act to provide for the collection and publication of statistics of tobacco by the Department, approved January 14, 1929 (7 U. S. C. 501–508), as amended, and the Act to prohibit the exportation of tobacco seed and plants, approved June 5, 1940 (7 U. S. C. 516), $1,660,500.

Cotton Statistics, Classing, Standards and Futures Acts: To carry into effect the provisions of the Act authorizing the Secretary to collect and publish statistics of the grade and staple length of cotton, approved March 3, 1927, as amended by the Act of April 13, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 471–476), and to perform the duties imposed upon him by chapter 14 of the Internal Revenue Code relating to cotton futures (26 U. S. C. 1920–1935), and to carry into effect the provisions of the United States Cotton Standards Act, approved March 4, 1923, as amended (7 U. S. C. 51–65), $1,675,000.

Marketing regulatory Acts: For expenses necessary to carry into effect the provisions of the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, as amended (7 U. S. C. 499a–499r), the Act to prevent the destruction or dumping of farm produce (7 U. S. C. 491–497), the Act to provide standards for baskets and containers for fruits and vegetables, as amended (15 U. S. C. 251–256), the Act to fix standards

for hampers, round stave baskets, and splint baskets for fruits and vegetables (15 U. S. C. 257–257i), the Act to provide export standards for apples and pears (7 U. S. C. 581–589), the United States Grain Standards Act (7 U. S. C. 71–87), the United States Warehouse Act (7 U. S. C. 241–273), the Federal Seed Act (7 U. S. C. 1551–1610), the Packers and Stockyards Act, as amended (7 U. S. C. 181–229), the Naval Stores Act (7 U. S. C. 91–99), and the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U. S. C. 135–135k), $3,495,000.

COMMODITY EXCHANGE AUTHORITY

To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1–17a), $650,000.

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION

For operating and administrative expenses, $7,204,000.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

To carry into effect the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended (7 U. S. C. 901–915), as follows:

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For administrative expenses, including not to exceed $500 for financial and credit reports, $8,550,000.

LOAN AUTHORIZATION

For loans in accordance with said Act, and for carrying out the provisions of section 7 thereof, to be borrowed from the Secretary of the Treasury in accordance with the provisions of section 3 (a) of said Act as follows: Rural electrification program, $350,000,000; and rural telephone program, $32,500,000; and additional amounts, not to exceed a total of $150,000,000 (including the uncommitted balance available as a carry-over from the fiscal year 1950), may be borrowed for the rural electrification program under the same terms and conditions if and to the extent that the Secretary of Agriculture shall certify, from time to time, to the Secretary of the Treasury that such additional amounts are required during the fiscal year 1951, under the then existing conditions, for the expeditious and orderly development of the program.

FARMERS' HOME ADMINISTRATION

To carry into effect the provisions of titles I, II, and the related provisions of title IV of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1000–1031), the Farmers' Home Administration Act of 1946 (7 U. S. C. 1001, note; 31 U. S. C. 82h; 12 U. S. C. 371; 35 D. C. Code 535; 60 Stat. 1062–1080); the Act of July 30, 1946 (40 U. S. C. 436–439); the Act of October 19, 1949 (Public Law 361); the Act of August 28, 1937, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590r–590x, 590z–5), for the development of facilities for water storage and utilization in the arid and semiarid areas of the United States; and the provisions of title V of the Housing Act of 1949 relating to financial assistance for farm housing (Public Law 171, approved July 15, 1949), as follows:

LOAN AUTHORIZATION

For loans (including payments in lieu of taxes and taxes under section 50 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, and advances incident to the acquisition and preservation of security of obligations under the foregoing several authorities): Title I and section 43 of title IV of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended and title V of the Housing Act of 1949 (except grants under 504 (a)) $65,000,000, of which not to exceed $3,500,000 of the amount available for the purposes of title I and section 43 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, may be distributed to States and Territories without regard to farm population and prevalence of tenancy, in addition to the amount otherwise distributed thereto, for loans in reclamation projects and to entrymen on unpatented public land (sums available for loans under title V of the Housing Act of 1949 to remain available until expended); title II of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, $85,000,000; the Act of August 28, 1937, as amended, $4,000,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed the foregoing several amounts shall be borrowed in one account from the Secretary of the Treasury on the request of the Secretary of Agriculture at such rate of interest as may be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, but not in excess of 3 per centum per annum; and the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to lend such sums to the Secretary upon the security of any obligations of borrowers from the Secretary under the provisions of said Acts: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may utilize proceeds from payments of principal and interest under such Acts to repay the Secretary of the Treasury the amounts borrowed therefrom for the purposes of such Acts: *Provided further*, That for the purpose of making loans pursuant to the foregoing authority, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public-debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under that Act are extended to include such loans to the Secretary: *Provided further*, That repayments to the Secretary of the Treasury on such loans shall be treated as a public-debt transaction.

GRANTS

For grants and for the grant portion of combination loans and grants for the purpose of section 504 (a) of the Housing Act of 1949, $650,000, to remain available until expended.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For the making, servicing, and collecting of loans and insured mortgages, the servicing and collecting of loans made under prior authority, the liquidation of assets transferred to Farmers Home Administration pursuant to the Farmers Home Administration Act of 1946, and the extension of financial assistance under the Housing Act of 1949, $28,500,000, together with a transfer to this appropriation item of not to exceed $80,000 of the fees and administrative expense charges made available by subsections (d) and (e) of section 12 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended.

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses, including not to exceed $5,000 for attendance at meetings or conventions of members of organizations at which matters of importance to the work of the Farm Credit Administration are to be discussed or transacted; library membership fees or dues in organizations which issue publications to members only or to members at a lower price than to others, payment for which may be made in advance; not to exceed $20,000 for expenditures authorized by section 602 of the Organic Act of 1944 (12 U. S. C. 833); purchase of one passenger motor vehicle (for replacement only) for use in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; garage rental in the District of Columbia; payment of actual transportation and other necessary expenses and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of subsistence of persons serving, while away from their homes, without other compensation from the United States, in an advisory capacity to the Farm Credit Administration, except that such expenditures shall not exceed $10,000; examination of corporations, banks, associations, and institutions operated, supervised, or regulated by the Farm Credit Administration $585,000, together with not to exceed $2,325,000 of collections from Federal Farm Credit agencies of assessments and charges, to be advanced by transfer and counter warrant to this appropriation, to cover the cost of Farm Credit Administration facilities, examinations, and other services rendered to such agencies; $2,910,000.

EXTENSION SERVICE

PAYMENTS TO STATES, HAWAII, ALASKA, AND PUERTO RICO

For payments to the States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico, for cooperative agricultural extension work as follows:

Capper-Ketcham, Bankhead-Jones, and related Acts: Capper-Ketcham Act, the Act approved May 22, 1928 (7 U. S. C. 343a, 343b), $1,480,000; Bankhead-Jones Act, section 21, title II, of the Act approved June 29, 1935, (7 U. S. C. 343c), $12,000,000; Bankhead-Jones Act, section 23, title II, of the Act approved June 29, 1935, as amended by the Act of June 6, 1945 (7 U. S. C. 343d–1), $12,500,000; additional extension work, the Act approved April 24, 1939, as amended (7 U. S. C. 343c–1), $555,000; Alaska, the Act approved February 23, 1929 (7 U. S. C. 386c), extending the benefits of the Smith-Lever Act to the Territory of Alaska, $13,950, and the Act approved October 27, 1949 (Public Law 417), extending to the Territory of Alaska the benefits of the Capper-Ketcham Act and sections 21 and 23 of title II of the Bankhead-Jones Act, $42,150; Puerto Rico, section 3 of the Act of March 4, 1931 (7 U. S. C. 386f), authorizing extension of the Capper-Ketcham Act to Puerto Rico, $31,348; the Act approved August 28, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 343f–343g), extending the benefits of section 21 of the Bankhead-Jones Act to Puerto Rico, $408,000, and the Act approved October 26, 1949 (Public Law 406), extending the benefits of section 23 of title II of the Bankhead-Jones Act to Puerto Rico, $40,000; and section 506a of title V of the Housing Act of 1949 (Public Law 171), $33,050; in all, payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico, $27,103,498.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary to administer the provisions of the Smith-Lever Act, approved May 8, 1914 (7 U. S. C. 341–348), and Acts amendatory or supplementary thereto, and to coordinate the extension work of the Department and the several States, Territories, and insular possessions, $900,000.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

For expenses of the Office of the Secretary of Agriculture, including the purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only; travel expenses, including examination of estimates for appropriations in the field; stationery, supplies, materials, and equipment; freight, express, and drayage charges; advertising, communication service, postage, washing towels, repairs and alterations, and other miscellaneous supplies and expenses not otherwise provided for and necessary for the practical and efficient work of the Department of Agriculture, $2,161,300, together with such amounts from other appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules in the Budget for the current fiscal year for such services and expenses, which several amounts or portions thereof as may be determined by the Secretary not exceeding a total of $109,280, shall be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation: *Provided, however*, That if the total amounts of such appropriations or authorizations for the current fiscal year shall at any time exceed or fall below the amounts estimated, respectively, therefor in the Budget for such year, the amounts transferred or to be transferred therefrom to this appropriation shall be increased or decreased in such amounts as the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives of the Department, shall determine are appropriate to the requirements as changed by such reductions or increases in such appropriations or authorizations.

OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

For necessary expenses, including payment of fees or dues for the use of law libraries by attorneys in the field service, $2,562,500, together with such amounts from other appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules in the budget for the current fiscal year for such expenses which several amounts not exceeding a total of $207,000 shall be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation.

OFFICE OF FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL RELATIONS

For necessary expenses for the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations and for enabling the Secretary to coordinate and integrate activities of the Department in connection with foreign agricultural work, $600,000.

OFFICE OF INFORMATION

For necessary expenses in connection with the publication, indexing, illustration, and distribution of bulletins, documents, and reports, the preparation, distribution, and display of agricultural motion and sound pictures, and exhibits, and the coordination of informational work and programs authorized by Congress in the Department,

$1,265,800, together with such amounts from other appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules in the Budget for the current fiscal year for such expenses, which several amounts or portions thereof, as may be determined by the Secretary, not exceeding a total of $16,200, shall be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation, of which total appropriation amounts not exceeding those specified may be used for the purposes enumerated as follows: For preparation and display of exhibits, $109,959; for preparation, distribution, and display of motion and sound pictures, $58,700; for farmers' bulletins, which shall be adapted to the interests of the people of the different sections of the country, an equal proportion of four-fifths of which shall be delivered to or sent out under the addressed franks furnished by the Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress, as they shall direct (7 U. S. C. 417) and not less than two hundred thirty thousand eight hundred and fifty copies for the use of the Senate and House of Representatives of part 2 of the annual report of the Secretary (known as the Yearbook of Agriculture), as authorized by section 73 of the Act of January 12, 1895 (44 U. S. C. 241), $611,128: *Provided*, That when and to the extent that in the judgment of the Secretary agricultural exhibits and motion and sound pictures relating to the programs of the various agencies of the Department authorized by Congress can be more advantageously prepared, displayed, or distributed by the Office of Information, as the central agency of the Department therefor, additional funds not exceeding $300,000 for these purposes may be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation, from the funds applicable, and shall be available for the objects specified herein: *Provided further*, That in the preparation of motion pictures or exhibits by the Department, not exceeding a total of $10,000 may be used for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706 (a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as amended by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a): *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the establishment or maintenance of regional or State field offices, or for the compensation of employees in such offices except that not to exceed $10,000 may be used to maintain the San Francisco radio office.

LIBRARY

For necessary expenses, including dues, for library membership in societies or associations which issue publications to members only or at a price to members lower than to subscribers who are not members; $713,293.

TITLE II—CORPORATIONS

The following corporations and agencies are hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to each such corporation or agency and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the Budget for the fiscal year 1951 for such corporation or agency, except as hereinafter provided:

Federal Crop Insurance Corporation.

Commodity Credit Corporation: Nothing in this chapter shall be so construed as to prevent the Commodity Credit Corporation from carrying out any activity or any program authorized by law: *Provided*, That not to exceed $16,350,000 shall be available for administrative expenses of the Corporation: *Provided further*, That all necessary expenses (including legal and special services performed on a contract or fee basis, but not including other personal services) in connection with the acquisition, operation, maintenance, improvement, or disposition of any real or personal property belonging to the Corporation or in which it has an interest, including expenses of collections of pledged collateral, shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses for the purposes hereof: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to discharge $66,698,457 of the indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation to the Secretary of the Treasury by canceling notes in such amount issued by the Corporation to the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to section 4 of the Act of March 8, 1938, as amended (15 U. S. C. 713a–4).

Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation: Not to exceed $1,280,000 (to be computed on an accrual basis) of the funds of the Corporation shall be available for administrative expenses, including employment on a contract or fee basis of persons, firms, and corporations for the performance of special services, including legal services, and the use of the services and facilities of Federal land banks, national farm loan associations, Federal Reserve banks, and agencies of the Government as authorized by the Act of January 31, 1934 (12 U. S. C. 1020–1020h) ; and said total sum shall be exclusive of services and facilities furnished and examinations made by the Farm Credit Administration central office, interest expense, and expenses in connection with the acquisition, operation, maintenance, improvement, protection, or disposition of real or personal property belonging to the Corporation or in which it has an interest: *Provided*, That promptly after June 30 of each fiscal year all cash funds in excess of the estimated operating requirements for the current fiscal year shall be declared as dividends and paid into the general fund of the Treasury: *Provided further*, That the aggregate amount of bonds the Corporation may issue and have outstanding at any one time shall not exceed $500,000,000.

Federal intermediate credit banks: Not to exceed $1,496,000 (to be computed on an accrual basis) of the funds of the banks shall be available for administrative expenses and services performed for the banks by other Government agencies (except services and facilities furnished and examinations made by the Farm Credit Administration central office, and services performed by any Federal Reserve bank and by the United States Treasury in connection with the financial transactions of the banks) ; and said total sum shall be exclusive of interest expense, legal and special services performed on a contract or fee basis, and expenses in connection with the acquisition, operation, maintenance, improvement, protection, or disposition of real or personal property belonging to the banks or in which they have an interest.

Production credit corporations: Not to exceed $1,358,000 (to be computed on an accrual basis) of the funds of the corporations shall

be available for administrative expenses and services performed for the corporations by other Government agencies (except services and facilities furnished and examinations made by the Farm Credit Administration central office); and said total sum shall be exclusive of interest expense, legal and special services performed on a contract or fee basis, and expenses in connection with the acquisition, operation, maintenance, improvement, protection, or disposition of real or personal property belonging to the corporations or in which they have an interest.

TITLE III—REDUCTIONS IN APPROPRIATIONS

Amounts available from appropriations are hereby reduced in the sums hereinafter set forth, such sums to be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury immediately upon the approval of this chapter:

An amount of $199,990,000 in the revolving fund held in the Treasury available to the Governor, Farm Credit Administration, as authorized by the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act, as amended (12 U. S. C. 1020b), for resubscriptions to the capital stock of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation.

The total amount of $125,000,000 in the revolving fund appropriated to the Office of the Secretary, Treasury Department, as authorized by the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended (12 U. S. C. 698), for subscriptions to the capital stock of the Federal land banks.

TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. Within the unit limit of cost fixed by law, the lump-sum appropriations and authorizations made for the Department under this chapter shall be available for the purchase of not to exceed 497 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, and for the hire of such vehicles, necessary in the conduct of the work of the Department outside the District of Columbia.

SEC. 402. Provisions of law prohibiting or restricting the employment of aliens shall not apply to (1) the temporary employment of translators when competent citizen translators are not available; (2) employment in cases of emergency of persons in the field service of the Department for periods of not more than sixty days; and (3) employment under the appropriation for the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations.

SEC. 403. Appropriations and authorizations made in this chapter shall be available for health service programs as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150).

SEC. 404. Funds available to the Department during the current fiscal year shall be available for the payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672).

SEC. 405. Funds available to the Department of Agriculture during the current fiscal year may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

SEC. 406. Funds available to the Department of Agriculture may be used for printing and binding, including the purchase of reprints of scientific and technical articles.

SEC. 407. Of appropriations herein made which are available for

the purchase of lands, not to exceed $1 may be expended for each option to purchase any particular tract or tracts of land.

SEC. 408. No part of the funds appropriated by this chapter shall be used for the payment of any officer or employee of the Department who, as such officer or employee, or on behalf of the Department or any division, commission, or bureau thereof, issues, or causes to be issued, any prediction, oral or written, or forecast, except as to damage threatened or caused by insects and pests, with respect to future prices of cotton or the trend of same.

SEC. 409. Except to provide materials required in or incident to research or experimental work where no suitable domestic product is available, no part of the funds appropriated by this chapter shall be expended in the purchase of twine manufactured from commodities or materials produced outside of the United States.

SEC. 410. Not less than $575,000 shall be available for contracts in accordance with section 10 (a) of the Act of August 14, 1946 (7 U. S. C. 427i) from appropriations herein made for the Bureau of Agricultural Economics; Bureau of Animal Industry; Bureau of Dairy Industry; Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering; Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine; Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry; Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics; and the Forest Service.

SEC. 411. Of the funds appropriated in this chapter for travel expenses, $791,888 shall be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury within thirty days after enactment of this Act; but such amount shall be credited toward any other reduction in amounts available for such travel expenses resulting from decreases in appropriations made by this Act below the budget estimates.

This chapter may be cited as the "Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1951".

CHAPTER VII—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

TITLE I

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary of the Interior (hereafter in this chapter referred to as the Secretary), including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; for purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only at not to exceed $4,500; printing and binding; employment of a Director of the Oil and Gas Division without regard to the civil service laws; and teletype rentals and service; $2,315,000.

ENFORCEMENT OF THE CONNALLY HOT OIL ACT

For expenses necessary for controlling the interstate shipment of contraband oil as required by law (15 U. S. C. 715), including personal services in the District of Columbia; purchase of not to exceed four passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; and printing and binding; $180,000.

claims in the manner authorized in the first paragraph of section 2672, as amended, of title 28 of the United States Code when such claims arise in foreign countries; expenses for translation and reproduction rights; acquisition, maintenance, operation, and distribution of educational, informational, reorientation, and rehabilitation materials and equipment for Germany, including grants; medical and health assistance for the civilian population of Germany; expenses incident to the operation of schools for American children who are dependents of Government personnel; expenses incident to maintaining discipline and order in occupied areas (including trial and punishment by courts established by or under authority of the President); printing and binding, including printing and binding outside continental United States without regard to section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111); purchase, rental, operation, and maintenance of printing and binding machines, equipment, and devices abroad; purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles; transportation to occupied Germany of property donated for the purposes of this appropriation; unforeseen contingencies (not to exceed $100,000) for the United States High Commissioner for Germany, to be accounted for pursuant to the provisions of section 291 of the Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C. 107); and representation allowances (not to exceed $20,000) similar to those authorized by section 901 (3) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (22 U. S. C. 1131); $27,000,000: *Provided*, That provisions of law, including current appropriation Acts, applicable to the Department of State shall be available for application to expenditures made from this appropriation: *Provided further*, That when section 601 of the Economy Act of 1932, as amended (31 U. S. C. 686), is employed to carry out the purposes of this appropriation the requisitioned agency may utilize the authority contained in this appropriation: *Provided further*, That expenditures from this appropriation may be made outside the continental United States, when necessary to carry out its purposes, without regard to sections 355 and 3648, Revised Statutes, as amended: *Provided further*, That the Department of State is authorized to utilize for carrying out the purposes of this appropriation, including unforeseen contingencies, without dollar reimbursement from this or any other appropriation (1) currencies deposited in Germany by the Federal Republic of Germany in accordance with section 115 (b) (6) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, and which may be made available by the Economic Cooperation Administration, (2) currencies otherwise deposited in Germany by the Federal Republic of Germany and which become available for use of the Government of the United States, its representatives or agencies in Germany, in such quantities and under such terms and conditions as may be determined by the Secretary of State after consultation with the Administrator for Economic Cooperation, and (3) other currencies derived from activities carried on under this appropriation: *Provided further*, That civilian employees of the United States serving in Germany who received appointments in October 1949 to the Foreign Service of the United States for service in Germany shall, for the purposes of section 625 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, be considered to have been in class on September 30, 1949: *Provided further*, That for the purposes of this appropriation appointments may be made to the Foreign Service Reserve with-

out regard to the four-year limitation contained in section 522 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946: *Provided further*, That in the event the President assigns to the Department of State responsibilities and obligations of the United States in connection with the government, occupation, or control of foreign areas in addition to Germany, the authorities contained in this appropriation may be utilized by the Department of State in connection with such government, occupation, or control of such foreign areas: *Provided further*, That when the Department of the Army, under the authority of the Act of March 3, 1911, as amended (10 U. S. C. 1253), furnishes subsistence supplies to personnel of civilian agencies of the United States Government serving in Germany, payment therefor by such personnel shall be made at the same rate as is paid by civilian personnel of the Department of the Army serving in Germany.

AID TO PALESTINE REFUGEES

For contributions by the United States to the United Nations for the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, as authorized by title III of the Foreign Economic Assistance Act of 1950 (Public Law 535, approved June 5, 1950), $27,450,000.

This chapter may be cited as the "Foreign Aid Appropriation Act, 1951".

CHAPTER XII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

SEC. 1201. Unless otherwise specifically provided, the maximum amount allowable during the current fiscal year, in accordance with section 16 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 78), for the purchase of any passenger motor vehicle (exclusive of busses, ambulances, and station wagons), is hereby fixed at $1,400.

SEC. 1202. Unless otherwise specified and during the current fiscal year, no part of any appropriation contained in this or any other Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any officer or employee of the Government of the United States (including any agency the majority of the stock of which is owned by the Government of the United States) whose post of duty is in continental United States unless such person (1) is a citizen of the United States, (2) is a person in the service of the United States on the date of enactment of this Act who, being eligible for citizenship, had filed a declaration of intention to become a citizen of the United States prior to such date, or (3) is a person who owes allegiance to the United States: *Provided*, That for the purpose of this section, an affidavit signed by any such person shall be considered prima facie evidence that the requirements of this section with respect to his status have been complied with: *Provided further*, That any person making a false affidavit shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $4,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penal clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law: *Provided further*, That any payment made to any officer or employee contrary to the provisions of this section shall be recoverable in action by the Federal Government. This section shall not apply to citizens of the Republic of the Philip-

pines or to nationals of those countries allied with the United States in the prosecution of the war.

SEC. 1203. Appropriations of the executive departments and independent establishments for the current fiscal year, available for expenses of travel or for the expenses of the activity concerned, are hereby made available for living quarters allowances in accordance with the Act of June 26, 1930 (5 U. S. C. 118a), and regulations prescribed thereunder, and cost-of-living allowances similar to those allowed under section 901 (2) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, in accordance with and to the extent prescribed by regulations of the President, for all civilian officers and employees of the Government permanently stationed in foreign countries: *Provided*, That the availability of appropriations made to the Department of State for carrying out the provisions of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 shall not be affected hereby.

SEC. 1204. No part of any appropriation for the current fiscal year contained in this or any other Act shall be paid to any person for the filling of any position for which he or she has been nominated after the Senate has voted not to approve of the nomination of said person.

SEC. 1205. No part of any appropriation contained in this or any other Act shall be used to pay in excess of $4 per volume for the current and future volumes of the United States Code Annotated and such volumes shall be purchased on condition and with the understanding that latest published cumulative annual pocket parts issued prior to the date of purchase shall be furnished free of charge, or in excess of $4.25 per volume for the current or future volumes of the Lifetime Federal Digest.

SEC. 1206. Funds made available by this or any other Act for administrative expenses in the current fiscal year of the corporations and agencies subject to the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended (31 U. S. C. 841), shall be available, in addition to objects for which such funds are otherwise available, for personal services and rent in the District of Columbia; printing and binding; examination of budgets and estimates of appropriations in the field; services in accordance with section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); and the objects specified in the sections of this title under the head "Departments and agencies", all the provisions of which shall be applicable to the expenditure of such funds unless otherwise specified in the Act by which they are made available: *Provided*, That in the event any functions budgeted as administrative expenses are subsequently transferred to or paid from other funds, the limitations on administrative expenses shall be correspondingly reduced.

SEC. 1207. No part of any funds of or available to any wholly owned Government corporation shall be used for the purchase or construction, or in making loans for the purchase or construction of any office building at the seat of government primarily for occupancy by any department or agency of the United States Government or by any corporation owned by the United States Government.

SEC. 1208. Funds of corporations and agencies, subject to the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, covered by the provisions of this or any other Act shall be available during the current fiscal year for payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672).

SEC. 1209. No part of any appropriation contained in this or any other Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation included in this or any other Act, shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of the United States, is not a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation or fund contained in this or any other Act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law: *Provided further*, That, as applicable to the Departments of Agriculture and Interior, nothing in this section shall be construed to require an affidavit from any person employed for less than sixty days for sudden emergency work involving the loss of human life or destruction of property, and the payment of salary or wages may be made to such persons from applicable appropriations for services rendered in such emergency without execution of the affidavit contemplated by this section.

SEC. 1210. No funds made available by this or any other Act shall be withdrawn from one appropriation account for credit to another, or to a working fund, except as authorized by law: *Provided*, That, except as otherwise specifically provided by law, any funds so withdrawn and credited shall be available for the same purposes, and subject to the same limitations, conditions, and restrictions, as provided by the Act appropriating such funds: *Provided further*, That any such withdrawal and credit shall be made, without warrant action, by check: *Provided further*, That no funds withdrawn and credited pursuant to section 601 of the Act of June 30, 1932, as amended (47 Stat. 417; 31 U. S. C. 686), shall be available for any period beyond that provided by the Act appropriating such funds.

SEC. 1211. Section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U. S. C. 665), is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3679. (a) No officer or employee of the United States shall make or authorize an expenditure from or create or authorize an obligation under any appropriation or fund in excess of the amount

available therein; nor shall any such officer or employee involve the Government in any contract or other obligation, for the payment of money for any purpose, in advance of appropriations made for such purpose, unless such contract or obligation is authorized by law.

"(b) No officer or employee of the United States shall accept voluntary service for the United States or employ personal service in excess of that authorized by law, except in cases of emergency involving the safety of human life or the protection of property.

"(c) (1) Except as otherwise provided in this section, all appropriations or funds available for obligation for a definite period of time shall be so apportioned as to prevent obligation or expenditure thereof in a manner which would indicate a necessity for deficiency or supplemental appropriations for such period; and all appropriations or funds not limited to a definite period of time, and all authorizations to create obligations by contract in advance of appropriations, shall be so apportioned as to achieve the most effective and economical use thereof. As used hereafter in this section, the term 'appropriation' means appropriations, funds, and authorizations to create obligations by contract in advance of appropriations.

"(2) In apportioning any appropriation, reserves may be established to provide for contingencies, or to effect savings whenever savings are made possible by or through changes in requirements, greater efficiency of operations, or other developments subsequent to the date on which such appropriation was made available. Whenever it is determined by an officer designated in subsection (d) of this section to make apportionments and reapportionments that any amount so reserved will not be required to carry out the purposes of the appropriation concerned, he shall recommend the rescission of such amount in the manner provided in the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, for estimates of appropriations.

"(3) Any appropriation subject to apportionment shall be distributed by months, calendar quarters, operating seasons, or other time periods, or by activities, functions, projects, or objects, or by a combination thereof, as may be deemed appropriate by the officers designated in subsection (d) of this section to make apportionments and reapportionments. Except as otherwise specified by the officer making the apportionment, amounts so apportioned shall remain available for obligation, in accordance with the terms of the appropriation, on a cumulative basis unless reapportioned.

"(4) Apportionments shall be reviewed at least four times each year by the officers designated in subsection (d) of this section to make apportionments and reapportionments, and such reapportionments made or such reserves established, modified, or released as may be necessary to further the effective use of the appropriation concerned, in accordance with the purposes stated in paragraph (1) of this subsection.

"(d) (1) Any appropriation available to the legislative branch, the judiciary, or the District of Columbia, which is required to be apportioned under subsection (c) of this section, shall be apportioned or reapportioned in writing by the officer having administrative control of such appropriation. Each such appropriation shall be apportioned not later than thirty days before the beginning of the fiscal year for which the appropriation is available, or not more than thirty

days after approval of the Act by which the appropriation is made available, whichever is later.

"(2) Any appropriation available to an agency, which is required to be apportioned under subsection (c) of this section, shall be apportioned or reapportioned in writing by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. The head of each agency to which any such appropriation is available shall submit to the Bureau of the Budget information, in such form and manner and at such time or times as the Director may prescribe, as may be required for the apportionment of such appropriation. Such information shall be submitted not later than forty days before the beginning of any fiscal year for which the appropriation is available, or not more than fifteen days after approval of the Act by which such appropriation is made available, whichever is later. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall apportion each such appropriation and shall notify the agency concerned of his action not later than twenty days before the beginning of the fiscal year for which the appropriation is available, or not more than thirty days after the approval of the Act by which such appropriation is made available, whichever is later. When used in this section, the term 'agency' means any executive department, agency, commission, authority, administration, board, or other independent establishment in the executive branch of the Government, including any corporation wholly or partly owned by the United States which is an instrumentality of the United States. Nothing in this subsection shall be so construed as to interfere with the initiation, operation, and administration of agricultural price support programs and no funds (other than funds for administrative expenses) available for price support, surplus removal, and available under Section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935, as amended (7 U. S. C. 612 (c)), with respect to agricultural commodities shall be subject to apportionment pursuant to this section. The provisions of this section shall not apply to any corporation which obtains funds for making loans, other than paid in capital funds, without legal liability on the part of the United States.

"(e) (1) No apportionment or reapportionment which, in the judgment of the officer making such apportionment or reapportionment, would indicate a necessity for a deficiency or supplemental estimate shall be made except upon a determination by such officer that such action is required because of (A) any laws enacted subsequent to the transmission to the Congress of the estimates for an appropriation which require expenditures beyond administrative control; or (B) emergencies involving the safety of human life, the protection of property, or the immediate welfare of individuals in cases where an appropriation has been made to enable the United States to make payment of, or contributions toward, sums which are required to be paid to individuals either in specific amounts fixed by law or in accordance with formulae prescribed by law.

"(2) In each case of an apportionment or a reapportionment which, in the judgment of the officer making such apportionment or reapportionment, would indicate a necessity for a deficiency or supplemental estimate, such officer shall immediately submit a detailed report of the facts of the case to the Congress. In transmitting any deficiency or supplemental estimates required on account of any such apportionment or reapportionment, reference shall be made to such report.

"(f) (1) The officers designated in subsection (d) of this section to make apportionments and reapportionments may exempt from apportionments trust funds and working funds expenditures from which have no significant effect on the financial operations of the Government, working capital and revolving funds established for intragovernmental operations, receipts from industrial and power operations available under law and any appropriation made specifically for—

"(1) interest on, or retirement of, the public debt;

"(2) payment of claims, judgments, refunds, and draw-backs;

"(3) any item determined by the President to be of a confidential nature;

"(4) payment under private relief Acts or other laws requiring payments to designated payees in the total amount of such appropriation;

"(5) grants to the States under title I, IV, or X of the Social Security Act, or under any other public assistance title in such Act.

"(2) The provisions of subsection (c) of this section shall not apply to appropriations to the Senate or House of Representatives or to any Member, committee, Office (including the office of the Architect of the Capitol), officer, or employee thereof.

"(g) Any appropriation which is apportioned or reapportioned pursuant to this section may be divided and subdivided administratively within the limits of such apportionments or reapportionments. The officer having adminstrative control of any such appropriation available to the legislative branch, the judiciary, or the District of Columbia, and the head of each agency, subject to the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, shall prescribe, by regulation, a system of adminstrative control (not inconsistent with any accounting procedures prescribed by or pursuant to law) which shall be designed to (A) restrict obligations or expenditures against each appropriation to the amount of apportionments or reapportionments made for each such appropriation, and (B) enable such officer or agency head to fix responsibility for the creation of any obligation or the making of any expenditure in excess of an apportionment or reapportionment.

"(h) No officer or employee of the United States shall authorize or create any obligation or make any expenditure (A) in excess of an apportionment or reapportionment, or (B) in excess of the amount permitted by regulations prescribed pursuant to subsection (g) of this section.

"(i) (1) In addition to any penalty or liability under other law, any officer or employee of the United States who shall violate subsection (a), (b), or (h) of this section shall be subjected to appropriate administrative discipline, including, when circumstances warrant, suspension from duty without pay or removal from office; and any officer or employee of the United States who shall knowingly and willfully violate subsection (a), (b), or (h) of this section shall, upon conviction, be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned for not more than two years, or both.

"(2) In the case of a violation of subsection (a), (b), or (h) of this section by an officer or employee of an agency, or of the District

of Columbia, the head of the agency concerned or the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, shall immediately report to the President, through the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and to the Congress all pertinent facts together with a statement of the action taken thereon."

SEC. 1212. No part of the funds of, or available for expenditure by any corporation or agency included in this Act, including the government of the District of Columbia, shall be available to pay for annual leave accumulated by any civilian officer or employee during the calendar year 1950 and unused at the close of business on June 30, 1951: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to officers and employees whose post of duty is outside the continental United States: *And provided further*, That this section shall not apply with respect to the payment of compensation for accumulated annual leave in the case of officers or employees who leave their civilian positions for the purpose of entering upon active military or naval service in the Armed Forces of the United States.

SEC. 1213. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 6 of the Act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 555), or the provisions of any other law, the Secretary of State may, in his absolute discretion, during the current fiscal year, terminate the employment of any officer or employee of the Department of State or of the Foreign Service of the United States whenever he shall deem such termination necessary or advisable in the interests of the United States.

Notwithstanding the provisions of section 6 of the Act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 555), or the provisions of any other law, the Secretary of Commerce may, in his absolute discretion, during the current fiscal year, terminate the employment of any officer or employee of the Department of Commerce whenever he shall deem such termination necessary or advisable in the best interests of the United States.

SEC. 1214. Appropriations, reappropriations, contract authorizations and reauthorizations made by this Act for departments and agencies in the executive branch of the government shall, without impairing national defense, be reduced in the amount of not less than $550,000,000 through the apportionment procedure provided for in Section 1211 of this Act.

SEC. 1215. No payment shall be made from appropriations in this Act to any officer on the retired lists of the Regular Army, Regular Navy, Regular Marine Corps, Regular Air Force, Regular Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service for a period of two years after retirement who for himself or for others is engaged in the selling of or contracting for the sale of or negotiating for the sale of to any agency of the Department of Defense, the Coast Guard, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Public Health Service any supplies or war materials.

This Act may be cited as the "General Appropriation Act, 1951".

Approved September 6, 1950.

IMMEDIATE RELEASE SEPTEMBER 6, 1950

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

I have signed H.R. 7786, the General Appropriation Act of 1951.

This bill provides, in a consolidated form, funds and other authorizations for the departments and agencies of the Federal Government for the fiscal year which began last July 1.

In signing this bill, I am compelled to call attention to a provision which, in my judgment, represents an unwise and dangerous departure from proper budgetary practices. This is the requirement that the Executive Branch reduce the appropriations enacted by the Congress by a fixed amount.

The foundation of our budget system is the preparation of an annual budget by the President and its presentation to the Congress for review, adjustment, and final determination.

For more than two hundred pages this enrolled bill sets forth in great detail the individual amounts appropriated by the Congress for the many programs of the Government. Section 1214, of the bill, however, directs that these individual and specific decisions by the Congress on appropriations and authorizations for the Executive Branch of the Government be reduced by at least $550,000,000, "without impairing national defense." In effect, the bill requires the Executive Branch to revise the judgment of the Congress on individual programs to meet an over-all arbitrary reduction.

This unusual provision represents a failure by the Congress to exercise its proper responsibility for enacting appropriations to conduct the Government's business.

The needs of our defense effort make it necessary to place primary emphasis on those programs of the Government which will strengthen our armed forces, our power to produce for defense, and the combined power of the free world to establish peace. In effecting the reduction required in the bill, a careful review will be made of all agency programs with a view to curtailing those which contribute least to these paramount objectives. This review is now going forward. It will continue during the coming months. If reductions greater than the amount specified in the bill can be made, I shall make them. Neither the Congress nor the President, however, can state at this time whether savings even to the extent arbitrarily required by Congress can be made without impairing essential Government

I also feel obliged to comment upon the provision of the bill which authorizes loans for the purpose of assistance to Spain. I do not regard this provision as a directive, which would be unconstitutional, but instead as an authorization, in addition to the authority already in existence under which loans to Spain may be made.

Spain is not, and has not been, foreclosed from borrowing money from this Government. Money will be loaned to Spain whenever mutually advantageous arrangements can be made with respect to security, terms of repayment, purposes for which the money is to be spent, and other appropriate factors, and whenever such loans will serve the interests of the United States in the conduct of foreign relations.

- - -